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Abstract
This dissertation celebrates the portable one-volume Latin Vulgate bibles produced on an unprecedented scale during the 13th century, particularly between 1230 and 1280, emphasizing their particular significance within the contexts of medieval book production and medieval bible use. The profound changes that these bibles implemented to the physical appearance and format of the Bible (as compact and portable copies of the complete biblical text), generated great innovations in the function and use of the Bible, and were directly responsible for the 13th-century portable bible’s extraordinary success and enduring popularity, in its own time and in ours, and thus their privileged place in the history of the Bible and the broader histories of medieval manuscripts and the Book.

I begin by positioning these bibles within contemporary trends of bible production, use and users at the time of their emergence in the early 13th century, comparing and contrasting their respective sizes, formats, texts, scripts, layouts and decoration, before proceeding, in my second chapter to examine the strategies of compression and miniaturization – including the use of thinner parchment, the miniaturization of their writing and the compression of the graphic unit of their mise-en-page - that made it possible to produce the whole Bible in Portable Book Format.

In my third chapter I turn to study how and why the 13th-century portable bible functioned as an independent searchable reference tool, and how these factors made these books invaluable for use for study and preaching, in addition to inviting liturgical use. Chapter 4 locates the portable bible within the early professional book trade, considers the production and early ownership of ‘luxury’ copies and offers a study of the costs involved in the ‘bespoke’ production of portable bibles (in the 13th century) and a survey of recorded prices of sale and purchase for which copies changed hands on the second hand book market (through the 16th century).

In my fifth and final chapter I investigate the position of 13th-century portable bibles in late medieval libraries and book collections focusing on the late medieval use of pandect bibles in two Benedictine communities, those at Durham Cathedral and at St. Augustine’s Abbey, Canterbury, concluding with a discussion of the places and purposes of these books in other religious institutions, illustrated through an extensive survey of medieval catalogues, inventories, wills and booklists.
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Introduction

This dissertation celebrates the portable one-volume Latin Vulgate bibles produced on an unprecedented scale during the 13th century, particularly between 1230 and 1280, emphasizing their particular significance within the contexts of medieval book production and medieval bible use. The profound changes that these bibles implemented to the physical appearance and format of the Bible (as compact and portable copies of the complete biblical text), generated great innovations in the function and use of the Bible, and were directly responsible for the 13th-century portable bible’s extraordinary success and enduring popularity, in its own time and in ours, and thus their privileged place in the history of the Bible and the broader histories of medieval manuscripts and the Book.

Over the course of the 13th century major changes took place in the arrangement and publishing of the Bible. These changes may be broadly characterized as having taken place in two stages over the course of the 13th century (the first ca. 1210-30, and the second ca. 1230-80). For the first time, the Bible assumed the appearance familiar to us from modern bibles: its biblical text was put into a single volume featuring the recognizable order of biblical books, layout on the page (its text presented in two neat and compact rectangular columns, each containing around 50 lines of tiny writing per page) and familiar devices for organizing and navigating its texts (such as chapter-divisions and page headings).

These bibles and the changes they embody, represent both “The most enduring monument of the scribes and illuminators of Paris in the early 13th century”, and a genuine phenomenon which has “a major place in the history of manuscripts.”¹ But more important in the history of book production and of ‘publishing’ were the changes to the physical appearance of the book. The new bibles were small, thick books, made using extremely thin parchment, almost translucent to the eye and very often creamy, smooth and silky to the touch. However, unlike previous bibles, these copies were portable and designed for study. Thus although bibles were by no means the only kind of book or text that was appearing in portable-sized copies during the 13th century, the Bible’s

¹ De Hamel (1994): 118.
² Portable bibles are immediately recognizable by their size and format, and in this respect are very similar
production in small-sized, single-volume portable copies during the 13th century were particularly significant in terms of the huge number of copies produced, the rapid rate at which this production took place and the pan-European scale of their production and use. Thus portable bibles played a crucial role in the changing methods of book production, users and reading strategies that the Bible underwent at a key moment in the histories of the Book, the Bible and Western Christianity.

Terminology & Classification

What may we consider as characteristic of ‘a 13th-century portable bible’ today? In this question I am referring primarily to the appearance of these books; in other words, what they look like (how can we recognize a copy today?) and what impression is made when you encounter one (what is recognizable about them?).

The defining characteristics of these portable 13th-century bibles reside in their physical size, their parchment and the size and layout of their writing. They are small, thick books, sufficiently small to hold a copy in one hand and turn its pages with the other

2 Portable bibles are immediately recognizable by their size and format, and in this respect are very similar to Books of Hours, their ‘cousin’ volumes amongst portable medieval books (along with breviaries). This is highlighted in a story told by Christopher de Hamel about a man who brought a Book of Hours to him at Sotheby’s for valuation and possible sale. Upon seeing the book on his desk, de Hamel exclaimed, “Oh, I know what that is; it’s a Book of Hours,” to which the man replied indignantly, “It’s not yours, it’s mine!” (as told by Will Noel). However unlike portable bibles, contemporary Books of Hours - and Psalters - are almost always decorated, often sumptuously so, usually featuring miniatures (particularly Full Page Miniatures); many contain artwork of a high quality, and such copies are frequently also illuminated. Furthermore, plentiful numbers of luxury Books of Hours and Psalters were produced and many such copies that have survived are known to have once been owned by illustrious patrons and owners (for example, The Hours of Catherine of Cleves and the Très Riches Heures of Jean, Duc de Berry). By contrast, very few 13th-century portable bibles feature portraits of their patrons (nor for that matter, of their artists). Indeed, not only are patron portraits very rarely found in small 13th-century bibles, but it is rare to find recorded evidence of the kind of medieval noble provenance commissioning or ownership of bibles such as these (à la ‘The Pocket Bible of Richard II’ or ‘The Minute Bible of Edward The Black Prince’) compared to the dozens of examples known in relation to Books of Hours. On Books of Hours in the 13th century: Claire Donovan compiled an extremely useful summary list (with descriptions) of 13th-century Books of Hours in England in her book The de Brailes Hours: Shaping the Book of Hours in Thirteenth-Century Oxford (London: British Library/Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1991): Appendix 3 (183-200); cf. Donovan’s chapter on the Book of Hours in 13th-century England in the same publication, 132-56. For further detailed studies of Books of Hours in the 13th century see Roger S. Wieck (1988) and (1997); Claire Donovan (1990) and Christopher de Hamel (1998) and ibid. (2012). On Psalters in the 13th century see William G. Noel (2001) and N.J. Morgan, Survey IV.1-2 (1982-88).

3 In our study of 13th-century portable bibles and other ‘portable’ medieval manuscripts, we should be measuring the thickness/depth and mass of these bibles in addition to their external measurements (i.e. height and width), since these factors have significant consequences for the books’ portability and, by extension, their use.
hand without difficulty. Their physical layout will probably be as follows: the volume is probably octavo in size; its leaves will probably be made of extremely thin parchment, almost translucent to the eye and very often creamy, smooth and silky to the touch; it will most likely feature the same order of biblical books, headings, chapter-divisions familiar to us from modern bibles; the arrangement of the text on its pages will be neat and compact, presented in two rectangular columns of around 50 lines of tiny writing per page, and these pages will likely be visually organized with chapter numbers and running headers in capitals of alternating red and blue, occasionally supplemented with a small number of historiated or decorated initials, probably no more than 20 or 30 mms in height.

Like the 13th-century portable bible itself, characterized by its small size (the tiny dimensions of its pages and the high degree to which its script and decorations are compressed), so is its study as a field of scholarly inquiry defined by characterized by size, namely the very large size of both the number of copies produced during a single century and of the number of surviving copies. The great numbers in which 13th-century portable bibles have survived means that these books occupy a privileged position within the modern canon of medieval manuscripts and within that of the medieval Bible.

Furthermore, the portable bible occupies a uniquely transformative position in the history of the Bible as (a single) Book. Our modern understanding of what constitutes ‘The Bible’ is not a medieval understanding of what the Bible was, what it contained, or what it looked like, whilst although the Bible certainly occupied a central position at the heart of medieval society, culture and religious life insofar as the biblical text was endlessly read, studied and interpreted throughout the Middle Ages, the Bible did not occupy the privileged position as book that, from a modern vantage point, we now expect it to have occupied (put simply, the biblical text was at the heart of medieval life but the Bible as book was not). The portable bible therefore represents a dynamic agent in shaping our modern understanding of medieval religious practices and reading habits and influencing how we conceive of the medieval book today.
Definitions & Terminology

Despite their popularity and importance in the history of the medieval Vulgate, the corpus of bibles produced during the 13th century has never been studied systematically and even lacks a widely accepted name. By the mid-13th century two overlapping but distinct types of bible had emerged, one textual and one material: the ‘Paris Bible,’ a textual blueprint or model of Scripture, its books, and their order; and the ‘pocket Bible,’ a compact material format for accessing and navigating the Scriptures in one, small volume (max height of 200 mm). To complicate matters further, these two descriptors are not mutually-exclusive; ‘Paris Bibles’ could be produced in small formats (of ‘pocket’ and ‘portable size) while small-format bibles did not exclusively follow the ‘Paris’ textual blueprint, although by the mid 13th century, they often did.

These bibles have been variously referred to as ‘Paris’ Bibles or ‘University Bibles’ (based on a concern with the biblical text), as ‘Pocket’ or ‘Portable’ Bibles (based on a concern with bible size and form and as ‘Preachers’ Bibles’ or ‘University Bibles’ (based on a concern with use and users). Questions of origin and use, and of form and function lie, inextricably linked, at the heart of our attempt to distinguish exactly what is meant by these terms and in attempting respective definitions, it is equally important to make clear what each kind of bible is not as it is to declare what it is.

However, there are two sub-groups that have been identified and mined for information on medieval universities and the book trade most often than the others. The common term for the first group is ‘Paris Bibles’, a testimony to the most important center of Bible production in the 13th and 14th centuries; a town where a thriving commercial book trade and a vibrant university environment converged to create a unique and influential manuscript culture. The term ‘Paris Bible’ refers to Bibles that share a specific order of the biblical books, accompanied by a standard set of prologues, modern chapter divisions, the inclusion of the IHN and the omission of earlier capitula

---

5 So for example, UPenn’s Ms. Codex 724, measuring ca. 370 mm in height, is almost twice the size of a “200 mm ‘Pocket’ Bible” and it was not made in Paris, but rather Arras; however it is still technically classifiable as a ‘Paris’ Bible because it follows the textual blueprint characteristic of that model.
6 ‘Introduction’ to Form and Function in the Late Medieval Bible, Eds. Eyal Poleg & Laura Light (Boston: Brill, 2013): 1-7 [3].
lists, as well as characteristic readings within the text. Bibles of this type were first produced in Paris ca. 1230.

The other sub-group is that of ‘pocket Bibles’ or ‘portable Bibles’, alluding to one of the most striking features of post-1230 Bibles. This group encompasses Bibles whose measurements rendered them easily portable (measuring 200 mm or less in height, or combined height plus width of 450mm or less, are common designations), and bear witness to the extraordinary craftsmanship of medieval scribes, parchmenters and illuminators. As this group is based on one primary criterion, it omits numerous other contemporary manuscripts, ranging in size from the minute to the monumental, whose layout is nevertheless strikingly similar.

However, in offering a definition of the 13th-century ‘Paris Bible’, much is uncertain. Light argues that the history of the Bible known as “The ‘Paris’ Bible” is “The story of one particular type of Bible, defined in terms of its text, that was very important in Paris and for the development of the modern Bible”; the designation “‘Paris’ Bible” is directly based on “The observation that numerous Bibles copied in Paris in the 13th century share certain common features. It is, in other words, a description of a common type of Bible.” Laura Light identifies two distinct ‘types’ of ‘Paris’ Bible that emerged in two key phases within patterns of bible production during the 13th century (ca. 1200-30 and 1230 onwards), each distinguishable from the other by distinct sets of material and textual characteristics. The first phase (ca. 1200-30) saw the emergence of what Light refers to as the “proto-‘Paris’ Bible,” which, ca. 1230, morphed into the “Mature ‘Paris’ Bible” during the second phase (ca. 1230-80), which established the textual blueprint for The Christian Bible that endures today in the modern Vulgate.

---

7 However, an indisputable truth is that in order to make such a definition, one’s first point of reference must be the work of Laura Light, the scholar who has been the premier expert on the bibles of the 13th century - in all their glorious variety - since the early 1980s; see Bibliography for a list of Light’s publications between 1983 through 2013. It is also worth mentioning that beyond her publications in scholarly journals and collections of essays issued by academic publishers, Light has also published a significant quantity of characteristically erudite and extremely helpful material on 13th-century bibles as manuscripts cataloguer for Les Enluminures Ltd. (of Chicago & Paris); long may she reign!

8 Light (2011): 228.


The textual characteristics distinguishing the two ‘types’ of ‘Paris’ Bible produced during these two phases center around their respective paratextual and extra-biblical elements, including: the ordering of the books of the Bible into that of the modern Vulgate\textsuperscript{12}; the schema according to which The Bible’s books into chapters; the inclusion (or not) of the 64 prologues attributed to St. Jerome\textsuperscript{13}; the division of the Scriptural canon within its books, into chapters; and the inclusion (or not) of capitula (chapter lists, which summarized the contents of each of The Bible’s books, chapter by chapter.\textsuperscript{14}

Based upon these criteria, one may thus broadly characterize “proto-‘Paris’ Bibles” as pandects produced in the early 13\textsuperscript{th} century (ca. 1200-30), generally closer to ‘lectern’ than ‘pocket’ size; in other words closer in size to the format of the 12\textsuperscript{th}-century pandect bibles or glossed books of the Bible (with a maximum height exceeding 200 mm but under 300 mm) and often written as a single column on the page - which feature the ‘new’ order of Biblical books and capitula lists, whilst retaining the Eusebian canon tables of earlier bibles, but are unlikely to include the IHV or Jerome’s 64 Prologues.\textsuperscript{15}

By contrast, “mature ‘Paris’ Bibles” of ca. 1230+ are distinguishable as pandect volumes – more than likely, although not necessarily, in smaller ‘pocket’ format (i.e. with an height measurement of no more than 200 mm)\textsuperscript{16} – whose books are arranged in the ‘new’ order and feature the newly-numbered chapter divisions, whose Bible text is made


\textsuperscript{13} The most detailed chronicling and analysis of these prologues remains that of F. Stegmüller with the assistance of N. Reinhardt, Repertorium Biblicum Medii Aevi, 11 vols. (Madrid, 1950-80); Vols. IX-XI (#s 284-839?); see also S. Berger, Les Préfaces jointes aux livres de la Bible dans les manuscrits de la Vulgate (Paris, 1902): 28; Donatien de Bruyne, Sommaires, divisions et rubriques de la Bible latine (Namur, 1914). These prologues are also helpfully recorded in Robert Branner, Manuscript Painting in Paris during the Reign of Saint Louis: A Study of Styles, California Studies in the History of Art 18, ed. W. Horn (Berkeley & Los Angeles, 1977): 154-5.

\textsuperscript{14} Light (2011): 230;


more legible on the page by its arrangement into two columns and more searchable within the codex by the addition of running headers, and which is supplemented by the inclusion of the IHN and Jerome’s 64 Prologues.  

Another term that scholars have, in the past, applied to any example of the huge number of small 13th-century pandect Latin bibles as ‘University Bibles’, so-named as a result of their geographical and intellectual place of origin (in Paris, in the environs of the university), or ‘Student Bibles’, based on the theory that these small bibles were ‘mass-produced’ on a grand scale in response to the growing demand for ‘study’ bibles amongst Europe’s rapidly increasing student population generated by the contemporary rise of the universities, since (so went the argument) these small portable bibles would supposedly have been convenient for students to take with them to class and annotate during lectures. However over the course of the 20th century this portrait was widely refuted, and has now been discredited, seldom so definitively, nor with more finality, than by De Hamel:

These little portable Bibles are often referred to as university Bibles. It is commonly claimed that their small format was convenient for students carrying their books to their classes. There is not the slightest evidence that this happened.

The Bible was indeed the fundamental text of the medieval cathedral schools and universities, with students of theology spending four years studying the biblical text in class, but the format in which the sacra pagina was used in classrooms and lecture halls was as separate books of the Bible, with the Gloss, supplemented by additional study and

---


19 For example: Robert Branner argued that the beginnings of the Bible’s production in small-format copies in 13th-century Paris was the result of “The new need in university circles to carry one’s Bible from place to place; students in Paris were in fact required to bring bibles to class” (Branner 1977: 10 n.45); and even recently M.A. Michael included “Study bibles” amongst “the books…which were needed at universities and colleges” (Michael 2008: 168).

discussion of various kinds of Biblical commentaries. Not only were our portable one-volume bibles were too small for annotation in the lecture room, their pages containing insufficient space for notes between the lines, but their convenience of portability would have been of no advantage to a student, whose lodgings were probably located at no very great distance from the lecture hall. Similarly the term ‘The Bible of the university’ meaning ‘University Text’ is no longer used without qualification following evidence for these bibles’ use beyond the academic confines, and scholars now generally agree that a ‘standard University text’ that was officially authorized or regulated by the major medieval universities never existed.

Ultimately, these terms are not synonymous, and should not be used as if they were. In particular, the term ‘Paris’ Bible should only be used for the smaller, sub-group of the Late Medieval Bible that share a common text. The importance of employing accurate and consistent terminology in discussing the bibles produced during the 13th century cannot be overemphasized, particularly since in failing to do so, the potential for confusion with regards to the contents of these bibles and the geography of their production is evident; the production of ‘Paris’ Bibles was not limited to that city, nor did all Parisian Bibles follow the ‘Paris’ textual blueprint, while a ‘Paris’ Bible is not necessarily ‘pocket’ sized or made in Paris, but is often both. By contrast, ‘pocket’ or

---

21 The content and format of the Glossed Bible, which comprised twenty or so separate volumes, were inseparable and both were dictated by how and where these books were used: to teach from, and for private reading (De Hamel 1994: 111 and Smith 2013: 364) but the size, weight and expense of its collective volumes would surely have made it impractical for widespread use in the classroom as a student reference text. Discussed in greater detail below.

22 Although many copies of glossed biblical books often are crammed with student notes; likewise the books of law which certainly were studied and annotated in the classrooms of Bologna were usually volumes of vast dimensions with ample margins for notes. (De Hamel 2001: 136)


24 The term ‘University Text’/‘The Bible of the university’ was used by J.J.G. Alexander, “English or French” (1980); Margaret T. Gibson, The Bible in the Latin West (1993): 10-12, 59-67. (also discussed in Poleg 2008: 162 n.34)

25 Although the moniker of ‘Paris’ Bible continues to be used to denote ‘A Bible Like Those Used At the University of Paris’ (or ‘First Used At the University of Paris’), ‘A Bible From the University of Paris’ or ‘A Bible (Usually of Small Size) Of the Type Which Emerging from the Paris University Bibles’.

26 The ‘Paris’ Bible should be taken to mean the Bible which evolved in the first few decades of the 13th century, containing a version of the text influenced by the glossed biblical books of the 12th century, with a standard selection and sequence of books featuring the ‘modern’ chapter divisions, accompanied by a standard set of [64] prologues and usually the HIN, but without the chapter lists and canon tables common in 12th-century bibles. Peter Kidd, “A Franciscan Bible Illuminated in the Style of William de Brailes,” e-British Library Journal (2007): Article 8 (1-20 [2 n.7]).
‘portable’ bibles are distinguished by a set of material characteristics identifying a bible in a particular form (small) and format (pandect), and their production was neither limited to distinct places nor sets of textual contents.

An Overview of the Scholarly Treatment of The Latin Bible - especially Portable Bibles - in the 13th Century

Despite their historical significance and the number of surviving manuscripts, these bibles, and indeed late medieval bibles as a whole, have attracted little scholarly attention. The pioneering studies of the Bible in the 13th century were undertaken in the late-19th century by Henri Denifle (1888) and J.P.P. Martin (1888-90) as well as the work of Samuel Berger (1893, 1902). Their work was followed and extended by early-20th century scholars including Henri Quentin (1922, 1926+) and Donatien de Bruyne (1914), culminating in the ‘Watershed publications’ of Hans H. Glunz (1933) and Raphael Loewe (1969).

However the primary concern of these scholars was the biblical text, presenting discussions, for example, on the connection between Carolingian versions of the biblical text (Berger) or the evolution of the Latin text of the Bible against the background of medieval exegesis (Glunz). Thus the animated (although often dense) studies by these late 19th and early 20th century scholars privileged the early to the high and late Middle Ages as a conduit to earlier strata of the Vulgate: Berger’s main body of work centered on the Carolingian period, with few pages dedicated to the Bible of the 13th and 14th centuries; Quentin did not investigate any manuscripts later than the mid-13th century and his survey of the ‘Groupe de l’Universite de Paris’ is four-pages long and based on four manuscripts; and even Glunz, who raised important questions on production, dissemination and use of biblical manuscripts, displays a textual bias in adopting Martin’s terminology of the ‘Paris’ text’ and his methodology of comparing textual variants.

---

27 ‘Introduction’ to Form and Function in the Late Medieval Bible, Eds. Eyal Poleg & Laura Light (Boston: Brill, 2013): 1-7 [3-4].
28 Their work was continued decades later in the scholarship of Pierre-Maurice Bogaert (1988).
29 Quentin, Mémoire (1922): 385-88.
30 For example, see Glunz (1933): 270-1.
In their limited discussions of the Bible in the late Middle Ages, scholars were, on the whole, more concerned with the Bible’s text than with its appearance or layout (i.e. studying the Bible as text rather than as book). Consequently, the few references that were made to late medieval bibles almost entirely treated them as vehicles for the transmission of the biblical text. Scholars showed little interest in the significance of these bibles as material objects, and demonstrably deemed attendant questions of these bibles’ appearance and layout unimportant. These historians’ focus on the transmission and establishment of the textus receptus of the Medieval Vulgate during this period and thus scholars’ preference for earlier manuscripts, especially Carolingian bibles, as important witnesses to Jerome’s original text resulted in the marginalization of the Late Medieval Bible in scholarship and little attention being paid to later bibles whose textual accuracy has been challenged virtually from their moment of inception. Furthermore, the displacement of the 13th-century Bible in these scholars’ studies perpetuated an asymmetrical equation, in which the most widespread bibles, owned and used by hundreds if not thousands, received only passing reference, marginalized in favor of the few survivals from the Carolingian era have been scrutinized time and time again.

However, despite their primary concentration on investigating the biblical text and their preference for the origins of the biblical text to its later manifestations, these scholars nevertheless identified the importance of appearance to 13th-century bibles. Such

---


33 A path-breaking study on this subject, albeit one restricted to the text of the gospels, was undertaken by Hans Hermann Glunz, whose central argument was that the Vulgate text of the 12th and 13th centuries looked far more like the printed editions of the 15th and 16th centuries than the critical editions based on the early manuscript evidence. (H.H. Glunz, History of the Vulgate in England from Alcuin to Roger Bacon… [Cambridge: CUP, 1933]: passim, but see esp. Chapter 10).

34 Such was the motivation which guided Martin’s analysis of Bacon and the ‘Paris text’ in his search to provide an image of a proto-researcher striving for an ur-text (Martin 1888-90), while textual clarity was also at the basis of Quentin’s project of establishing a textual hierarchy of the Latin Bible, by comparing biblical manuscripts to the authorized text of the Vulgate.
a trend was first gestured to by J.P.P. Martin (1889), who advocated emphasizing the physical elements of the ‘Paris Text’ (“...signe exterieur, un signe palpable et visible”) in its characterization although he also saw the ‘Paris’ text’s prime characteristic as its Langtonian chapter divisions. Likewise Glunz, in addition to acknowledging Martin’s emphasis on the significance of these divisions, also commented on the appearance of these manuscripts, discussing their use of thinner parchment and smaller script.

Nevertheless, the first scholar to focus on the Bible as book and how its appearance (size, page layout etc.) informed its function (as a material object) was Josephine Case Schnurman, in her doctoral dissertation at Oxford (1960). Although Schnurman’s work remains unpublished, and is accessible only in Oxford’s Bodleian Library, it contains an abundance of information on late medieval bibles, their appearance and provenance and must always be the first port of call fpr any scholar writing on these bibles (as the dissertation’s sign-in registration slip impressively witnesses). To date it remains one of the most important examinations of appearance and use of biblical manuscripts in the late Middle Ages, addressing questions of size, layout, scripts, decoration and illumination and addenda, with reference to over four hundred manuscripts) to present an appeal for a uniformity within the canon of 13th-century bible, predicated upon codex size ('pocket' bibles) and a suggestion for two possible audiences (academic and mendicant).

35 Martin (1889).
36 Martin, “Texte Parisien” (1889-90): 446. Likewise Berger, paraphrasing Bale and Hody, claimed that the ‘Paris’ text’s new division of chapters was central to its success and advocated seeing the ‘Paris Bible’ as the precursor of the modern Bible. (Berger, Vulgate en France 1887: 9-16).
37 Glunz also commented on the marginalia and addenda added to copies of these bibles and their connection to biblical scholarship; Glunz (1933): 268-73, 284-91.
38 Case Schnurman’s doctoral work on 13th-century bibles remains, to date, one of only two doctoral dissertations (both unpublished) to focus exclusively on these bibles. Case Schnurman’s was the first; the second followed a little over a decade later in the form of Adelaide Bennett’s excellent study of English portable bibles, particularly artistic styles and decorative schemes which may be characterized as ‘insular’; Adelaide Bennett (Columbia University, 1973). Each dissertation took a markedly different methodological approach: Case Schnurman made observations about ‘a type of 13th-century bible’, drawing her conclusions based on her surveying of hundreds of MS examples – ‘in the flesh’ and relying heavily (perhaps too heavily in some places); Bennett focused on one MS (Princeton, Ms. Garrett 28) and its relationship to 4 related bibles. However both dissertations provided extensive and phenomenally detailed sets of illustrative Appendices. Both remain outstanding studies of their respective aspects of 13th-century bibles.
The first article to concentrate on the appearance and materiality of the 13th-century Bible was published in 1984 by Laura Light.\(^\text{39}\) Based on a close analysis of numerous biblical manuscripts, Light re-evaluated previous works and established the history of the ‘Paris’ Bible, supplemented later by two additional articles\(^\text{40}\) which remain the standard reference for any discussion on the creation and evolution of the ‘Paris’ Bible.\(^\text{41}\) In an inversion of previous works, Light utilizes Carolingian and monastic Bibles of the high Middle Ages to place the 13th-century bibles in context. Light re-examined Bacon’s comment, and expanded upon the questions Glunz had raised earlier to conclude that there never was a single exemplar of a Bible produced and sanctioned by the University of Paris, but that one should rather see the appearance of the new form of biblical manuscripts as an evolution, gradually taking place in the first three decades of the 13th century.

Light’s argument for a lack of a single exemplar does not inhibit her from delineating a very narrow group of ‘Paris’ Bibles. Rejecting previous scholars, such as Martin, who termed numerous 13th- and 14th-century Bibles as the ‘Paris text’, Light argues that only strict textual criteria, and not even Parisian origins, can grant admittance to that group.\(^\text{42}\) Light’s analysis of late medieval bibles moves between the narrow, well-defined group of ‘Paris’ Bibles, and a more amorphous group of late medieval bibles, which share one or more characteristics of the former, but do not adhere to all its qualities. This latter group is the one behind Light’s survey of physical changes in the production of biblical manuscripts, namely smaller hand and thinner parchment, which were not exclusive to a group narrowly defined by textual criteria.

Thus Light follows Martin to emphasize the centrality of appearance. She acknowledges that “The textual history of the bible cannot be divorced from its history as a physical object,”\(^\text{43}\) and utilizes appearance, addenda and marginalia in ascertaining the

\(^{39}\) See Light’s publications in Bibliography.
\(^{40}\) Light (1984), (1987) and (1994).
\(^{42}\) As we have seen, these textual criteria are a specific sequence of books, 64 prologues, ‘modern’ chapter numbers, and the IHN, alongside the exclusion of the earlier Eusebian Canons and summary of books Light (1984): 79-88 and expanded in Light (1994).
\(^{43}\) Light (1987): 275 (noted in Poleg 2008: 158 n.21)
provenance of late medieval biblical manuscripts (beyond the narrow Parisian group). Light advances Loewe’s idea of a typical user of the late medieval Bible (a ‘wandering scholar’) to trace the evolution of biblical manuscripts in conjunction with their use, arguing that these bibles’ appearance in a single-volume format and in a size of bible that could be easily carried were characteristics born directly out of the needs of itinerant preachers, especially the newly-risen mendicants, for a portable bible that could easily serve as a reference tool.

However recent decades have seen the first scholarly treatments of the 13th-century portable bible in independent monographs. In particular, those of Christopher de Hamel (1994 and 2001), who has offered a series of extremely readable yet detailed and informative social histories of small bibles in the 13th century (particularly in his 2001 study), privileging the significance of their size for how they could be used and by whom. His work has been supplemented in recent years by the scholarship of Sabina Magrini (pubs. 2000-2013), who has discussed in context of the environment of the late medieval universities, the medieval Vulgate and esp. within the context of bible production in late medieval Italy, and of Eyal Poleg (2008, 2013) who has examined not the evolution of the ‘Paris’ Bible but rather the standard layout (Poleg 2008), and questioned the ways in which numerous biblical manuscripts mediated the biblical text for readers in the 13th and 14th centuries through their presentation of it (Poleg 2013).

In recent years, Chiara Ruzzier emerged as the scholar producing the most useful, informative and provocative scholarship on the topics of appearance, size, production and use (pubs. 2010-15), supplementing the ongoing and prolific publications of Paul Saenger (pubs. 1999-2013) – who has primarily discussed these bibles in context of their text, especially their popularization of the ‘new’ chapter divisions – to jointly occupy ‘pole position’ (with Light) as the premier champions of the 13th-century portable bible, as witnessed in their thought-provoking contributions to Form and Function in the Late Medieval

44 Loewe (1969): 146 (noted in Poleg 2008: 158 n.22)
45 The connection between the pocket bible and the mendicants was also explored by Glunz (1933): 273 ff. (noted in Poleg 2008: n.24)
46 Eyal Poleg (2008) and (2013)
48See Ruzzier’s publications in Bibliography.
49 Paul Saenger (1999-2013)
Bible (2013)\(^{50}\) the recent collection edited by Light and Poleg, which will surely prove transformative for our field. In its publication, the 13th-century portable bible has gained, at long last, a go-to handy reference volume, and as a work of outstanding quality, a worthy champion indeed.

The surviving illustrated and illuminated portable bibles have benefited from the generous attentions of the Art Historians: Eric G. Millar (1926) and Peter H. Brieger (1957)\(^{51}\) have looked at illuminated copies, Luba Eleen (1982) discussed examples in the context of the illustration of the Pauline Epistles in French and English bibles of the 12th and 13th centuries. Indeed some ateliers and centers of Bible production (especially Paris) are now fairly well studied, thanks to the efforts of Robert Branner (1977), Christopher de Hamel (1984)\(^{56}\) and Richard and Mary Rouse (2000).\(^{57}\) Furthermore, the very great significance of the position that 13th-century portable bibles occupy in the history of medieval illuminated manuscripts is further emphasized in the standard scholarly surveys of the subject. This prominence is attested in the great number of 13th-century bibles - especially portable copies - included in Nigel Morgan’s 1982/88 survey of production and cultural significance of ‘Early Gothic’ illuminated manuscripts (1190-1285), whilst De Hamel (1994) celebrates their position within the longue durée history of the production, use and collection of medieval illuminated manuscripts from the Middle Ages through to the present day.\(^{59}\)

\(^{50}\) Form and Function in the Late Medieval Bible, Eds. Eyal Poleg & Laura Light (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2013).
\(^{56}\) Christopher de Hamel, Glossed Books of the Bible and the Origins of the Paris Booktrade (Woodbridge: Brewer, 1984).
\(^{58}\) 13th-century bibles constituting 25 out of the total 188 chosen examples; 11 from the period 1190–1250 (Survey IV.1) and 14 from the period 1250-85 (Survey IV.2); Nigel J. Morgan, Early Gothic Manuscripts. A Survey of Manuscripts Illuminated in the British Isles, IV (London: Harvey Miller Publishers, 1982; 1988).
\(^{59}\) Christopher de Hamel, A History of Illuminated Manuscripts. 2nd ed. (London: Phaidon Press, 1994).
The Structure of this Dissertation

This study comprises four chapters structured around these two ‘Phenomenon Contexts’: the first and second chapters consider the phenomenon of the portable bible within the context of medieval book production, while my third through fifth chapters do so within the context of medieval bible use.

In Chapter One, I describe and contextualize the phenomenon that is the portable 13th-century portable bible in terms of its production, and its consequences for bible function and use etc. in order to demonstrate that the portable bible occupied a central and privileged place both within the events and circumstances that constituted the revolution that the Bible underwent during the 13th century and within the history of the Bible in the Middle Ages. The portable bible was both a product of these changes and a contributory cause; its format was a sign of the contemporary changes taking place in the environments within which it appeared, while the functions the bible’s format enabled, as a portable pandect copy of the whole Bible, made it a powerful vehicle of change itself.

In Chapter Two I consider the production of the portable bible in the 13th century. First I study the socio-cultural context within which this phenomenon emerged, before identifying those innovative material technologies through which it became possible to produce the whole Bible as a single, small size codex, and finally I examine those strategies of compression and miniaturization through which these bibles’ form and format were achieved together. These questions are crucial for our understanding of the medieval Bible, for it was these innovative production methods that implemented significant changes on the appearance of the sacra pagina, resulting in profound effects for how the biblical text could be read, and by extension, in combination with these bibles’ inclusion of the entire text in a single volume, profound effects for how the Bible itself could be used.

In my third chapter I turn from my study of these bibles’ production to examine their consumption, considering the interlinked questions of how and why these bibles became a phenomenon and of the consumption of the phenomenon, asking why these bibles were produced in such quantities during the 13th century and whose was the demand that necessitated the production of this massive supply of bibles. At the heart of
this chapter is the enduringly troublesome question of how these portable pandect bibles were used in the 13th century. This is a particularly thorny subject, since these ‘new’ portable bibles invited new uses by new bible users (according to ‘new’ needs and habits of reading the Bible), new uses (predicated upon these bibles’ receptiveness to such innovative functions as both ‘complete’ copies of the Bible and as portable books), and as such, it is a far more complicated task to attempt to offer a straightforward portrait of these bibles users and uses, certainly compared to glossed individual books of Scripture or liturgical, devotional, and pedagogical tools such as missals, breviaries, psalters and lectionaries. Nevertheless, I argue that the portable bible was a mobile book used by mobile communities of users, positioned at the heart of medieval religiosity. I address the question of how and why these bibles were so popular with mobile users, arguing that their format and contents made these bibles particularly well-suited to the needs of mobile communities and, in turn, facilitated user-mobility.

However, portability is not a complete explanation for the small bibles of the 13th century, as some copies are elaborately ornamented, and indeed illuminated bibles are among the works most frequently produced in pocket-sized formats, alongside Books of Hours. It is very clear that the early book trade in Paris, Bologna, and Oxford, especially, was not only catering for an academic market but also had a local clientele that was both lower and higher than the university in the hierarchy of customers, including royal and ecclesiastical administrators, wealthy aristocratic families, and communities of urban friars. However, although the production of portable bibles in an increasingly broad range of degrees of decoration and of expense over the course of the 13th century reflects their production in response to a growing demand for luxury books and higher quality copies from people who had never owned books before, including clerks and administrators of estates to royal officials and the local nobility, how can we see the production of such ‘luxury’ copies with those communities within which we have already located these bibles’ primary users, including preachers, friars, masters and students, all groups of limited financial means and resources?

---

60 Books whose primary function was to serve as luxurious commodities – gifts, symbols of status etc. - rather than as tools for study, teaching or learning.
Thus having argued that these little one-volume portable bibles represent one of the supreme success stories of book production in the Middle Ages, in Chapter Four I turn to locate the place of their production within the trends visible in the increasingly secular and commercial early professional book trade, asking how we may see the breadth of the scale on which these bibles were produced aligning with the increase in the number of ‘luxury’ bibles produced? In so doing I pursue the question of how much did portable bibles cost to produce and to purchase between the 13th through late 15th centuries, asking to what extent do users’ access to these bibles depend on their affordability, and are bible-use and bible-ownership mutually-exclusive? The investigations discussed in this chapter reveal that prolonged possession and use of portable bibles by individuals was becoming, if not more common, then at least less extraordinary, contemporary to increasing numbers of instances of private bible ownership becoming more and more visible amongst an ever-widening social audience.

Thus by the mid-13th century, the portable bible was certainly rooted at the heart of religious practice ‘out and about’ in the medieval world. However, despite their suitability for mobile use and the advantages that made them so appealing to mobile user-communities, portable bibles were also to be found in in non-mobile, enclosed late medieval religious communities such as monasteries and other religious houses. In my fifth and final chapter I seek to locate the position and function of portable bibles in the context of late medieval Benedictine communities, asking whether we can see a demonstrable need for portable bibles within this kind of religious community, how and where this need may be sought and diagnosed, and if copies of these books were demonstrably needed, what were they needed for, and can we find evidence of this need varying over time? To this end I consider the place and uses of Latin Pandect Bibles through case studies of two Benedictine cathedral priories; those of Durham Cathedral Priory and St. Augustine’s Abbey, Canterbury from the late 13th through early 15th centuries. Through close readings of the surviving medieval library catalogues and inventories from both institutions in order to demonstrate the extent of the continued presence of such bibles in these communities, the locations in which they were stored and the nature of these bibles’ use by members of these communities.
Chapter One

The Phenomenon of the 13th-Century Portable Bible

1 Locating the 13th-century portable bible within contemporary trends in bible production and use

The first decades of the 13th century was a pivotal period for medieval culture and religion. It saw important changes, including the establishment of the first universities in Paris, Oxford, and Bologna, and the rise of the mendicant orders of Franciscans and Dominicans, dedicated to preaching and pastoral care. Parallel with these changes, and closely linked to them, major changes took place in the arrangement and publishing of the Bible. Of all the various types of bibles copied in the 13th century, it is the ‘pocket’ or ‘portable’ bible that stands out. The creation of this radically new format constitutes one of the great innovations of the 13th century, marking the beginning of a new era in the history of the medieval Vulgate and transforming the use and ownership of the Bible. This chapter explores the 13th-century portable pandect bible as a material phenomenon, asking how and why they became so significant, both in their own time and for us today as scholars of the medieval book.

Originating at the University of Paris and the centers of learning in southern England in the early 13th century, the Bible began to be produced in copies that compressed the complete scriptural text and contents (comprising over 700,000 words) into pandect copies. These newly-created volumes contained the components of the biblical text in a standard and logical order (something almost unknown before 1200), presented in a two-column layout, with running titles in alternating red and blue

---

61 These changes may be broadly characterized as having taken place in two stages over the course of the 13th century; the first ca. 1210-30, and the second ca. 1230-80.
identifying the biblical books, and clearly numbered modern chapter divisions (their most celebrated feature). They typically also included the IHN, which supplied alphabetical indices of the Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek proper names in the Vulgate. However even more significant were the changes to the physical appearance of the book. For almost the first time, bibles contained the entire biblical text, from beginning to end, as we know it now, in a single volume which could fit into the palm of one’s hand. While pandects did exist from the early Middle Ages, they were few and far between and the copies that did exist were large and cumbersome books. Unlike previous copies of the Bible, the new 13th-century small-format bibles were portable, being small enough to comfortably fit in a large pocket or small satchel. The portability of these new bibles made it possible for the first time to take the Bible on the road – a feature especially appealing to the friars. Together, the changes to the format and contents of the Bible implemented in these portable bibles represent a genuine phenomenon, constituting one of the great achievements of 13th-century book-making, and one that has assured these books “a major place in the history of manuscripts.”

Appearance is therefore central to the definition of the 13th-century portable bible, for their production constitutes the first case of so-called ‘mass production’ in Western Europe of a work in ‘standardized form’ and with ‘standardized contents’. The portable bibles copied during the 13th century (especially between 1230 and 1280) are strikingly similar in appearance, attesting to the success of this new presentation of the biblical text. Arguably their most celebrated feature is their chapter divisions. Commonly attributed to Stephen Langton (d.1228), they were adopted as standard in bibles throughout Europe, and are still used today. These chapter divisions also formed the

67 And in turn, the appearance of the portable bible “has influenced its modern analysis.” ‘Introduction’ to *Form and Function in the Late Medieval Bible*, Eds. Eyal Poleg & Laura Light (Boston: Brill, 2013): 1-7 [2].
68 Although I disagree with the use of the term ‘mass production’ to describe the production of these bibles (for an example of the term’s use in reference to bible production see Ganz 1994) or the use of the term ‘standardization’ to describe the process of the medieval Vulgate’s textual consolidation in the ‘Paris’ Bible, I use them here as convenient shorthand, and also to be able to make this point early on in this study.
69 Although Paul Saenger has recently challenged both the attribution of modern chapters and chapter-divisions to Langton as well as their Paris origin, instead tracing their genesis to late 12th-century England; see Saenger (2013): Ch. II (31-66).
basis of a common addendum to biblical manuscripts, the *Summarium Biblicum*, which condensed each chapter to a single word, thus creating a mnemonic aid, albeit one whose actual use is still not completely understood. A different type of addendum affixed to Latin bibles in the 13th century – tables of lections – likewise made use of the ‘new’ chapter divisions to make the Bible more accessible to inexperienced readers.

The 13th-century portable bible was thus “a pan-European phenomenon”; copies spread from Paris and England, causing ripples all through Latin Christendom. Although the study of bibles from across Europe during the 13th century – particularly in Northern France, England, and Italy – unearths important features in the appearance of their texts and paratexts common to bibles produced in all countries, these bibles range widely in place of origin, nature of use and level of production. The 13th century (especially between ca. 1230-80) saw the production of Latin bibles on an unprecedented scale, both in terms of quantities produced (more than at any other time in the Middle Ages) and the rate at which they were copied (more produced at a faster rate than at any other time in the Middle Ages) and in terms of the breadth of the ‘geographical stage’ upon which they were produced (copies produced in multiple major centers in multiple countries throughout Europe simultaneously). In fact, so many were made during the 13th century that the scale of this production evidently furnished the need for Latin bibles for the rest of the Middle Ages, in copies sold and resold for hundreds of years.

These little one-volume portable bibles represent one of the supreme success stories of book production in the Middle Ages. They presented the biblical text in a format that was designed for ease of reference and optimal seachability, and their layout and addenda quickly became synonymous with the format and presentation of the Bible.

---

72 As recently demonstrated in *Form and Function in the Late Medieval Bible*, Eds. Eyal Poleg & Laura Light (Boston: Brill, 2013): 1-7 [47].
73 ‘Introduction’ to *Form and Function in the Late Medieval Bible*, Eds. Eyal Poleg & Laura Light (Boston: Brill, 2013): 1-7 [5-6].
74 A survey of pocket Bibles produced in France, England and Italy demonstrates similarities [and differences] across Countries of Production, linking layout and writing support; see Chiara Ruzzier in *Form and Function* (2013): 105-25.
75 ‘Introduction’ to *Form and Function in the Late Medieval Bible*, Eds. Eyal Poleg & Laura Light (Boston: Brill, 2013): 1-7 [1-2].
76 “The arrangement and publishing of the Bible was the most enduring monument of the scribes and illuminators of Paris in the early 13th century.” (De Hamel [1994]: 118).
as well as how one read its contents. They were an immediate success and became one of the most popular books of the Middle Ages, used for study and preaching, private devotion and public liturgy, and were disseminated throughout Western Christendom as the quintessential companion of traveling preachers. Chiara Ruzzier has estimated that ca. 30,000 were produced over the course of the century,\(^{77}\) while Laura Light has identified the pattern of their production as having developed in two main chronological stages; first between ca. 1200-1230 (the “proto-‘Paris’ Bible”), followed by the majority being produced between ca. 1230-1280 (the “mature ‘Paris’ Bible”). The overwhelming dominance of the 13\(^{th}\) century in the landscape of bible production across medieval Europe was highlighted in the landmark surveys of transatlantic institutional and private medieval collections by Neil R. Ker (1964 and 1969-90)\(^{78}\) and Seymour de Ricci (1935-40),\(^{79}\) whose surveys reveal that over three-quarters of medieval Bibles in Britain and two-thirds of those in North America were produced in the course of this single century.

These landmark works by Ker and de Ricci emphasize the correlative relationship between the scale of bibles’ medieval production and their modern survival. It is impossible to overemphasize the sheer number of 13\(^{th}\)-century bibles that survive from all parts of Europe. As Christopher de Hamel reminds us, more bibles survive from the 13\(^{th}\) century than any other artifact, except perhaps coins and buildings,\(^{80}\) or, as Paul Needham puts it: “If someone were to tell you today, with no further information given, that he or she owned a medieval Latin Bible, you could presume that it belonged to the

---

\(^{77}\) Chiara Ruzzier, “The miniaturization of Bible manuscripts in the XIIIth century: A comparative study,” in *Form and Function in the Late Medieval Bible*, Eds. Eyal Poleg and Laura Light (Boston: Brill, 2013): 105-125 [107, n.7].


thirteenth century, and almost always be right.”\(^{81}\) Nevertheless it is equally impractical, if not impossible, to attempt to calculate the exact number of surviving examples, although some have attempted to do so: J.P.P. Martin, for instance, in his 1889 discussion of what he called “le Texte Parisien” and its defining characteristics, made passing mention of its survival in between 1000 to 1500 manuscripts,\(^{82}\) and more recently, Eyal Poleg and Laura Light have put this number at “several thousand.”\(^{83}\) A census is needed, but would be extremely difficult to accomplish, owing to two factors: first, obviously, the very large number of surviving copies; and second the difficulty of tracking down many of these books today given the very high portion of the total number of surviving copies that are in private ownership today.\(^{84}\) It is a task for the future, and both a very enjoyable and worthwhile one at that. One day, perhaps.

If 13th-century bibles were produced in extraordinarily high volume across Europe, they have survived into the post-medieval era in equally striking numbers. The physical appearance and ‘new’ organization of the biblical text in these ‘new’ bibles as well as the scale of their dissemination and circulation, established the norm for bibles for centuries to come.\(^{85}\) In these bibles was born the direct progenitor of both the text and format of the Gutenberg Bible and its printed descendants, a single book owned and used by lay individuals that Richard and Mary Rouse highlight as catalyzing the Bible’s


\(^{83}\) See their editorial ‘Introduction’ to *Form and Function in the Late Medieval Bible*, Eds. Eyal Poleg & Laura Light (Boston: Brill, 2013): 1-7 [1].

\(^{84}\) This is witnessed in Seymour de Ricci’s *Census of Medieval and Renaissance Manuscripts* (compiled between 1935-40), in which he listed 223 medieval bibles and Bible fragments extant in the US and Canada; of that total, almost half (104) were in the possession of a handful of North American institutions, namely the major institutional repositories of medieval manuscripts in the US: 26 in The Free Library of Philadelphia (Philadelphia, PA), 24 in The Walters Art Museum (Baltimore, MD), 21 in The Morgan Library & Museum (NY, NY), 12 apiece in The Huntington Library (San Marino, CA) and The Library of Congress (Washington DC) and 9 in The Newberry Library (Chicago, IL), while of the rest, 80 items were in private hands, far exceeding the 59 items in other institutional collections, of which 30 belonged to Art Institutes, Historical Associations, Museums or public libraries, 20 were in university collections and 19 were in the possession of religious institutions. (S. de Ricci, *Census* [1935-40]: Free Library, II.2012-84; Walters, I.757-856; Morgan, II.1359-2, 2318-2, 2343-2; Huntington, I.35-146; Lib. Congress, I.179-266; and Newberry, I.522-50).

\(^{85}\) ‘Introduction’ to *Form and Function in the Late Medieval Bible*, Eds. Eyal Poleg & Laura Light (Boston: Brill, 2013): 1-7 [1].
journey “from the communal altar to become the private property of the priest [and] personal possession of the friar.” Indeed bibles as physical books have hardly evolved in shape, size, and arrangement ever since; many of the innovations designed for the friars by the booksellers of Paris in the 1230s are still found in any traditional modern printed bible today, and as De Hamel says, “It is hardly possible to find another object which was so new in 1200 and which is still made with so little modification today.”

The pages of the 13th-century portable bible encode traces of production and of diverse reading strategies, preaching techniques and liturgical customs, reflecting the place of these books in the world of scribes and artists, patrons and readers as one of the key cultural artifacts of its time. The transformation in biblical reading, which began in a handful of academic centers, gradually made its way to wider audiences; features which were constructed for a learned Latin audience were later employed to facilitate lay access to the Scriptures. Similarly, the surge of production of Latin Bibles in the 13th century, equipping at first preachers and university students, gradually made its way to the less learned circles, extending to new lay audiences and paving the road to the wide dissemination of Bibles with print and the Reformation.

2 A Short History of the Pandect Bible up to 1200

While the small size of these portable bibles played an undeniably significant role in their widespread adoption in the 13th-century, just as important was the fact that these bibles represent a triumph for the adoption of the pandect as the predominant form for copying the Bible. The portable pandect bibles produced during the course of the 13th century embody the moment of the Bible’s transformation from the earlier definition of the Scriptures from biblia (neut. pl.) to biblia (fem. sing.); from scroll to codex.

---

87 De Hamel (1994): 120.
88 De Hamel (1994): 120.
89 This phenomenon, like many other facets of the Late Medieval Bible, has yet to be fully explored; ‘Introduction’ to Form and Function in the Late Medieval Bible, Eds. Eyal Poleg & Laura Light (Boston: Brill, 2013): 1-7 [6].
91 On medieval terminology for describing the Bible see Cornelia Linde, How to correct the ‘sacra pagina’? Medium Aevum Monographs XXIX (Oxford; MPG Books Group, Bodmin & King’s Lynn UK for The Society for the Study of Medieval Languages and Literature, 2011): 7-26 (on the Septuaginta, 8-13; Vulgata,
Plurality was implicit in the nomenclature used when referring to the Bible throughout the Middle Ages, whether as canon (the Old and New Testament Scriptures), as text (the collected canonical text-books) or as written object (its material form). Bibles or a copy of the Bible were referred to alike as biblia (neut. pl.), however the word first referred neither to the texts of the Scriptures nor to their divine authorization, but rather, through the word’s derivation from the Greek ‘βιβλία’ (biblia’) the plural form of ‘βιβλίον’ (biblion), a diminutive form of ‘βιβλος’ (biblos), meaning the inner bark of the papyrus reed, to the material support on which any oral text could be transcribed. Even in the 4th century, St. Jerome, whose ‘biblia’ was in the form of codices, did not think of the Scriptures in the singular; he referred to them as a ‘biblioteca’ (or ‘bibliothēca’), a word derived from the Greek for a container of scrolls and meaning, by extension, a library or collection of scrolls.

---

13-23; Hebraica veritas/ graeca veritas, 23-6); and Frans van Liere, An Introduction to The Medieval Bible (Cambridge; CUP, 2014): 4, 36, 87-91; cf. on the authority of the Vulgate, 12-15, 103, 178, 186, 202, 204-5. For discussion of how the Bible came to be a canonical book in the first place, see Stallybrass & Chartier (2013): passim. See Chapter 4 for discussion of how bibles were defined and classified in medieval library catalogues.

92 Although additional terms were used to distinguish particular kinds of bible, including references to ‘Biblia integra,’ ‘Biblia versificata’ or ‘Biblia diuisa’, each term revealing further insight into the medieval understanding of the textual and material Bible. For further analysis of these usages see Chapter 3.

93 Etymology of ‘Bible, n.’: The Greek βιβλία was plural of βιβλίον, diminutive of βίβλος (1. the inner bark of the papyrus, ‘paper’; 2. a paper, scroll, roll, or book), which had ceased to have a diminutive sense, and was the ordinary word for ‘book,’ whether as a distinct treatise, or as a subdivision of a treatise, before its application to the Jewish and Christian Scriptures. “Bible, n.” in OED (2nd edition, 1989; online version June 2012): <http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/18605> (accessed 03 August 2012).

94 Most of the texts that compose the Hebrew Bible were recited orally long before they were written down and repeatedly redacted and rewritten; See Stallybrass & Chartier (2013): 198-99.

95 “The common change of a Latin neuter plural into a feminine singular in -a was in the case of biblia facilitated by the habit of regarding the Scriptures as one work.” Of biblia, Becker, Catal. Biblioth. Antiq. 42, has a 9th century example; but the evidence of the Romanic languages shows that biblia must have been the popular name, and have been treated as a feminine singular, much earlier than this. “Bible, n.” in OED (2nd edition, 1989; online version June 2012): <http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/18605> (accessed 03 August 2012).

However by the 9th century, ‘biblia’ began to be used as a feminine singular to mean not ‘scrolls’ or ‘books’ but ‘the book’.97 The changes in the word’s meaning and usage (i.e. from papyrus to scrolls to Scriptures to ‘the Bible’) “inscribe the history of a material technology.”98 Before ‘biblia’ was used in the singular, the Scriptures, previously written on multiple scrolls or divided up into small codices, had been gathered together into massive codices, known as pandects, single volumes “that defined what did and, by exclusion, what did not count as divine scripture.”99

The importance of the material form in the shaping and defining of Scripture extends beyond the semantic transformations of ‘biblia’ (from papyrus to scrolls to Scriptures to ‘The Bible’) to how the scriptural texts, once selected, were organized (on scrolls and in codex form).100 “Above all,” say Stallybrass and Chartier, “the pandect, whether as a massive sixth-century codex or as a thirteenth-century complete pocket Bible, gave a new material sense of the Christian Bible as a single canonical work.”101 The word had come from its use in the context of Roman Law - post-classical Latin ‘pandectae’ - meaning a compendium of Roman civil law (in 50 books), made by order of the emperor Justinian in the 6th century,102 although the classical Latin word ‘pandectēs’ had been used in this way since the 2nd century A.D., to denote a book of universal knowledge or an encyclopedia.103 At the same time (in the 6th century) the post-classical Latin word

---

100 “Although the sequencing of the Jewish scriptures was a topic of debate long before the invention of the codex, the material form of the latter gave a new theological significance to the sequences of the biblical books, which, when written on multiple scrolls, were always potentially miscellaneous in their ordering,” (Stallybrass & Chartier 2013: 199).
102 Sense 1a. cf. Sense 1b. gen: “A complete body of the laws of a country, or of any system of law (natural or statutory).” (King James Bible (A.V.), Transl. Pref. 3: “The Scripture is...a Pandect of profitable lawes, against rebellious spirits.”). Etymology: “Originally, as plural < post-classical Latin pandectae compendium of Roman civil law made by order of the Emperor Justinian (6th cent., representing the plural of pandectes) < Byzantine Greek πανδέκται compendium of Roman civil law (6th cent.), representing the plural of πανδέκτης.” “Pandect, n.”, OED (2005), [accessed 10 November 2012].
103 Sense 2: “A treatise covering the whole of a subject; a comprehensive treatise or digest.” “Pandect, n.”, OED (2005), [accessed 10 November 2012].
‘pandectes’ began to be used for referring to the complete Bible (or a complete copy of the Bible).\textsuperscript{104}

I Early Medieval Pandect Bibles

Before the 9\textsuperscript{th} century, Latin Bibles were most commonly copied in a series of volumes, though at Monkwearmouth-Jarrow the single-volume Codex grandior, made in the late 6\textsuperscript{th} century for Cassiodorus, was imitated in the three great pandects copied for Abbot Ceolfrith.\textsuperscript{105} One of these has survived complete as the Codex Amiatinus, with 1,030 leaves and the text copied in two columns of 44 lines.\textsuperscript{106}

In the second quarter of the 6\textsuperscript{th} century, the Roman senator Flavius Magnus Aurelius Cassiodorus (ca. 485-ca.580), founded a monastery - named the Vivarium (‘the fish pond’).\textsuperscript{107} - on his family estate near Naples, which he furnished with three complete sets of the books of the Bible.\textsuperscript{108} Cassiodorus records how he had devised quite distinct formats for each of these three sets in the first book (‘Divine Letters’) of his Institutiones, a text on Christian education written at Vivarium after A.D. 554, and describes their textual and codicological characteristics in some detail. “These two one-volume full Bibles, together with the working copy of the Bible which Cassiodorus had set out in nine volumes were the pride and joy of his library.”\textsuperscript{109}

The first of his three bibles was a set comprising the Bible arranged into nine matching volumes; he speaks, in chapter XI, of having gathered together “The Holy Scripture in nine codices together with the introductory writers and…almost all the Latin

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{104} Sense 3: “A manuscript volume containing all the books of the Bible.” “Pandect, n.”, \textit{OED} (2005?): <LINK> (accessed 10 November 2012).}

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{105} cf. in Ch. I, Appendix 1).}


\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{108} Cassiodorus describes the location of the Monastery of Vivarium or Castella in \textit{Institutiones} I, XXIX and concludes Book I with chapters containing advice to the Abbot and congregation of monks (I, XXXII) and Prayer (I, XXXIII). Cf. De Hamel (2001): 32-3 [32].}

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{109} James W. Halporn, “Pandectes, Pandecta, and the Cassiodorian Commentary on the Psalms,” \textit{Revue Bénédictine} 90 (1980): 290-300 [293].}
commentators.”¹¹⁰ The word he uses for this act of Scriptural collection/ biblical assemblage is “collegimus”, i.e. ‘we [I] have collected [these works].’¹¹¹ This bible seems to have served as Cassiodorus’ own working copy, its text presumably following the standard Vulgate text.¹¹² Bonifatius Fischer calls this nine-volume Bible the “normalexemplar” (i.e. ‘standard reference text’).¹¹³ Cassiodorus repeatedly referred to this bible as being physically-multiple throughout Book I of his Institutiones as “novem codices,”¹¹⁴ e.g. at praef.8 (“I have read over carefully all nine sections ['novem codices'] containing the divine authority as best as an old man could”)¹¹⁵ and at XV.16 (“With the Lord’s aid, I have listed the nine volumes of the law and detailed the introductory writers with their commentaries as carefully as I could.”)¹¹⁶

Cassiodorus’ second and third bibles were both in one-volume pandect format. The first was a smaller “pandectes” bible (I.12.3), presumably another copy of the Vulgate text:

---


¹¹¹ On the meaning of the term ‘codex’ as used by Cassiodorus, see Cassiodorus, Institutions of the Divine and Secular Learning and On the Soul, Translated with notes by James W. Halporn and introduction by Mark Vessey, Translated Texts for Historians 42 (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2004): 49-52 [49].

¹¹² On Cassiodorus’ divisions of the Bible, see Cassiodorus, Institutions of the Divine and Secular Learning and On the Soul, Translated with notes by James W. Halporn and introduction by Mark Vessey, Translated Texts for Historians 42 (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2004): 52-3; I.


¹¹⁵ “Although all Divine Scripture shines with heavenly brilliance and the excellence of the Holy Spirit appears clearly in it, I have dedicated my efforts to the Psalter, the Prophets, and the Apostolic Letters, since they seem to me to stir deeper profundities, and to contain, as it were, the glorious citadel and summit of the whole Divine Scripture. I have read over carefully all nine sections containing the divine authority as best as an old man could. I carefully collated against older books as my friends read aloud to me from these. In this pursuit I claim that I have struggled, God willing, to achieve a harmonious eloquence without mutilating the sacred books by taking undue liberties.” Cassiodorus, Institutions of the Divine and Secular Learning and On the Soul (I, ‘Preface’), Translated with notes by James W. Halporn and introduction by Mark Vessey, Translated Texts for Historians 42 (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2004): 105-11 [108-9].

Hunc autem pandectem propter copiam lectionis minutiore manu in senionibus quinquaginta tribus aestimavimus conscribendum, ut quod lectio copiosa tetendit scripturae densitas adunata contraheret.\(^{117}\)

I have decided that this full volume of the Latin Bible ought to be written in a rather small script in fifty-three gatherings of six folios each so that the close density of the writing might bring within a short compass the fullness of the text.\(^{118}\)

He therefore describes how the small format of the codex imposes requirements on both the physical make-up of the volume and upon the size of writing in which its text thus needed to be written. In order to produce a pandect copy of the entire Bible in small format, it was necessary to and compressed its text into 53 gatherings of 6 leaves (‘in senionibus quinquaginta tribus’), making a total of 318 folios, and in order to impose this material restriction upon the “large amount of text”\(^{119}\) of the entire Bible (‘copiam lectionis’), he determines that this could only be accomplished by writing the Bible text in a script of smaller size (‘minutiore manu … aestimavimus conscribendum’). His use of the comparative “minutiore” (‘smaller’) is significant, since it indicates that it is unusual to write this kind of text in writing of such small size, i.e. that the writing must be smaller than that size of writing in which The Bible would usually be written. Also significant is his description of the act of writing itself in his reference to a “smaller hand” (‘minutiore manu’) rather than to a “smaller script”; he is not specifying that a different kind of script, or style of writing (i.e. uncial, half-uncial etc.) should be used for writing this bible, but rather that the same kind of script should be used as would usually be employed (or as would be used in coping the other pandect) only that its text should simply be written in a smaller hand, i.e. of smaller size.


Cassiodorus calls his second pandect bible his “codex grandior,” or his ‘larger codex’ (XIV.2):120 “The larger volume, written in a clearer script (‘In codice grandior littera clariore conscriptus’).121 It has ninety-five gatherings of four folios each in which the translation of the Old Testament by the seventy interpreters is included in forty-four books; to this are added the twenty-six books of the New Testament and the total comes out altogether as seventy books.”122 This bible therefore consisted of 95 gatherings of 8 leaves, comprising a total of 760 vast folios, and contained Jerome’s intermediate version of the Bible text, i.e. taken from the Greek rather than the Hebrew. He had identified this copy earlier in the *Institutiones* (at V.2) as the “pandecte Latino corporis grandioris” (‘the Latin Bible pandect in the larger format’) which included, at its beginning, a plan of the Temple of Jerusalem and a diagram of the Sanctuary in the Wilderness (The Tabernacle),123 together with tables showing different ways of arranging the books of The Bible,124 diagrams intended to serve a mnemonic function.125 In these descriptions Cassiodorus identifies this codex grandior pandect comparatively, describing it as his bible ‘of larger size’ meaning to distinguish it from its fellow pandect bible in his library, namely the pandect

120 On the meaning of the term ‘codex’ as used by Cassiodorus, see *Cassiodorus, Institutions of the Divine and Secular Learning and On the Soul*, Translated with notes by James W. Halporn and introduction by Mark Vessey, Translated Texts for Historians 42 (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2004): 49-52.
124 These three tables marked the divisions of Scripture as set out by St. Jerome and St. Augustine and in the Septuagint.
125 Cassiodorus describes his intention as following Eusebius’ example: “[Eusebius] had placed such great authors and such great books in the library of his memory that he would accurately advise the reader in what part of the book a passage he had recommended might be found. He kept in his mind all branches of learning and elucidated them by the clearest commentary. He also advised us that the tabernacle and temple of the Lord were shaped like the celestial vault. I have placed suitable pictures of them, their proper contours carefully painted, in the Latin Bible pandect in the larger format.” (I.5); Cassiodorus, *Institutions of the Divine and Secular Learning and On the Soul*, Translated with notes by James W. Halporn and introduction by Mark Vessey, Translated Texts for Historians 42 (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2004): 103-233 [122]. On the illustrations in the Codex Grandior and their relation to illustrations in the Codex Amiatinus, see Paul Meyvaert, “Bede, Cassiodorus and the Codex Amiatinus,” *Speculum* 71 (1996): 827-83.
in “minutiore manus conscriptus” which he had described only two chapters earlier (in XII.3).

In addition to comparatively distinguishing his two pandects by their format and relative physical size, Cassiodorus further distinguishes the two bibles through comparatively description of their scripts; the “smaller pandect” is that bible written “in a smaller hand” (“minutiore manu…aestimavimus conscribendum’ [XII.3]), i.e. “smaller” than that of the “codice grandior” which is written “in clearer script” (“littera clariore conscriptus’ [XIV.2]). What can we infer from the fact that Cassiodorus had intentionally devised specific formats for the three Bibles he gifted to the monks of the Vivarium? Each of these three bibles was produced in very different formats, each permitting a very different kind of Bible-use: a ‘Reference’ copy (Bible III; a multi-volume, large, cumbersome and immobile);130 a copy for reading from or for reference (Bible II; a large bible, but a pandect copy, and mobile, at least more mobile that the multi-volume set; it was possible for the monks to move this bible from place to place within the community with relative ease as their needs dictated); a copy for private study or reference (Bible I; this sounds like a portable and easily mobile bible and thus usable for their other bible-use needs? Which presumes that they had need, even occasionally, for such a copy of the Scriptures, needs that could not be met by copies of the Bible in either a multi-volume set or in a large pandect format.)

Alas, the Vivarium did not long survive the death of its founder (d. ca. 580) and within 30 or 40 years, lacking the necessary institutional funding it had been disbanded.131 The manuscripts made for Cassiodorus seem to have been acquired by an Englishman visiting Rome in the 7th century, Benedict Biscop (d. 690), who then brought them back to Northumbria in the North of England, where the Codex Grandior was evidently much-admired. Enter Ceolfrith (ca. 642-712), Biscop’s successor as Abbot of Monkwearmouth Abbey (in 690) and the warden of the Venerable Bede (672/3-735) from Bede’s arrival at Monkwearmouth at the age of seven years old, remaining Bede’s

mentor until Ceolfrith’s death in 712. The anonymous *Vita Ceolfridi* (‘Life of Ceolfrith’), written contemporary to the lifetime of its subject (ca. 710?), describes a significant part of Ceolfrith’s benevolent influence for the community at Monkwearmouth (and the important point for our story) as being his role as bibliophilic promoter of knowledge and library-builder. It is significant that Ceolfrith was intending these bibles, in their pandect format, to be used for *communal reference*, available and accessible to all, although the third pandect, “Romam profecturus donum beato Petro apostolorum principi offerre decreuit” (‘He decided to present as a gift to the blessed Peter, prince of the apostles, while preparing to set out for Rome.’)

These events were later chronicled in Chapter 15 of Bede’s *Historia abbatum* (‘History of the Abbots of Wearmouth and Jarrow’), in which Bede also praised Ceolfrith for his diligent and tireless efforts in collection-building for his monks, and of

---

132 “Bibliothecam quam de Roma uel ipse uel Benedictus attulerat, nobiliter ampliavit, ita ut inter alia tres Pandectes faceret describi, quorum duo per totidem sua monasteria posuit in ecclesiis, ut cunctis qui alliquod capitulum de utrolibet Testamento legere uolissent, in promptu esset inuenire quod cuperent.” (‘He famously enlarged the library which he himself and Benedict had brought from Rome, in the course of which he had three pandects copied out, two of which he placed in the churches of each of his monasteries, so that it was easy for all who wanted to read a chapter of both testaments to find what they desired.’) *Vita Ceolfridi* in *Abbots of Wearmouth and Jarrow*, Edited & translated by Christopher Grocock & I. N. Wood (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2013): 78-121 [Chapter 20, 98-9].

133 Two of the bibles Ceolfrith “placed in the churches of each of his monasteries, so that it was easy for all who wanted to read a chapter of both testaments to find what they desired” (‘quorum duo per totidem sua monasteria posuit in ecclesiis, ut cunctis qui alliquod capitulum de utrolibet Testamento legere uolissent, in promptu esset inuenire quod cuperent.’) *Vita Ceolfridi* in *Abbots of Wearmouth and Jarrow*, Edited & translated by Christopher Grocock & I. N. Wood (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2013): 78-121 [Chapter 20, 98-9].


136 Bede celebrates Ceolfrith’s having “Doubled in size the libraries of both monasteries, working with no less industry than Abbot Benedict had displayed when he began it with great urgency” (“Bibliothecam utriusque monasterii, quam Benedictus abbas magna caepit instantia, ipse non minori geminavit industria.”) *Historia abbatum in Abbots of Wearmouth and Jarrow*, Edited & translated by Christopher Grocock & I. N. Wood (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2013): 22-75 [57]; *Historia abbatum auctore Baeda*, Chapter 15 in C. Plummer, *Venerabilis Baedae…* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1896): 364-404 [379]. The two monasteries referred to are St. Paul’s at Monkwearmouth and St. Peter’s at Jarrow. These two monasteries functioned as one, as demonstrated in Bede’s reference to Ceolfrith’s having presided over “utriusque monasterio, uel sicut rectius dicere possumus, in duobus locis postio uni monasterio, beatorum apostolorum Petri et Pauli” (‘both monasteries, or as we can more correctly say, over the one monastery based in two places, that is of the blessed apostles Peter and Paul’) [Plummer, 379; Grocock & Wood, 57]. St. Peter’s at Monkwearmouth was established first, in 674, by Benedict Biscop, who subsequently ordered the erection of a sister cell (St. Paul’s) at Jarrow in 682, appointing Ceolfrith as its superior. Ceolfrith took 20 monks with him on the 7-mile journey from Monkwearmouth to Jarrow, including his protégé, the young Bede, whose devotion to
particular importance in Ceolfrith’s collection-building for the Monkwearmouth-Jarrow Abbey community was his commissioning of three grand new pandect bibles,\textsuperscript{137} and “as an old man he took one as a gift with him, amongst other items, on his journey to Rome, and left the others to each monastery” (‘Quorum unum senex Romam rediens secum inter alia pro munere sumpsit, duos utrique monasterio reliquit.’)\textsuperscript{138} Thus three vast pandect bibles of the ‘new’ translation of the Bible (the Vulgate version) were made based on the same model as the Codex Grandior, one for each of Ceolfrith’s monasteries,\textsuperscript{139} and one intended for the pope in Rome\textsuperscript{140} - it is striking that this version of The Bible text was still described as the “new translation”, three hundred years after Jerome had prepared it\textsuperscript{141} - alongside the production of an additional copy of the Old Latin version (“Ceolfrith’s smaller pandect” which contained ca. 920 leaves?)\textsuperscript{142}


\textsuperscript{141} De Hamel (2001): 32-4 [33].

The exemplar for part of the *Codex Amiatinus* survives in the fragment of a 6th-century copy of Maccabees, now in Durham (DCL, Ms. B.IV.6, fol. 169*: 127 x 212 mm [about half a leaf] in 2 cols. of 30 lines, and, as far as we know, constitutes, together with the *Codex Amiatinus* itself, the sole surviving example demonstrating the Northumbrian monks’ ‘editorial’ efforts to establish the Bible’s text during the production of the three pandects of the ‘new’ translation.

Ceolfrith himself set off for Rome in June 716 to deliver the pope’s copy in person, but he died on the journey. The manuscript however, survived. Its history for the rest of the Middle Ages through the Renaissance is unknown until it later reappears at the monastery of San Salvatore at Monte Amiata in Italy (where it was highly prized and thought to be a 6th-century Italian work). When the monastery closed in the 18th century the manuscript was taken to the Biblioteca Medicea-Laurenziana in Florence, where it still resides today, and where it was named after the monastery from which it had come; ‘Cod. Amiatino 1’, more commonly known as the *Codex Amiatinus*.

There are two important points for our study to be made about the *Codex Amiatinus*. The first is that it is a complete Bible in a single volume, or a ‘pandect’. “This is a word from the Greek, *pan* (all) and *dekhestai* (to receive), and a pandect is an all-

---


inclusive Bible, or a complete text of every book combined into a single comprehensive volume.” Of course, complete Bibles, as we would now recognize them, with all the books of the Old and New Testaments contained in a single volume, “were almost unimaginable at this time,” and the books of the Bible would usually have circulated in multiple volumes, but The Codex Amiatinus is a single vast volume containing 1,030 leaves and measuring 505 x 340 mm, encompassing all the books of the bible, with a diagram showing the Holy Ghost clasping in its beak a sort of net linking the whole of the eloquence of God in a single unit.” The second important point is that it was made in England, as De Hamel points out: “The idea of a one-volume pandect of the Bible was evidently imported from Cassiodorus in southern Italy, but English scribes seized the concept as no one else had done, and they multiplied the text.”

The Codex Amiatinus is therefore not only the oldest surviving manuscript of the Latin Bible as a single volume but “It marks a turning-point not only in book production but in the abstract concept of the Bible as a unity.” This is emphasized by the bible’s Ezra portrait frontispiece (Fig. 1.1A) shows a visual depiction of the Bible in different formats: as multiple large books (Fig. 1.1B); and as a single small codex (Fig. 1.1C). Ezra is shown seated writing in one bible balanced on his knees (Fig. 1.1A), with a book cupboard to his left containing a 9-volume Bible on its shelves (Fig. 1.1A), and with another book, a third bible strongly reminiscent of Cassiodorus’ small pandect copy, lying open on the floor at his feet (Fig. 1.1C). This frontispiece therefore depicts the 6th-8th century understandings of the textual and material multiplicity of the Bible that we have

147 De Hamel (2001): 32-4 [33].
148 De Hamel (2001): 32-4 [33].
149 De Hamel (2001): 32-4 [33-4].
150 De Hamel (2001): 32-4 [34].
151 The antiquity of the Codex Amiatinus as a kind of ‘ur-format’ cornerstone in the history of the Christian Bible is far from its sole claim to fame and celebration; its text provided the direct model for the Lindisfarne Gospels (British Library, Cotton Ms. Nero D.IV) and possibly also for the Lindisfarne-made Echternach Gospel Book (BnF, Paris, ms. lat. 9389 for other biblical books subsequently disseminated by Anglo-Saxon missionaries across Europe in the 8th century; see De Hamel (2001): 32-4 [34-5].
153 This frontispiece has been reproduced everywhere, but see de Hamel (2001): Pl. 17 [34].

\section{Carolingian Bibles}

The St. Riquier library catalogue of 831 contained both a “Bibliotheca integra ubi continentur libri LXXII in uno volumine” (‘a complete Bible where 72 books are contained in one volume’) and a “Bibliotheca dispersa in voluminibus quattuordecim” (‘a Bible divided into 14 volumes’).\footnote{David Ganz, “Carolingian Bibles” (2012): 326.} Although these examples show that there were one- or two-volume Bibles before the Carolingian age, over the course of the 9\textsuperscript{th} century such pandects became much more common.\footnote{Two further examples of pandect bibles in pre-1000AD are recorded in the library catalogues printed by G. Becker \textit{Catalogi bibliothecarum antiqui} (Bonn, 1885): the first in the library of Fontanellense coenobium, 823-33: “In Flaviacensi quoque coenobio quae obtulerit dona, hoc in loco declarandum cen/ Nomina autem librorum, quos ipsi contulit loco, haec sunt: [no. 33.] "pandectem a beato Hieronymo ex Hebraeo vel Graeco eloquio translatum; eisdem expositionem in duodecim prophetas et sunt tomi viginti in volumine uno." (“Fontanellense coenobio, 823-33” in G. Becker \textit{Catalogi bibliothecarum antiqui} [Bonn, 1885]: 13-16 [14]; cf. \textit{Gesta abbatum Fontanellensiun in Monument, hist Germaniae script. \}: Tom. II, 295,47-97,53.). The second is recorded in the library of Tullum Leucorium (= Toul.), before 1084: “Hi sunt libri inueniti in armario S[an]c[t]i APR[ilis] temporibus abbatis Widonis. / 1 Pandecten totius divinae legis veteris ac noui testamenti vol. I.” (G. Becker \textit{Catalogi bibliothecarum antiqui} [Bonn, 1885]: 149-154 [149].) For a survey of Latin Bible manuscripts before 800, covering script, layout, page size, corrections and contents, see P. McGurk, “The Oldest Manuscripts of the Latin Bible,” in \textit{The Early Medieval Bible. Its Production, Decoration, and Use}, Ed. R. Gameson (Cambridge: CUP, 1994): 1–23.} It was during the Carolingian Renaissance that the production of pandects first began in earnest, when the Bible text, with its prefaces and chapter divisions, became established and when biblical readings for the Mass and
the Office were standardized. During this period extensive copying of complete pandects and multi-volume Bibles took place in addition to gospelbooks and books of biblical readings.

During the reign of Charlemagne, the earliest large format pandect was made for Archbishop Angilram of Metz, before his death in 791. Single-volume bibles were also copied for Bishop Theodulf of Orleans and for Alcuin at Tours after ca. 796/7. Theodulf’s Bibles were portable reference works, following the order of the biblical books as given by Isidore. Theodulf’s bibles also included non-biblical texts relating to biblical chronology and interpretation, and like Alcuin, Theodulf included verses in his Bible drawing attention to the small format of the volume.

From the year 800, the scriptoria of the abbeys of St Martin and Marmoutier at Tours copied large, single-volume Bibles. Though the earliest of these have not survived, the dedicatory poems by Alcuin reveal that a copy of a Tours Bible was presented by Alcuin to Charlemagne in 800 and a second copy was presented to him at Christmas 801. In a letter to Charlemagne, Alcuin informed the king that he was...

158 Fischer lists some 33 one- or two-volume Bibles and 260 gospelbooks copied in the 9th century; B. Fischer, Lateinische Bibelhandschriften im frühen Mittelalter, VLB 11 (Freiburg: Herder, 1985): passim.
sending him a copy of the Scriptures, ‘gathered together in the sanctity of a single and most illustrious corpus and scrupulously emended’. Alcuin also wrote verses for bibles copied for Bishop Gerfrid of Laon, and for an abbess named Ava, several of which mention that the whole Bible is present in a single volume, which would have been an innovation, and in one instance Alcuin emphasized that the book was properly called ‘a pandect’ (“Nomine pandecten proprio vocitare memento”).

In another of his poems, Alcuin makes clear that the Tours Bibles were copied for public reading in church. 18 complete or near complete Tours Bibles and 28 fragments have survived, suggesting that at least two Bibles were copied at Tours every year until the Viking raids of 853. A complete Tours Bible consisted of some 450 folia, measuring ca. 480 x 375 mm, in two columns of around 51 lines per page. Alas, the chronology of these bibles’ production cannot be established on textual grounds, as Fischer has demonstrated. The scriptorium worked on several copies of the Bible at once, and did

---

165 Ep. 261, in MGH Epp. 2, 419. Angelomus of Luxeuil, in his commentary on Genesis presented to Charlemagne’s grandson, Emperor Lothar, referred to ‘the Bible which Alcuin had corrected for Charlemagne and took pains to emend, which we have carefully examined’, which suggests that Charlemagne’s copy was available for consultation at Aachen, and had a normative status; see PL 115, col. 180 (cited in Ganz 2012: 330 n. 26).


168 However, the liturgical reading of Psalms and the Gospels was done from psalters and gospelbooks, and in Tours Bibles the psalter and Gospel texts were copied in a much smaller minuscule format than the rest of the book. In addition to the complete Bibles, some 25 gospelbooks copied at Tours have survived, many of which were presentation volumes.

169 The earliest of these, probably copied during Alcuin’s lifetime, are BnF, Paris Ms. lat. 8847, Monza Biblioteca Capitolare, Ms. g–1/1 and St Gall, Stiftsbibliothek, Ms. 75, along with the volumes represented by the fragments in Bibl. Mun., Angers, Ms. 1 (fols. 99–104) and the pastedowns in Staatsbibliothek Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Berlin, Ms. theol. lat. (fol. 260) and Burgerbibliothek, Bern, Ms. 756, (pp. 59, 70 & 71).

170 Fischer records some 46 Bibles and gospelbooks from Tours; B. Fischer, Die lateinische Evangelien bis zum 10. Jahrhundert, 4 vols., VLB 13, 15, 17, 18 (Freiburg: Herder, 1988–91).

171 The St Gall Tours Bible (Stiftsbibliothek Ms. 75), at 540 x 395 mm, has a larger format than the Codex Amiatinus (505 x 340 mm in two columns of 44 lines).

172 B. Fischer, Lateinische Bibelhandschriften im frühen Mittelalter, VLB 11 (Freiburg: Herder, 1983): 209. The bibles included the Hieronymian prefaces, used the Gallicanum psalter text, and gave various chapter lists for the chapters of selected individual books, but the order of the biblical books and the presence of prefaces and chapter lists were not fixed. (Ganz 2012: 332)
not always copy the same exemplar.\textsuperscript{173} The number of scribes involved in the copying of a single Bible varied from between 6\textsuperscript{174} to a dozen (e.g. BL, Ms. Harley 2805\textsuperscript{175}), although as many as 16 or even 24 hands have been identified in some Tours Bibles.\textsuperscript{176} There is some evidence that scribes each copied a single quire, and if their exemplar was disbound, different scribes could have been working at the same time, making the copying faster.\textsuperscript{177} These scribes all wrote in a very similar way,\textsuperscript{178} and out of the grand total of bibles they produced (and it is very grand) only two of these scribes are named.\textsuperscript{179} Tours Bibles generally include the following features of layout: each book began with an enlarged decorated initial; red was used for the capital letters at the start of sections of the text, and for the incipit and explicit (opening and closing words); and each chapter of a book usually began on a new line.\textsuperscript{180} A few copies include full-page illustrations, copied on inserted leaves.\textsuperscript{181} These indications suggest a considerable body of industrious

\textsuperscript{174} 6 scribes copied the First Bible of Charles the Bald and 8 copied the Rorigo Bible (Ganz 2012: 332).
\textsuperscript{175} Rand suggested that about a dozen scribes copied the first part of the pandect which is now BL, Ms. Harley 2805; about a dozen also worked on Zentralbibliothek, Zurich, Ms. Car. C. 1 (perhaps including some whose hands are found in the Bamberg Bible) and about the same number are found in the surviving portion of BnF, Paris, Ms. lat. 68 (Ganz 2012: 332). Cf. entry for BL, Ms. Harley 2805 on the British Library’s \textit{Catalogue of Illuminated Manuscripts} online here.
\textsuperscript{176} 14 scribes copied Deutsche Staatsbibliothek, Berlin, Ms. Hamilton 82 and some 16 scribal hands have been indentified in the incomplete BnF, Paris, Ms. lat. 11514, while Bruckner distinguished an astounding 24 scribal hands in the Moutier Grandval Bible (Ganz 2012: 332).
\textsuperscript{177} Over the period during which the Tours Bibles were produced, the ruling of the page layout evolved from two columns with a central margin, to inner and outer ruled marginal columns on either side of the column of text; see A. Dold, “Neuentdeckte Blätter einer unbekannten Biblehandschrift von Tours,” \textit{Zentralblatt für Bibliothekswesen} 48 (1931): 169-76 (cited in Ganz 2012: 333, n.37).
\textsuperscript{178} Although as David Ganz has noted, scribes might form ‘r’ with a longer or shorter tongue, or ‘g’ with a large or smaller bowl, while the left-hand compartment of capital ‘M’ (which was usually more or less symmetrical about the central shaft) was sometimes closed at the base. In the early Tours Bibles the text script used both a half-uncial cc-shaped ‘a’ and the minuscule form of ‘a’, and ‘r’ entered into ligature with a following ‘a’ or ‘e’, and word separation was uneven, designed to justify both margins of the column of text. However over the course of the 9\textsuperscript{th} century there was an improvement in the script and decoration of Tours Bibles. (Ganz 2012: 331) For further discussion of the layout of Tours Bibles see P. Petitmengin, “La Bible de Rorigon,” in \textit{Mise en page et mise en texte du livre manuscrit}, Eds. H.-J. Martin & J. Vezin (Paris: Cercle de la Librairie-Promodis, 1990): 78–83.
\textsuperscript{179} These are ‘Amalricus’ in the Monza Bible, and ‘Hildebertus’, who left his name beside the quire signature on a bifolium from a Tours Bible now in Munich; D. Ganz, “Carolingian Bibles” (2012): 333
\textsuperscript{180} The title of the book was often copied in elegant written display capitals which were close to the letter forms of Roman inscriptions. A few lines of somewhat heavy uncials were used at the start of the text of each book. The Gospel prologues were copied in half-uncial script. Explicit were always in a small capitals script. In a number of places at the end of a quire, the script was compressed in order to make sure that the text did not run over into the next scribe’s section. (Ganz 2012: 331) For further discussion of the layout of Tours Bibles see P. Petitmengin, “La Bible de Rorigon,” in \textit{Mise en page et mise en texte du livre manuscrit}, Eds. H.-J. Martin & J. Vezin (Paris: Cercle de la Librairie-Promodis, 1990): 78–83.
copyists engaged in a harmonious yet impressively productive program of collaboratively copying bibles.

However pandects and gospelbooks from Tours also served as gifts given to (and received by) prominent figures and their relatives, including kings, emperors and archbishops, and to important religious foundations. For example, The Vivian Bible (now BnF, Paris, Ms. lat. 1) has a full-page illustration accompanied by a poem showing the bible’s presentation to Charles the Bald, then King of the Franks and subsequently Holy Roman Emperor (Fig. 1.2). Charles’ brother, Emperor Lothar, himself presented a complete illustrated Bible to the abbey of Prüm when he entered it as a monk in 852 (presumably not to be outdone; it was his way), while The Moutier Grandval Bible (now BL, Add. Ms. 10546) may have presented to the abbey by the lay abbot Luitfrid, a nephew of Louis the Pious’s queen Irmingard.

In the reign of Charlemagne, Alcuin and Theodulf were innovators in copying single-volume pandects. Multi-volume Bibles were copied for Corbie under Abbot Maudramnus and for Salzburg under Bishop Arno. But under the influence of Theodulf and Alcuin, the idea of a single-volume pandect spread to Paris, Corbie, Rheims, St Amand, Lyon, Reichenau, St Gall, Freising and Corvey, as well as other unidentified centres.

---

183 This presentation took place ca. 846, and the illustration is on fol. 423r of The Vivian Bible, which contains 423 fols. and measures 375 x 495 mm. Cf. Dutton and Kessler, First Bible of Charles the Bald (): 71-87; cf. De Hamel (1994).
184 Cf. on The Moutier Grandval Bible (BL, Add. Ms. 10546) see its entry in the British Library’s online repository of Digitized Manuscripts, available here. Further examples of Tours Bibles serving as gifts involving prominent figures include: Abbot Hilduin of St Denis, the chancellor of emperor Louis the Pious, may have presented BnF, Paris, Ms. lat. 250 to St. Denis; Count Rorigo, the grandson of Charlemagne, owned BnF, Paris, Ms. lat. 3 and presented it to the abbey of Glanfeuil on the Loire; St Gall, Stiftsbibliothek, Ms. 75 appears to have reached St. Gall by the mid-9th century; BnF, Paris, Ms. lat. 8847 was at Echternach; and Dombibliothek, Cologne, Ms. 1 was presented to Cologne by Archbishop Hermann (890–925), though it was probably copied some thirty years before he became archbishop. D. Ganz, “Carolingian Bibles” (2012): 332-33 cf. ns. 35-36.
186 See D. Ganz, “Carolingian Bibles” (2012): 334, cf. ns. 41-50. Fischer records some 24 surviving Breton gospelbooks, 7 from the court school of Charlemagne and 3 from the court school of Louis the Pious, some 46 Bibles and gospelbooks from Tours, 7 from western France, 5 gospelbooks from Lyon and its region, 5 from Burgundy, 3 from Metz, 6 from Lorsch, 7 from Lotharingia, 15 from northern France, 8 from northeastern France, 15 from St Amand, 12 from Rheims, 6 from Mainz and 6 from Freising. B. Fischer, Die lateinische Evangelien bis zum 10. Jahrhundert, 4 vols., VLB 13, 15, 17, 18 (Freiburg: Herder, 1988–91); cited in Ganz 2012: 334 n.53.
III ‘Romanesque’ or ‘Display’ Bibles ca. 1060-1200

Following the commencement of the copying of pandect bibles during the Carolingian Renaissance, pandect production ceased in the late 9th century amidst the turmoil associated with the fall of the Carolingian empire, and in the ensuing years, the production of biblical manuscripts was mostly limited to parts of the Bible and especially to the production of gospel books and psalters.\footnote{On the production and uses of Romanesque display bibles see Dorothy Shepard, “Romanesque display Bibles” (2012): 400-403 [400].} However in the early 11th century the production of the Bible in pandect form, which required much more in the way of materials and skilled craftsmen, was resumed.\footnote{“The major stimulus for this seems to have been the 11th-century Gregorian reform. One goal of this movement was to counter the arguments of heretics who rejected much of the Old Testament, and thus the copying and decoration of complete Bibles at this time was probably designed to declare the canonicity of the Old Testament as well as the New.” Dorothy Shepard, “Romanesque display Bibles” (2012): 400; cf. P. Briege, “Biblical Illustration and Gregorian Reform,” in \textit{Studies in Church History}, Ed. G.J. Cumming. 2 vols. (London: Nelson, 1965): II, 154-9.}

These bibles produced between 1060 and 1200, sometimes referred to as Romanesque Bibles, are monumental luxury codices; together they constitute, as Dorothy Shepard puts it, “probably the most elaborate, expensive and beautiful group of Bibles ever made.”\footnote{Shepard concludes: “However they were used and wherever they were kept, Romanesque display Bibles remain among the most treasured of all medieval manuscripts.” (Shepard 2012: 403). The term ‘Romanesque’ was coined by by 19th-century scholars to refer to the period dominated in western Europe by a distinctive style in architecture and art inspired by ancient Roman precedent, and therefore characterized as ‘Romanesque’; Dorothy Shepard, “Romanesque display Bibles” in \textit{The New Cambridge History of The Bible}, Vol. I: From 600 to 1450, Eds. Richard Marsden & E. Ann Matter (Cambridge: CUP, 2012): 392-403 [392]. Cf. Walter Cahn, \textit{Romanesque Bible Illumination} (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1982) and \textit{eadem}, \textit{Romanesque Manuscripts: The Twelfth Century}, 2 vols. \textit{A Survey of Manuscripts Illuminated in France} I (London: Harvey Miller Publishers, 1996).} Although ‘display’ bibles form a distinct category of manuscript production in the Romanesque period, they were for the most part individually conceived and executed; the number of volumes, the size of the page, the page layout and the amount of decoration vary widely.\footnote{Walter Cahn discusses 150 in his \textit{Romanesque Bible Illumination} (Ithaca, NT: Cornell University Press, 1982) (cited in Shepard 2012: 392, n.1).} Unsurprisingly, these large bibles were costly in terms both of the materials required and the time needed for copying and decoration, and yet hundreds were produced in all parts of Europe, and many have survived...
complete and others in part. Very famous surviving 12th-century bibles include The Bury Bible (CCCC, Ms. 2), The Dover Bible (CCCC, Ms. 3), The Lambeth Bible (Lambeth Palace, London, Ms. 3), The Winchester Bible (Winchester Cathedral, Ms. 17), The Le Puiset Bible (Durham Cathedral Library, Ms. A.II.1) and The Carilef Bible (DCL, Ms. A.II.4) and this lovely list goes on and on.

IV Examples of Pandect Bibles in the 12th Century

As stated, the bibles produced during the 11th to 12th centuries were typically multi-volume copies of extremely generous proportions; many were over 500 mm high and 300 mm wide and included from around 400 to over 700 pages, with each volume usually containing 30 or 40 gatherings of 8 folios. However bibles were also copied in pandect format during this period; a number of complete examples survive along with others in part or in fragments. Furthermore a series of recorded references indicate the presence and production of pandect bibles in monastic communities during the 12th century, including at Canterbury, Durham, Bury St. Edmunds, St. Albans and Peterborough.


192 See C.M. Kaufmann, Romanesque Manuscripts, 1066-1190. Survey III (London, Harvey Miller, 1975): Lincoln Cathedral Library, Ms. A.I.2 + Trinity College, Cambridge, Ms. B.5.2: no. 13 [59-60, Ills. 30-3]; The Bury Bible: no. 56 [88-9, Ills. 148-53, Fig. 12]; The Dover Bible: no. 69 [97-9, Ills. 188-91, Fig. 29]; The Lambeth Bible: no. 70 [99-100, Ills. 192-5, Figs. 30, 32, 36]; Winchester Bible II*: no. 82 [107-8, Ills. 225-8]; The Winchester Bible: nos. 83-84) (no. 83: 108-11, Ills. 225-8); The Le Puiset Bible (DCL, Ms. A.III.1): no. 98 (121-2, Ills. 279-82, 285); Bodleian Library, Oxford, Ms. Laud Misc. 752: no. 103 (123-5, Ills. 291-3). Other examples of very famous 12th-century bibles include: The Pantheon Bible (Vatican, cod. Vat. Lat. 12958), The Parc Abbey Bible (London, BL, Add. Ms. 14788), The Worms (or Frankenthal) Bible (BL, Harley Mss. 2803-4), The Floreffe Bible (BL, Add. Mss. 17737-8), The Arnstein Bible (BL, Harley Ms. 2798-9), The Burgos Bible (Burgos, Biblioteca Provincial, cod. 846), The Manerius Bible (Paris, Bibliothèque de Ste.-Geneviève, Miss. 8-10), The Pontigny Bible (fragments in Paris, BnF, Ms. lat. 8823 and elsewhere), The Souvigny Bible (Moulins, Bibliothèque Municipale, Ms. 1), The Capucins’ Bible (Paris, BnF, Miss. Lat. 16743-6), The Bible of Boulogne-sur-Mer (Boulogne, Bibliothèque Municipale, Ms. 2), The Ansbach Bible (Erlangen, Universitätsbibliothek, Cod. 1 Perg); De Hamel (2001): 78-9. See also Laura Light & Christopher de Hamel, with Preface by Sandra Hindman, The Idda Collection: Romanesque Biblical Manuscripts c. 1000 to 1240 (Les Enluminures [Paris-Chicago-NY] Catalogue 19) (Cierre Grafica ZGE: Verona, Italy for Les Enluminures, 2015): Contains 16 Manuscripts, including: No. 13, Glossed Job ($185,000); No. 14, Glossed Pauline Epistles ($245,000); No. 15, Glossed Mark ($215,000); No. 16, Glossed Apocalypse ($190,000).

193 See Dorothy Shepard, “Romanesque display Bibles” (2012): 396-400.
Thomas Becket owned a one-volume bible (‘bibliotheca’) by 1170, which the chronicler William of Canterbury describes Becket bringing with him in his luggage when he set sail from France in the last months of his life,\(^1\) a bible which Becket most likely acquired during the final years of his life in exile in France\(^2\) (probably at the Cistercian Abbey of Pontigny\(^3\)) and subsequently bequeathed to Christ Church, Canterbury.\(^4\) Robert of Adington, *magister* in Durham in the 1190s\(^5\) had a bible in 48 gatherings (“Bibliothea tota in xlviij quaternis"), which, if each quire had 8 sheets, comprised only 384 leaves, strongly suggesting a small portable copy rather than a huge lectern bible such


\(^2\) De Hamel has argued that the major part of Becket’s collection, and all of his surviving glossed books, must belong to the final years of Becket’s life; the fact that Becket and his colleagues were in France from 1164-70, together with the evidence of the surviving books' text and layout, all suggest that the books were acquired there; on the bibles and book collections of St. Thomas Becket, see De Hamel, *Glossed Books of the Bible* (1984): 38-54 [38], cf. 37, n.67

\(^3\) We may follow Dodwell and De Hamel in localizing the production of the books which Becket gave to Canterbury – including his pandect ‘Biblia’ – more specifically to the Cistercian Abbey of Pontigny, where, as William FitzStephen described in his *Life of St. Thomas*, Becket spent two years giving himself over to academic study and attending to having manuscripts written out: “Archiepiscopus...etiam studio litterarum, et maxime divinae paginae, operam dalbat; libris etiam conscribendis, et perquirendis a domino papa privilegis. In quorumcunque ecclesiarum omnibus armariis nullum audiebat in Gallis esse antiquitatis vel approbatae auctoritatis librum, quem transcribi non faceret, nullum privilegium quod ecclesiae suae non perquireret, ut omni retro tempore optimis voluminibus et privilegiis ecclesiae Cantuariensis ita dixit et nobilitata non fuerit, sicut tandem eam refersit.” Materials for History of Becket, Eds. J.C. Robertson & J.B. Sheppard, 7 vols. (Rolls Series, 1875-85); iii: 76-7, (cited in C.R. Dodwell, *The Canterbury School of Illumination, 1066-1200* [Cambridge: CUP, 1954]: 108, and discussed in De Hamel 1984: 45, n.34; also 44-5 & 45, n.35) It therefore seems very likely that Becket’s pandect ‘Biblia’ was a product of what De Hamel refers to as “The So-Called ‘Pontigny’ School of Illumination” whose distinctive style of illumination has been found in the glossed books of Becket, Ralph of Rheims and Herbert of Bosham. De Hamel, *Glossed Books of the Bible* (1984): 45; for De Hamel on “The So-Called ‘Potigny’ School of Illumination” see *ibid.*, Ch. IV, 38-54.

\(^4\) A list of Becket’s manuscripts survives in Prior Eastry’s inventory of the books in the library of Christ Church, Canterbury (compiled in the late 13th- or early 14th-century) which records Becket’s collection as filling the library’s first two *distinctiones* (De Hamel suggests: “perhaps the two faces of one piece of furniture”) on the second side of the library. Becket’s bible was later entered as the third volume on the list of ‘Libri Sancti Thome’ included in Eastry’s catalogue and described simply as “Biblia” M.R. James published Eastry’s complete list of Becket’s 69 volumes in his *Ancient Libraries of Canterbury and Dover* (Cambridge: CUP, 1903): 82-5 ['Biblia': 82, no. 785]; cf. De Hamel, *Glossed Books of the Bible* (1984): 38.

as the Winchester, Dover or Puiset Bibles (468, 556 and 723 leaves respectively). Alas, neither Robert’s bible nor Thomas’ survives.

The late 12th or early 13th-century catalogue of the library at Bury Abbey records three, or possibly four bibles, including a “Bibliotheca in uno volumine. [Item bibliotheca Azonis.]” while six bibles (and two part bibles) can be identified as having been produced at St. Albans in the mid to late 12th-century, and one (very special) bible

---

199 This bible is the first entry on the inventory list of Robert’s books added to fol. 2v of Robert’s glossed Ecclesiasticus (now Durham Cathedral Library Ms. A.III.16); the list begins “Hi sunt librini magistri Roberti de AEdnt. repositi apud sanctum Victorem” and refers to Robert’s books being stored in the house of the Canons Regular of St-Victor in Paris, the city where Robert most likely acquired his pandect bible. Robert’s collection of 38 volumes “seems to have been brought to England and ultimately given to Durham, almost unbroken.” Mynors describes the “note” (a remarkable list of the library of an English student at Paris in the second half of the XIth century) as written “in a hand perhaps of the late XIth century”; it is printed in full in R.A.B. Mynors, Durham Cathedral Manuscripts to the end of the Twelfth Century (Oxford: OUP, 1939): 78, cited by De Hamel, Glossed Books of the Bible (1984): 50-1 and 37, n.67. Mynors comments that “Of these thirty-eight volumes, eight can be identified with Durham books which still survive, and all save half a dozen can be traced with a greater or less degree of probability among the titles given in the catalogues of 1391 and 1395”: Durham Cathedral Manuscripts to the end of the Twelfth Century (Oxford: OUP, 1939): 78. Six of Robert’s glossed books remain in Durham Cathedral’s library (Ms. A.III.2, 5, 16, 17, 19 & 24) and a seventh is not far away, in the library of York Minster (Ms. XVI.Q.5). Compare to the library of Ralph Foliot, archdeacon of Hereford from 1163 to 1195; he gave to Hereford 20 books in all, of which 10 are still in the Cathedral library; 8 of these are glossed books of the bible, and 1 is the Sentences of Peter Lombard. R.A.B. Mynors, Durham Cathedral Manuscripts to the end of the Twelfth Century (Oxford: OUP, 1939): 79. Cf. the late 12th-century catalogue from Durham, in Catalogus Veterum Librorum Ecclesiae Cathedralis Dunelmensis, Ed. J. Raine. Surtees Society? (Durham, 1838): 1-10.


202 See Rodney M. Thomson, Manuscripts from St. Albans Abbey 1066-1235. 2 vols. (Woodbridge, Suffolk: D.S. Brewer, for the University of Tasmania, 1982): no. 3 Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, Ms. 48 [I: 81-2, II: Pl. 177, 179-84, 230]; 11 Trinity College, Cambridge, Ms. B.5.1 (147) [I: 86-7, II: Pl. 93-5]; 16 Eton College, Ms. 26 [I: 89-90, II: Pl. 235]; 59 Corpus Christi College, Oxford, Ms. 2* [I: 112, II: Pl. 117-18]; 75 Trinity College Dublin, Ms. 51 [I: 121-2, II: Pl. 227-9, 233-4]; 81 Lambeth Palace Library, London, Ms. 3
from the early 13th-century (The Lothian Bible, ca.1200-25). Amongst the books copied in the late 12th century for Abbot Benedict of Peterborough Abbey (1177-93) were two bibles which certainly seem to have been pandect copies.

3 Contrasting 13th-century bibles with 12th-century bibles

I Their Respective Sizes

Characteristically, the bibles produced during the 12th century are large folio-sized productions containing the complete Vulgate and many accessory texts in up to five volumes. The generous proportions of their pages allowed for around 40 to 50 lines of text per column as well as ample margins between columns and around the written space, with text generally copied in a large rounded minuscule script; as a result, these bibles “project a feeling of spaciousness and monumentality.” These ‘Romanesque’ bibles were such monumental productions “that the answer to the question of their use seems self-evident”; they were surely intended for display as well as regular use. They were certainly designed for communal ownership, either by monasteries or cathedral chapters, so the altar would seem to have been the logical place to keep them, and we know that many had become objects for display at large and wealthy institutions before the mid 12th century.
The early owners of these Romanesque Bibles demonstrably valued these books as much for their symbolic and sacramental meanings as for the meaning of the actual words they contained. A Bible on an altar was a symbol as well as a physical object; it contained the sacred word of God but also represented a symbol of God “in a time when the Christian faithful believed that the divine could be encountered in physical objects that then became holy by association.” The magnificence of these bibles reflects the importance of their role in societal worship and their function as more than just sacred texts; they were also treasures, heavenly as well as earthly. It is on account of Romanesque pandects’ function as venerated treasures, as magnificent symbols of the Divine that scholars generally explain the scarcity of these bibles in medieval monastic library catalogues, reasoning that such volumes were kept on the altar rather than in the library.

However, the absence of pandect bibles from monastic communities’ catalogues and inventories of their books may also be attributed to other such copies having been stored in locations outside of the library where they were to be used, such as close to the refectory. In fact far more evidence exists for these bibles’ use than their display for veneration and admiration from afar. The 11th-century Gregorian reform of the clergy in northern Europe was concerned with strengthening the faith and practices of both the monks and the secular clergy. For many Benedictine monks this meant a return to the practices laid out in their rule, which required the reading of the Bible throughout the year, and the large-scale Bibles, containing all the biblical readings needed for the liturgy, met that need. Monastic customaries specify biblical readings in the daily Office, and

---

211 Dorothy Shepard, “Romanesque display Bibles” (2012): 402.
213 The noticeable quantitative and qualitative leap in manuscript production that had taken place by the end of the 11th century reflects this demand; Dorothy Shepard, “Romanesque display Bibles” (2012): 401.
215 The *Rule of St. Benedict* in English, Ed. T. Fry (NY: Vintage Books, 1981): chs. 9-13 & 17 [21-4 & 26] (cited in Shepard 2012: 401, n.26). New orders of monks emphasizing reform aims were established in this period, emphasizing a return to the *vita apostolica* or communal life as a remedy for moral decadence (i.e. priests,
oral reading during meals is often mentioned. Textual evidence survives that shows that some Romanesque Bibles were produced for that express purpose of being used for reading aloud to the community in the refectory. The more modest character of those large Romanesque Bibles that were not richly decorated with gold and figures is often attributed to these volumes being intended for this specific purpose of use.

13th-century bibles are generally about half the size of their mighty 12th-century predecessors or less “and some are small enough to be termed portable or pocket Bibles because they are of such a size that they could easily be carried about.” The dramatic changes in the format in which the Bible was produced between the 12th and 13th centuries were summarized by Eric G. Millar in his celebrated English Illuminated Manuscripts from the Xth to the XIIIth Century (1926), itself a gigantic tome, as follows:

Nothing is more characteristic of the thirteenth century change of style than the small bibles that have come down to us in immense quantities. The great volumes of the previous century fell almost at once into disfavor, and the pendulum swung across to the opposite extreme; it now became the apparent object to produce the

deacons and so on were to live much like monks) and each monastery and church, new or restored, required manuscripts for use in its religious services, the Mass and the Office; these large bibles satisfied such needs perfectly.

219 Exceptions include bibles such as The Lothian Bible (Morgan Library & Museum, NY, Ms. M.791: ca. 1220?, 395 fols., 470 x 320 mm) and CUL Ms. Dd.8.12 (ca. 1210-20?, 469 fols., 376 x 252 mm); see Morgan (1982): nos. 32 and 44.
220 Morgan (1982): nos. 66 (Peterborough Cathedral Library, Ms. 10) and no. 69 (Bodleian Library, Oxford, Ms. lat. Bibli. e.7).
whole Bible within the smallest portable compass, the eyesight of the scribe and the reader being secondary matters.\textsuperscript{221}

Three years later, Millar extended his previous comments to emphasize the practical significance of these changes,\textsuperscript{222} namely that the reduction in the size and weight of the bibles produced in the 12\textsuperscript{th} and 13\textsuperscript{th} centuries respectively lead to an increase in the bibles’ portability:

The twelfth century liked to have its Bibles of immense size and corresponding magnificence, and, it may be added, weight: no one who has ever attempted to carry the great Bury St. Edmunds Bible now at Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, which measures upwards of 21 by 14 inches…will ever again think of these wonderful books in terms of portability.\textsuperscript{223}

The pocket Bible was a Bible shaped by purely utilitarian needs: one no longer valued primarily as a symbol, but rather simply as a useful book, designed both for reading and, for the first time in the Middle Ages, for reference.\textsuperscript{224} The earliest portable bibles were copied in Paris at the end of the 1220s or the early 1230s, but English examples appear at almost the same time.\textsuperscript{225} One of the earliest French examples, and the earliest known dated ‘pocket’ bible, is Dôle, Bibliothèque Municipale, Ms. 15 (160 x 105 \(106-11 \times 71-73\) mm, 968 pp., 2 cols./49 lines), a portable Bible copied in 1234, most

\textsuperscript{221} E.G. Millar, \textit{English Illuminated Manuscripts from the Xth to the XIIIth Century} (Paris and Brussels: G. van Oest, 1926): 51, cf. pl. 76 (BL, Burney Ms. 3, reprod. fol. 5v) and pl. 77a-b (BL, Royal Ms. 1.D.I, reprod. fol. 4v and 5r)

\textsuperscript{222} Millar’s short yet erudite and extremely readable article – which opens with the delicious, and characteristically punchy, sentence, “Fashions in books in the Middle Ages changed almost as frequently as the fashions in dress of their owners, and nowhere is the change more striking than in the Latin manuscript Bibles of the thirteenth century.” - remains one of the best ‘Short Introductions’ to 13\textsuperscript{th}-century portable bibles ever written. E.G. Millar, “Thirteenth Century Portable Bibles,” \textit{International Studio} (August 1929): 26-30, 80-81. Millar illustrated his article with eight facsimile images, five of them from a minute and extremely portable French bible in Millar’s own collection (now British Library, Add. Ms. 54,235), copied in the second half of the 13\textsuperscript{th} century, perhaps in Paris. These images (unnumbered) reproduce the following folios of BL, Add. Ms. 54,235: on p.26, fols. 5v-6r (Genesis initial); on p.27, fol. 276v (‘D’ initial for Psalm 52) and fol. 237v (Esther initial); and on p.28, fols. 283v-84r (Proverbs initial) and fol. 463r (Matthew initial); see E.G. Millar, “Thirteenth Century Portable Bibles,” \textit{International Studio} (August 1929): 26-28; the article also includes reproductions of BL, Ms. Egerton 2908, fols. 294, 14r, and 308v (on 29-30).


\textsuperscript{224} Light (1987): 276. See Schnurman’s study, still, to date, the only serious study of 13\textsuperscript{th}-century portable/pocket bibles, although, as Light notes, Schnurman’s study – while raising a number of interesting questions – “is of necessarily limited value” since the study was based largely on the evidence afforded by descriptions in catalogues. (Light, 1987: 276 n.7). In the interests of fairness, it should be pointed out that it is not entirely fair to characterize Schnurmann’s entire study as based primarily upon secondary sources (although these were primarily catalogue descriptions), but it is fair to say that the majority of her Appendix catalogue of examples were sourced from such sources.

\textsuperscript{225} Light (1987): 277.
likely in Paris, which was signed and dated by its scribe, Thomas, “clericus de Pontisara”.226

The oldest dated ‘portable’ bible (i.e. larger than a ‘pocket’ bible yet still of relatively small size seems to be Morgan Library & Museum, NY, Ms. M.163,227 written and illuminated in 1229 in northeastern France, possibly Corbie (216 x 162 mm).228 One of the earliest English examples, datable to between about 1234 and 1250 is now Bodleian Library, Ms. Lat. bib. e.7, a tiny Bible made for a Dominican with decoration and illuminations by William de Brailles (168 x 105 mm, 440 fols.).229 Another early English pocket bible, also most likely Dominican, is British Library, Arundel Ms. 303 (138 x 93 mm, 484 fols.), copied between 1228 and 1234.230 Like Bodleian Ms. Lat. e.7, this bible may also have been produced in Oxford, and it too has a mendicant provenance, having perhaps been made for an Oxford Dominican, as witnessed by the table of readings (fols. 1r-2v) and Calendar for Dominican use (fols. 3v-4v) preceding its Bible text and the IHN (fols. 5r-442v, 443r-83r). Bodleian Library, Oxford, Ms. Auct. D.5.8.

---


229 See further discussion in Chapter 3.


231 Further support for the bible’s (Oxford?) University provenance (in the 15th century at least) is located in an erased caucio note on fol. 483v dated 1432 (?).
another English bible which was copied during the second half of the 13th century, perhaps also in Oxford (127 x 85 mm, 660 fols.), is an exceptionally small example of these so-called ‘pocket’ bibles;232 indeed only a handful of examples of comparable size can be cited.233

Although these volumes are now commonly referred to as ‘pocket bibles’, I would argue that the term ‘portable bible’ - meaning a bible containing the whole biblical text easily transportable in a bag or in a pocket234 - is preferable for two reasons. First, the term ‘pocket bible’ seems unnecessarily and unhelpfully restrictive given the existence of many copies which, despite being somewhat larger, still remained portable and whose production and circulation was fairly widespread.235 Rather than focusing exclusively on ‘pocket’ bibles, it seems wiser and more productive to extend of definition to include examples whose measurements were somewhat larger than the dimensions scholars have assigned to ‘pocket’-sized bibles in the past, but that were still unarguably ‘portable’.236 By doing so we may include, in addition to extremely small bibles, those that are slightly

---

232 The biblical text and prologues broadly follow the ‘Paris’ model (lacking the Psalter), and are preceded by the IHN (inc. “Aaz. apprehensus vel fortitude”, fol. 1r); see Pächt & Alexander III (): no. 508 (43) & pl. XLI; Summary Catalogue II.2 (1897): no. 3587 (693); Christopher de Hamel, Bibles: An Illustrated History from Papyrus to Print (Oxford: Bodleian Libraries/ University of Oxford, 2011): no. 28 (86-7). On the book’s first leaves (fols. 1-3v) are a list of the books of the Bibles (names abbreviated) in the order of the Paris Bible, and a Summary of selected Old Testament books, arranged by modern chapters, using headings from the chapters of Peter Comestor’s Historia Scholastica (added to the Bible very early, perhaps by its original owner). The bible text (OT: fols. 4-491v, NT: fols. 491v-619v) is followed by the text of Lamentations (not included in the bible) added at the rear of the volume (fols. 620-22v).

233 Comparable examples include BuF, Paris Ms. lat 219 and another English bible offered for sale by Les Enluminures in 2009, that is even smaller still (120 x 83 [84-5 x 57-5] mm, 2 cols./38 lines, 623 fols.), copied by at least two scribes ca. 1230-50. Cf. on the Les Enluminures bible: Les Enluminures, TextManuscripts (January 2009): Ref. No. 319 (description with images available on Les Enluminures’ TextManuscripts website here); see also SDBM ID #152267 (Jan. 2009) and #236093 (New York Antiquarian Book Fair [3 April 2009]: No. 17)

234 The preference for using the term ‘portable’ over ‘pocket’ bible is well-put by Chiara Ruzzier (see Ruzzier 2011: 74-5)

235 Ruzzier 2011: 75; cf. 77 n.5, 78 n.8.

236 For example, Ruzzier focuses on bibles with a taille measurement (i.e. Height + Width) of less than 380 mm For further details on taille measurements, see the categories of format (according to measurements by taille) established by Carla Cozzolo and Exio Ornato, i.e. small (height + width < 320 mm), medium-small (height + width = 320-490 mm), medium-large (height + width = 491-670 mm); Carla Cozzolo and Exio Ornato, Pour une histoire du livre manuscrit au Moyen Âge: Trois essais de codicologie quantitative, 2nd ed. (Paris, 1983): 268.
bigger - most probably used for preaching and studying - which, although not very small, would have still been easy to carry in a saddle bag.\(^{237}\)

Second, the expression ‘bibliae portatiles’ was already attested in the 13th century. An early (albeit indirect) reference to a bible in small format survives from 1139, when Pope Innocent II asked St. Augustine’s Abbey, Canterbury “ut Bibliam manualem parvi voluminis qualem Romanum pontificem deceat ad opus nostrum fieri faciatis.”\(^{238}\) Another example from the 12th century is supplied by Christopher de Hamel, who has suggested that Abp. Thomas Becket may have possessed a pandect bible, possibly in a small, handy size.\(^{239}\)

Some medieval inventories do include references to ‘biblie portatiles’ which are in accordance with the dimensions now considered ‘pocket’ size. For example, Biblioteca Marciana, Venice, Ms. I. 60, which measures 209 x 140 mm has been identified as the bible entered in the 13th-century catalogue of the library of S. Giustina a Padova, described as “Biblia integra…portatilis,”\(^{240}\) while a 13th-century ownership note in a 13th-century French bible measuring 211 x 152 mm (now Bibliothèque mun., Lille, Ms. 7) describes the bible as “Biblia parva portatoria”\(^{241}\) (‘small and portable’), and as De Hamel comments, although the volume is “not exactly pocket-sized [it is] certainly portable.”\(^{242}\)

Further surviving examples which problematize these categories of size and ‘portability’ include the early examples of ‘Paris’ Bibles studied by Laura Light, produced at the beginning of the 13th century, which, if strictly speaking ‘portable’ \textit{per se}, could

\(^{237}\) Ruzzier decided to extend the parameters of her survey to include all ‘complete’ bibles with overall dimensions of less than 450 mm in order to generate a data set in which she might be able to study the incidence of size vis-à-vis the physical attributes of the bible manuscripts and the type of biblical text they contained more productively, in addition to highlighting the different modalities of textual compression developed in the three main countries where portable Bibles were produced: France, Italy and England. (Ruzzier 2013: 106).


\(^{241}\) “Biblia parva portatoria, que fuit magistri Petri de Aghignies, cum hoc signo D.”;

certainly have been handled without great difficulty.\textsuperscript{243} However, although both medieval and modern definitions of ‘portable’ bibles each infer that the designated volume could be easily transported, neither definition establishes an exact size (for example in mm) according to which one may categorize these books.\textsuperscript{244}

However, despite the fact that the portable bible was, without a doubt, one of the most important innovations of the 13\textsuperscript{th} century, we must not forget that there was in general still considerable variety in the size and format of bibles copied throughout the 13\textsuperscript{th} century.\textsuperscript{245} Two-volume bibles were not uncommon, with the second volume starting at Proverbs\textsuperscript{246} (for example, see UPenn Ms. Codex 1053, discussed in Chapter 3). Multi-volume bibles, especially glossed ones, were still being produced during the same period when the first large-sized Bibles-with-gloss in one volume were starting to appear.\textsuperscript{247} Furthermore pandect bibles were still being produced in large, lectern-sized format throughout the 13\textsuperscript{th}-century, some used in monastic communities for refectory readings or as study resources for communal reference,\textsuperscript{248} while other examples were arguably intended to serve as luxurious symbols of social status (e.g. UPenn Ms. Codex 724).\textsuperscript{249} Examples of large-format luxury bibles produced during the 13\textsuperscript{th} century recently sold at

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{243} For example Paris, BnF Ms., 15475 (268 x 180 mm) et Paris, Bibliothèque Mazarine, Ms. 70 (231 x 164 mm); see Light (1994): 175-6. Also Beinecke Library, Yale University, Ms. 551 (178 x 127 mm, single column; datable to around 1150-70); cf. Ruzzier, “Des armaria aux besaces” (2011): 78 n.8.
\item \textsuperscript{244} Although a broad ‘pocket’ size category has emerged via inter-scholarly suggestion, consensus and emulation, i.e. max height of 200 mm. cf. Light (2011B) etc.
\item \textsuperscript{246} Van Liere points out that in fact, codicological evidence, such as a more decorated page at the beginning of the book of Proverbs, suggests that many of the one-volume Bibles were in fact two-volume Bibles, bound together at a later date; Frans van Liere, “The Latin Bible, c.900 to the Council of Trent, 1546,” in The New Cambridge History of the Bible I. From 600-1450, Eds. Richard Marsden & E. Ann Matter (Cambridge, CUP, 2012): 93-109 [105].
\item \textsuperscript{247} e.g. British Library, Add. Ms. 15253. On the production of pandect vs. multi-volume bibles see Frans van Liere (2014): 25-27, 53-4.
\item \textsuperscript{248} For example two bibles from Durham Cathedral Priory, now CUL, Ms. Kk.5.10 (refectory reading), and Durham Cathedral Library, Ms. A.II.3 (study resource).
\item \textsuperscript{249} For example ‘The Brantwood Bible’ (British Library, Yates Thomson Ms. 22), or UPenn Ms. Codex 724, ‘The Lumley Bible’ (British Library, Royal Ms. 1 E.II) or ‘The Bible of William of Devon’ (British Library, Royal Ms. 1.D.I).
auction include the Chester Beatty Bible, the Chudleigh Bible, the Northumberland Bible, and the Carysfort Bible. If these smaller bibles (characterizable as “thick squat books which can be held on the palm of one hand,” less than a quarter of the size of ‘lectern’ bibles) can be considered “the familiar norm” in the 13th century, we must therefore consider larger copies (those in ‘lectern’ format) to be exceptional and luxurious copies representing “conscious enlargements, inflated symbols of wealth, display or religious commitment.”

II The Number of Bibles Produced

Although the production of thousands—probably tens of thousands—of bibles in this small format over the course of the 13th century and the survival of thousands of copies, scattered to libraries and private collections in all corners across the world, is common currency in discussions of medieval bibles and of medieval manuscripts in general, no comprehensive survey of surviving manuscripts has been attempted, and thus we lack exact or reliable figures for these bibles’ production and survival. However Chiara Ruzzier has recently argued that the output of portable bibles during the 13th-

---

250 This bible was previously Chester Beatty Ms. W.173, sold at Chester Beatty sale at Sotheby’s, 24 June 1969: Lot 57, and subsequently dispersed; several of its leaves were recently sold at Sotheby’s, 8 July 2014, Lots 11 & 15.

251 See Sotheby’s sale, 8 July 2014, Lots 13 & 14.

252 Recently offered for sale at Sotheby’s 8 July 2014, Lot 49; purchased by Sam Fogg for £85,000.

253 Produced in N. France, probably Paris, ca. 1250 (593 fols.; in 3 vols., each 490 x 344 mm, with 78 large HIs and 59 DIs); see Sam Fogg, Art of the Middle Ages (Sam Fogg: London, 2007): No. 10: 46-51; Sam Fogg, An Album of Medieval Art (Sam Fogg: London, 2007): No. 32: 86-91.


255 Indeed their ubiquitous presence in practically every Special Collections library that one visits is one of their defining characteristics (“Ah of course, the inevitable 13th-century pocket bible. How lovely.”)

256 Although Chiara Ruzzier has recently compiled an extensive census of small-size bibles (including nearly 1,800 examples) as part of her quantitative and comparative research on these bibles (a methodological approach which is very well suited to the study and analysis of portable bibles, given the extremely large size of the corpus of surviving manuscripts); see Ruzzier (2011): 77 n.6; Ruzzier’s research is rooted in the evidence presented in her PhD thesis: Entre Université et Ordres mendiants. La miniaturisation de la Bible au XIIIe siècle, Université Paris 1 Panthéon-Sorbonne, 2010 (for the methodological basis of her research see ibid.: 42-50, 55-68).
century could have exceeded 30,000 copies. If so, this number would represent a survival rate of 20% for 13th-century portable bibles and would mean that these bibles account for at least half of the entire production of complete Bibles in the 13th century.

### III Places of Production

Bibles were produced in ‘portable’ format on an unprecedented scale throughout the 13th century all across Europe, most notably in France (especially in Paris) but bibles of this style also began to be produced in England at the same time (particularly in Oxford), and slightly later in both Italy (mainly in Bologna and Venice) and in Spain.

It is worth noting that scholars have previously argued that relatively few bibles were made in England during the 13th century, and that the English demand for these bibles was rather met through importing copies in large numbers from France or Italy, along with other books such as the texts required for the university curriculum in the arts, theology and law faculties. Nevertheless, Ruzzier’s survey highlights the prominence of

---

257 In the absence of an estimation of the survival rate of medieval manuscripts, Ruzzier calculates this number through applying the hypothetical survival rate of incunabula as developed by Uwe Neddermeyer; thus her calculation is based on the survival of “Over 1,500 portable Bibles as currently preserved” (‘portable bibles’ defined as ‘Bibles with an overall taille size of less than 380 mm’) and assuming a survival rate of 4.2%; Ruzzier, (2013): 107, using Neddermeyer, *Von der Handschriften zum gedruckten Buch* (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1998): 72-81 (cited in Ruzzier 2013: 107, n.7).


259 Ruzzier suggests that according to her partial census of extant complete Bibles of the 13th century (based on the consultation of all catalogues of French libraries) portable Bibles represent about 53.5% of all surviving complete 13th-century bibles (Ruzzier, “Miniaturization,” 2013: 107, n.8).

260 Of the bibles in Ruzzier’s census whose place of production has been determined, half (54%) are of French, mainly Parisian, origin but her census also highlights the prominence of these Bibles’ production in England (20%) and Italy (16%). Ruzzier notes that “The production of portable Bibles outside these areas is extremely small and starts later, with the exception of Spain. Fifteen portable Bibles of Spanish origin have been identified [5% of Ruzzier’s census], which copy the Parisian model to various extents. A further 5% also originated in either N. France or England; see Ruzzier (2013): 109 and Chart 1, ‘Place of origin of portable Bibles’ (109) and Ruzzier (2011): 78-81, esp. Graphique 1 (79).

261 In contrast, devotional books such as Psalters and Books of Hours were almost exclusively made at English centers for the ‘home market’ during the 13th and 14th centuries, and very few were commissioned or purchased from France and Flanders. “Preface,” *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain*, Vol. II: 1100-1400, Eds. Nigel Morgan & Rodney M. Thomson (Cambridge: CUP, 2008): xxi.
England and Italy amongst the countries in which these portable bibles were produced, and as Ruzzier rightly points out, this prominence grows even larger when one considers that non-Parisian bible production has often been underestimated in the past, and the importance of England and Italy as producers of portable Bibles in the 13th century has been particularly inaccurately represented.

IV Date Range and Rate of Production

The pattern of the production of portable bibles presents peculiar features within the broader global context of contemporary book production. The patterns visible for the 13th through 14th centuries demonstrate that book production reached its peak in the 13th century then decreased during the second half of the 14th century, owing to twin calamities of economic recession and the ‘Black Death’ plague of ca. 1348. By contrast, the patterns of the production of portable bibles witness an explosion in output - beginning around 1230 - and a magnificent escalation until the mid-century mark, before peaking during the second half of the century and swiftly and dramatically collapsing at the beginning of the 14th century, some decades before that of manuscript production in general. Moreover, this collapse was not followed by the recovery in output in the 15th century that is observable in manuscript production as a whole.

Although we still lack a definite survey of all these bibles, for an approximate indication of the volume of their production we may look to the number included in Robert Branner’s study of 13th-century illumination in Paris. Of almost two hundred

---

262 Of the bibles in Ruzzier’s census whose place of production has been determined, 20% are of English origin and 16% of Italian production (Ruzzier 2013: 109 & Chart 1 [109] and Ruzzier 2011: 78-81 & Graphique 1 [79]).

263 This sorry state of affairs can be attributed to the unreliability of older catalogues on the matter of establishing the localization of the bibles – a damning criticism, although not an unfair one - and indeed catalogueurs of the early 20th century and before “rarely note down the place of production when it is not Paris itself.” Ruzzier (2013): 106-7, 110.


265 See Overty (2014).

266 See Ruzzier, “The Miniaturisation of Bible Manuscripts” (2013): 111, Chart 2: “Production period according to period of origin (% of production per each country).”


complete pandect bibles that Branner identified as produced in Paris during the 13th century, he dated seventeen to ca. 1200-30, he dated over a hundred to approximately between 1230 and the middle of the century, and around sixty from the 1230s and later. Of course, these examples represent only a fraction of the bibles copied in Paris in the 13th century; Branner’s calculations include only those bibles in which he was interested, namely bibles with painted initials, and there were surely dozens of illuminated bibles that were either unknown to him, or that did not fit his ‘selection criteria’. Nevertheless, his survey does provide further confirmation that the number of bibles copied during the 13th century increased significantly as of the century’s third decade.

The complete abandonment of the production of portable Bibles at the end of the 13th century can possibly be explained by the very long usable life-time of these objects, for these bibles, like most medieval manuscripts, were designed to last a long time. Bibles were certainly passed on from generation to generation, and the long lists of possession notes from the 14th and 15th centuries in 13th-century bibles confirm that many were used for centuries.

Following the explanation for the relatively small number of these bibles made in England during the 13th century that the English demand for these bibles in the 13th century was met through importing copies rather than making their own, the almost complete cessation of their production and import in the 14th century has traditionally been attributed to the very great scale on which copies had been imported during the previous century. Nigel Morgan and Rodney Thomson have argued that since the main use of bibles in England during this period was for scholars involved in theological study both in the religious houses and the universities, the libraries of these places were

---

271 When the number of potential owners stabilized or decreased, the number of bibles already circulating became sufficient to meet the demand. (Ruzzier 2013: 110-11). See
273 In contrast, devotional books such as Psalters and Books of Hours were almost exclusively made at English centers for the ‘home market’ during the 13th and 14th centuries, and very few were commissioned or purchased from France and Flanders. “Preface,” The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain, Vol. II: 1100-1400, Eds. Nigel Morgan & Rodney M. Thomson (Cambridge: CUP, 2008): xxi.

i The difficulty of dating and localizing the origins of portable bibles

It is often extremely difficult to identify where a 13th-century portable bible was produced. The surviving records of who copied these bibles, and under what circumstances are very limited. A survey of secondary literature confirms this. The catalogues in the \textit{Dated and Datable Manuscripts} series, which list manuscripts in British libraries which can be dated, or are datable within a period from the mid-5th century through 1600 (1979-2003, ongoing), reveal not only quite how few 13th-century bibles (of any size) survive to which we are able to attribute a definite date, but furthermore how small that number is out of the total corpus of surviving dated or datable premodern manuscripts. The series’ catalogue for the British Library (1979) contains 953 entries, of which only four are 13th-century bibles.\footnote{These are: BL, Add. Ms. 31830 [no. 348 [I: 74, II: Pl. 149]], BL, Add. Ms. 50003 [no. 422 [I: 86, II: Pl. 164]], BL, Ms. Arundel 303 [no. 462 [I: 92, II: Pl. 131]] and BL, Ms. Royal 1 B.XII [no. 855 [I: 149, II: Pl. 150]]; Andrew G. Watson, \textit{Catalogue of Dated and Datable Manuscripts c.700-1600 in the Department of Manuscripts, The British Library}. 2 vols. (London: The British Library, 1979).} Likewise out of all 882 entries included in the catalogue covering both The Bodleian Library and all Oxford college libraries (1984), only four are 13th-century bibles.\footnote{These are: Bodleian Library Mss. Canon. Bibl. Lat. 56 [no. [I; II: Pl. ] and Lat. Bib. f.3 [no. [I; II: Pl. ]]; New College, Oxford, Mss. 3-6 [no. [I, II: Pl. ]]; and Wadham College, Oxford, Ms. 1 (A.5.2) [no. [I, II: Pl. ]]; Andrew Watson, \textit{Catalogue of dated and datable manuscripts c. 435-1600 in Oxford libraries}. 2 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984).} Worse still are the results of consulting the catalogues for libraries in London (2003\footnote{Excluding the British Library; for the British Library manuscripts see Andrew G. Watson, \textit{Catalogue of Dated and Datable Manuscripts c.700-1600 in the Department of Manuscripts, The British Library}. 2 vols. (London: The British Library, 1979).}) and in Cambridge (1988), which contain 285 and 394 entries respectively, and include not a single 13th-century bible.\footnote{Pamela Robinson, \textit{Catalogue of dated and datable manuscripts c. 888-1600 in London libraries}. 2 vols. (London: British Library, 2003) and \textit{eadem}, \textit{Catalogue of dated and datable manuscripts c. 737-1600 in Cambridge libraries}. 2 vols. (Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 1988).} Thus out of all the dated and datable manuscripts in the libraries of Oxford, Cambridge and London (including both the British and Bodleian libraries) listed in these catalogues, comprising a
grand total of 2,514 entries, we find a not-so-grand total of eight 13th-century bibles.\textsuperscript{279} Of these eight bibles in British collections (according to the \textit{Dated and Datable} series of catalogues), six are dated\textsuperscript{280} and two are datable (from added liturgical calendars)\textsuperscript{281} and only three are ‘pocket’ size\textsuperscript{282}; the other five are all ‘lectern’ bibles.\textsuperscript{283}

\textbf{ii} The difficulty of dating and localizing these bibles by their script

Likewise, the standardized character of the style of writing found in ‘pocket’ bibles affords only very fragile indications for localizing their production by attempting to identify distinct nationalistic features in the scripts in which they were copied. Identification between Insular and Continental hands is made all the more challenging (and important) as a result of the standardized character of 13th-century book scripts in general.\textsuperscript{284} However these generalizations are certainly too broad to permit precise identification and attribution of date or place of production in the study of 13th-century ‘pocket’ bibles\textsuperscript{285} and [this challenge] can thwart even the most expert \textit{oculus palaeographicus}.\textsuperscript{286}

\textsuperscript{279} Four in the British Library (BL, Add. Ms. 50003; BL, Add. Ms. 31830; BL, Ms. Arundel 303; BL, Ms. Royal 1 B.XII), two in the Bodleian Library (Bodleian Library Ms. Canon. Bibl. Lat. 56; Bodleian Library Ms. Lat. Bib. f.3) and two in Oxford college libraries (New College, Oxford, Mss. 3-6; and Wadham College, Oxford, Ms. 1).

\textsuperscript{280} BL, Add. Ms. 50003; BL, Ms. Royal 1 B.XII; Bodleian Library Ms. Canon. Bibl. Lat. 56; Bodleian Library Ms. Lat. Bib. f.3; New College, Oxford, Mss. 3-6; and Wadham College, Oxford, Ms. 1.

\textsuperscript{281} BL, Add. Ms. 31830 and BL, Ms. Arundel 303.

\textsuperscript{282} BL, Add. Ms. 31830 (145 x 100 mm), BL, Ms. Arundel 303 (138 x 93 mm) and Bodleian Library Ms. Lat. Bib. f.3 (153 x 120 mm).

\textsuperscript{283} BL, Add. Ms. 50003 (375 x 260 mm), BL, Ms. Royal 1 B.XII (308 x 202 mm), Bodleian Library Ms. Canon. Bibl. Lat. 56 (355 x 235 mm), New College, Oxford, Mss. 3-6 (488-505 x 335-60 mm) and Wadham College, Oxford, Ms. 1 (330 x 180 mm).

\textsuperscript{284} S. Harrison Thomson makes tentative suggestion of ‘French’ characteristics of letter forms in analyzing a 13th-century hand which demonstrates “a French influence” - including the looped \textit{r} following an \textit{o} or a \textit{p}; the forked ascenders \textit{b}, \textit{h} and \textit{l}; the backward swing of the final downstroke of the \textit{h}, \textit{m} and \textit{n} - suggesting more generally that French \textit{textura} “maintained a high degree of calligraphic gothic precision.” See Thomson (1969) No. 12 “France 1277” (‘Varia SS. Augustini et Isidori,’ Bib. Royale, Brussels, Ms. lat. II, 2297 [1116], fol. 1v) for Thomson’s selection of 13th-century French scripts see \textit{ibid.} nos. 6-17.


\textsuperscript{286} For example, Paul Saenger has described how Malcolm Parkes, upon attempting to distinguish between a number of French and English 13th-century bibles at The Newberry Library in Chicago on the basis of their respective hands, looked long and hard and concluded: “You really can’t tell the difference!” This is at least comforting for the rest of us mortals. Saenger comments on the standardized character of 13th-century book scripts, particularly those of the early 13th-century and including those used for copying
The difficulty of dating and localizing these bibles by their decoration

The decoration and illumination in 13th-century pocket bibles occupy a position of particular importance in the study of this kind of bible - and, more broadly, in the comparison of portable bibles to other kinds of manuscript bible and to other medieval books in general - since these bibles offer an unusually small number of identificatory criteria by which one may steer in attempting to attribute a date or location of origin. Given the scarcity of signatures or dates appended by portable bibles’ producers, the difficulty in finding out anything about most of these bibles from outside sources, and the fact that their scripts are generally so unhelpful, it is largely from pocket bibles’ decoration that any theories on dates and countries of origin may be formulated.

Nevertheless, for those bibles which received illumination, a typology of modes of decoration may be established, sometimes making possible the association of groups of manuscripts with a particular locality, and some ateliers and centers of bible production (especially Paris) are now fairly well studied. Figure decoration, where it exists, may also, “at least in a good many cases and contexts,” enable a more precise dating. However even this is not encouraging news for one’s hopes of assigning English provenance to this kind of bible, for as Nigel Morgan comments, as a result of conservatism in the decorative ornamentation of 13th century English manuscripts, “It is difficult to date English manuscripts of this period lacking any textual evidence for dating at all precisely on this aspect of their decoration,” and it is usually only possible to attempt

---

bibles throughout the 13th century (Paul Saenger, “The Birth of Modern Chapter Divisions,” Rosenbach Lecture II: 15 April 2008).

287 Outside sources such as surviving written records which illuminate our knowledge of contemporary book production, including records of taxes, trade, wills, statutes and legal documentation etc.

288 Schnurman (1960): 125. However styles and features of pen flourishing (for example in the treatment of initials) has been cited as providing suggestive evidence of date and provenance; see Sonia Scott-Fleming, Pen Flourishing in Thirteenth-Century Manuscripts (Leiden, The Netherlands: E.J. Brill, 1989), esp. 72-75.


dating to about a quarter century, although in some cases even an attribution to such a comparatively broad date range is no simple matter.292

V Script

The scribes of the 12th century had inherited three sizes of script: large for Bibles and Psalters (for example the magnificent large format bibles, such as the Bury and Dover Bibles (CCCC, Ms.2 and Ms. 3-4293), medium for most texts and small for ‘school’ texts.294 This may be attributed to the results of two major developments in the techniques of handwriting which had begun to change the appearance of handwriting in books by around the beginning of the 12th century: changes in the nature of the pen and in the way it was handled.295 Both changes appeared first in Europe in the handwriting of scribes in England and Normandy, who preferred the more flexible quill pen (instead of the reed pen), and, at the same time, adopted a constant pen-angle of 45° (instead of the 25°–30° employed by earlier scribes.296 The handwriting exhibits a number of new features that had become typical of formal handwriting in books throughout western Europe during the 12th century. For example, there are significant differences in the overall weight of the script: the ratio of nib-width to minim height is greater; ascenders are shorter in relation to minim height; the bodies of letters are narrower, as is the space between letters; and the measurable pen-angle recorded on the page is steeper (either as a result of a change in the angle at which the nib was cut or in scribal technique or both).297 During the course of the 12th century the proportions of the letters in the large and medium sizes of handwriting changed as scribes continued the explorations into ways in

296 These changes altered the distribution of thin strokes traced with the leading edge of the nib and thick strokes traced with its full width, and meant that scribes were able to construct letters with more frequent short strokes, and by breaking curved strokes at junctures with other strokes, thus altering the profiles of the letter shapes For further discussion of these changes in technique see M.B. Parkes, Their Hands Before Our Eyes (2008): 57-69, 87-100; Petrucci (1989): 125; and Boussard (1951): 259–64.
297 Together these changes create a greater contrast between thick and thin strokes; curved strokes at the headline (as in the arches of m and n) were sometimes traced as broken strokes of contrasting thickness, while there was a tendency to introduce a sharper change of direction when forming curved strokes on the vertical axis (such as the lobe of d). Teresa Webber, “English Manuscripts in the Century after the Norman Conquest (2013): 209-10.
which to apply features of style to these forms begun by their predecessors of the later 11th century.\textsuperscript{298}

By contrast, there was no single script habitually employed for writing the biblical text in 13th-century bibles of ‘pocket’ or portable size, although the style and size in which 13th-century portable bibles were written are often erroneously discussed and commented on as if all these manuscripts were written in a single script, similar to one ‘printing type’;\textsuperscript{299} this assessment is not only incorrect, but, in mistaking ‘script’ for ‘style of writing’ (there is a difference) fails to distinguish between the size of the text as written and the script in which it was written (in the case of 13th-century ‘pocket’ bibles: small size and written in variants of Gothic bookhand script). In fact, the uniformity of these bibles’ written text is a uniformity not of category of script, but rather of size, and of style of writing.\textsuperscript{300} Furthermore, despite the fact that “Small, often minute handwriting is usually informal, reflecting the rapid personal ductus of individual scribes,”\textsuperscript{301} as in the case of university manuscripts etc.,\textsuperscript{302} in 13th-century ‘pocket’ bibles, the script is rather characterized by its neatness and uniformity.

One may, however, broadly characterize 13th-century ‘pocket’ bibles as written in minute, neat, compressed Gothic (or Textura) bookhand scripts. Letters are compressed

\textsuperscript{298} For example, replacing curved elements with broken strokes; increasing the contract between thick and thin strokes, and emphasizing the headline and baseline of the script with serifs added to the tops and bottoms of minuscule strokes. Ascenders of letters such as \(b\), \(h\) and \(l\) became shorter and in northern Europe the essentially rounded forms of Caroline minuscule became more compressed and rectangular, reinforcing a tendency for the arches of letters such as \(m\) and \(n\) to be replaced with broken strokes. By the late 12th century, “these new stylistic features were being accompanied by other developments, such as the fusion of consecutive letters formed with facing curved elements, for example, \(o\) or \(e\) following \(b\).” Panayatova \& Webber, “Making an Illuminated Manuscript” (2005): 30.


\textsuperscript{301} Apart from its size it is also characterized by the appearance of variant letter shapes; for a concise overview of these letters with analyses of their respective shapes, see M.B. Parkes, “Handwriting in English books,” in \textit{CHBB} II (2008): 116-117.

\textsuperscript{302} For examples of such handwriting - described as ‘écriture microscopique’ by Omont and Molinier (H. Omont \& A. Molinier, \textit{Catalogue générale des manuscrits dans les bibliothèques publiques de France}, 11 [1889]: 108) - see M.B. Parkes, “Handwriting in English books,” in \textit{CHBB} II (2008): figs. 6.3 (Magdalen College, Oxford, Ms. lat. 172, fol. 99r: William of Malmesbury’s autograph working copy of his \textit{Gesta pontificum anglorum}, ca. 1125) and 4.13 (CUL, Ms. Dd.15.1, fol. 11r: ‘\textit{Dictionarium}’, copied in 1278), although, as Parkes notes, this kind of handwriting is, in general, “poorly represented in published facsimiles” (2008): 116 n.31.
both horizontally and vertically, their size averaging, in most cases, less than 2 mm (the height of ascenders and capitals measuring from 1-2 mm; minim strokes ca. 1mm), approximately the same size as a modern 6-8 point ‘type’ font. Their text was, as a rule, highly compressed; its word- and line-units were laterally-compressed through common and frequent use of abbreviation symbols mostly either suspensions or contractions (without which “the pocket Bibles would have been nearly twice as thick and heavy, and would have taken far longer to write”\textsuperscript{303} and tightly-formed letter forms (commonly featuring ligatures or fusion of letters), while the number of lines per column was also tightly compressed. Combined, these features resulted in the bible’s reader being presented with a textblock whose aspect and impact (within the space of the page) was extraordinarily visually dense.

VI Decoration

The portable bibles produced during the 13\textsuperscript{th} century were typically not richly decorated nor can a significant proportion of those copies produced be considered to be ‘luxury manuscripts’.\textsuperscript{304} Portable bibles generally contain some decoration and some are also illuminated, but copies generally contain only a limited amount of either kind of artwork. The decoration in most small 13\textsuperscript{th}-century bibles is limited to historiated or ornamental initials at the beginning of each of the Bible’s books, sometimes embellished with ornamental extensions into the borders. Nevertheless, a wide range of decoration of various degrees is witnessed in these smaller 13\textsuperscript{th}-century bibles, ranging from an almost complete set of historiated initials to the books, with ornamental initials to their prologues, down to the simplest form with only an illuminated initial at the beginning of Genesis.\textsuperscript{305} The reduced size of the bibles themselves mean that these initials are usually

\textsuperscript{303} Schnurman: 77.
\textsuperscript{304} Nigel Morgan drives this point home, perhaps a little over-zealously, arguing that “Fine as the 13\textsuperscript{th}-century [bible] examples are, they cannot be claimed as major products of their time in comparison for example with the luxury Psalters.” (Morgan, Survey IV.1 1982: 22).
\textsuperscript{305} N.J. Morgan, Survey IV.1 (1982): 22. The examples which Morgan identifies as typical of the appearance of English Bibles from ca. 1230 through the end of the century all have relatively small fine illuminated initials, some with figure subjects and others only ornament; i.e. N.J. Morgan Survey IV (1982/88): Peterborough Cathedral Library, Ms. 10 (no. 66 [112-13]), Bodleian Library, Ms. lat. bibl. e.7 (no. 69 [114-16]), Gonville & Caius College, Cambridge, Ms. 350/67 (no. 70 [117-17]) and Bodleian Library, Ms. Auct.
no more than a few millimeters high, with the exception of a much larger initial given to the book of Genesis, usually with a series of Creation scenes. Although the compression of the bible volume to ‘pocket’ size effected a proportional miniaturization of their initials, necessitating the abbreviation of scenes to two or three figures, with the effect that the iconography of these initials can be difficult to determine, the exquisite little scenes which inhabit these tiny initials may still delight the eye and gladden the heart. The parts of the text page in portable bibles which received penwork or illuminated ornament included: the large multiple line initials (ornamental illuminated initials, color wash initials and pen flourish initials); the line fillers (or line endings); the border extensions which extend from the initials to partly or wholly frame the text block.

Indeed 13th-century bibles of any size almost never included full-page miniatures; it is only very rarely that one finds such miniatures in this kind of bible and when present, the miniatures were usually later additions or insertions. Amongst the rare exceptions to include this kind of artwork are three bibles, all of English origin: Walters Art Museum, Ms. 51 (ca. 1260, 145 x 95 mm), in addition to containing a large number of small illuminated historiated initials, also includes two folios with images of the Three Living and the Three Dead (fols. 1v-2r, added ca. 1290-1300; Fig. 1.3); Huntington Library, San D.4.8 (no. 75 [123-24]) - “with those from the de Brailes workshop [Bodleian Library, Ms. lat. bibl. e.7 and Gonville & Caius College, Cambridge, Ms. 350/67] as the best examples”.


“The ornamental illuminated or pen-flourish initial had in the early years of the [13th] century been combined with the line filler, and in the second quarter of the century long penflourish extensions and border bars begin to appear. A hierarchy of decoration existed from small one-line pen-flourish initials to multiple line fully illuminated initials and to border bars incorporating pen-flourishes, dragons and fully illuminated blocks of ornament. In the second half of the century all these elements are combined in some elaborately decorated manuscripts, border bars come to act as a stage for animals, birds and grotesques, such that the ornament forms a frame for the text block. For manuscripts with rich illumination that system which had been established in the 13th century will continue until the end of the Middle Ages.” (ibid.: 27-8).
Marino CA, Ms. HM 26061 (ca. 1240, 220 x 154 mm) a bible-missal luxuriously decorated and illuminated throughout, contains a full-page Crucifixion miniature with Mary and John (on fol. 178v, facing the Canon of the Mass; Fig. 1.4);310 and British Library, Arundel Ms. 250 (perhaps Norwich ca. 1225-75, 215 x 160 mm) includes six full-page miniatures, forming a cycle of images of the Old Testament (fols. 1-3v), including miniatures depicting Cain and Abel (fol. 2v) and the Ark of the Covenant (fol. 3r; Fig. 1.5).311

Nevertheless, a number of luxurious bibles certainly were produced during the 13th century, beautifully decorated and lavishly illuminated. These illuminated 13th-century bibles testify to their innovative status as the first bibles to be more readily available, answering to the needs of the wealthy laity and the court as much as to professional clerics, the mendicants and other religious; diverse in both their provenance and ownership.312 However very few of the luxuriously illuminated bibles produced during the 13th century are of portable - never mind ‘pocket’ - size; the overwhelming majority are either ‘lectern’ bibles or are positioned at the ‘larger’ end of the ‘Saddle Bag’ category of size.

The exquisite little French bible known as the Fécamp Bible (British Library, Yates Thompson Ms. 1; 140 x 90 mm, 578 fols.) which was copied in Paris during the third quarter of the 13th century is a superb example of one of the exceptional 13th-century illuminated ‘luxury’ bibles that is ‘pocket’-sized.313 Although this bible is of

310 The bible’s decoration has been identified as style of the Robert of Lindsey group; bible-missal includes seven historiated initials, 13- to 9-line at fols. 22 (Prologue), 24 (Gen.), 166 (Psalms), 284 (Matt.), 292 (Mk.), 297 (Lk.) and 306 (John), with 12- to 7-line painted initials for the books of the Bible, and 10- to 4-line initials for prologues, in parted red and blue with flourishing in both colors. Similar examples of luxuriously-illuminated 13th-century bibles-missals include UPenn Ms. Codex 236, Bodleian Library, Ms. Lat. Bib.e.7 and BnF, Paris, Ms. lat. 36 and 10431; see Light (2013): passim, and esp. Light’s list of 25 13th-century bible-missals: ‘Appendix’, 208-14.


313 (140 x 90 [95 x 60 mm, 2 cols./45 lines, 578 fols.] For selected scholarship on the Fécamp Bible see M.R. James, A Descriptive Catalogue of Fifty Manuscripts from the Collection of Henry Yates Thompson (Cambridge: CUP, 1898): no. 2 (5-9); Illustrations from One Hundred Manuscripts in the Library of Henry Yates Thompson, 7 vols (London: Chiswick Press, 1907-18); [VI]: Consisting of Ninety Plates Illustrating Seventeen MSS. with Dates Ranging from the XIIIth to the XVIIth Century (1916): 3-4, pl. XI; Seymour de Ricci, Les Manuscrits de la Collection Henry
minute size it is lavishly decorated and illuminated, including 79 large historiated initials in colors and gold (at the beginning of each biblical book and at the major divisions of the Psalms) and large initials with zoomorphic and foliate decoration in colors (at the beginning of prologues) plus small initials in red with blue pen-flourishing or in blue with red pen-flourishing (at the beginning of chapters) and chapter numbers and running titles in alternate red and blue characters (Figs. 1.6A-C).\(^\text{314}\)

However the Fécamp Bible also demonstrates that ‘luxury’ bibles were used (for its biblical text), their opulence and value notwithstanding. Despite the luxury nature of this bible - which has unquestionably assured the volume a special place and privileged status in the collection of every one of its owners, medieval to modern\(^\text{315}\) - its pages also contains plentiful signs that its early owners certainly did not view the book as a luxury object to be treasured but never used for its biblical text. In the 13\(^{\text{th}}\)-century one of the bible’s earliest owners, an unidentified owner associated with the Benedictine abbey of St Taurinus, Evreux, Normandy, supplemented the bible’s original contents (comprising the biblical text with prologues and the IHN) by adding a table of Epistle and Gospel readings and a litany at the rear of the volume,\(^\text{316}\) and in the 15\(^{\text{th}}\)-century, unidentified French

\begin{footnotesize}  
\begin{itemize} 
\item \(^\text{314}\) Branner attributed the bible’s illumination to four artists: Artist A: responsible for the Genesis initial (f. 4v) [also painted the John initial in Vatican, Vat. lat. 120, f. 274]; B: related to the Pierre le Bar atelier, responsible for the initials from Exodus to Isaiah (ff. 15v-321); C: responsible for the initials from Jeremiah to II Maccabees (ff. 321-419v) [also painted Vatican, Reg. lat. 16 and BnF, Paris, Ms. lat. 16082]; D: related to the Mathurin atelier, responsible for the initials in the New Testament (fosl. 419v-572v); see Branner (1977): 220. Cf. for detailed descriptions of the bible’s decoration see M.R. James (1898): 7-9.
\item \(^\text{315}\) Beyond the unidentified 13\(^{\text{th}}\)-century owner associated with the Benedictine abbey of St Taurinus, Evreux, Normandy and the unidentified French owners who replaced leaves missing from the bible in the 15\(^{\text{th}}\) century, we know nothing more of the Fécamp Bible’s provenance until it was purchased from Bernard] Quaritch in March 1893 by Henry Yates Thompson (d.1928) (who noted his purchase on his book-plate on the inside upper cover of the bible – still present - inscribed “[MS] 2 / ye [i.e. £30] / Quaritch / March / 1893”). It was whilst in Yates Thompson’s possession that the bible was rebound for him by Gruel (re-covered in purple velvet, with two strap-and-pin fastenings, gilt edges, replacing the bible’s previous [post-1600?] binding, which M.R. James described as consisting of “original wooden boards, with fragment of blue silk cover: formerly had two clasps” [James 1898: 5]). The bible was bequeathed to the British Museum in 1941 by Mrs. Henry Yates Thompson.
\item \(^\text{316}\) The table of Epistle and Gospel readings added on fols. 573-76v and the litany on fols. 576v-77, following the biblical text and the IHN (fols. 1-524v, 526-72v). The litany includes: Benedict with a double invocation; Taurinus of Evreux is first among the confessors and has a double invocation; there are
\end{itemize} 
\end{footnotesize}
owners replaced leaves missing from the bible and added neat marginal annotations. These factors all indicate that a succession of medieval users this bible’s deemed its textual contents as valuable as the book itself was beautiful.

**VII Standardization of contents and order of the biblical text**

As we have already seen, Laura Light identifies two distinct ‘types’ of ‘Paris’ Bible that emerged in two key phases within patterns of bible production during the 13th century (ca. 1200-30 and 1230 onwards), each distinguishable from the other by distinct sets of material and textual characteristics. The textual characteristics distinguishing the two ‘types’ of ‘Paris’ Bible produced during these two phases center on a selection of paratextual and extra-biblical elements: the ordering of the books of the Bible into that of the modern Vulgate; the schema according to which The Bible’s books were ordered.

---

317 The missing leaves replaced in the 15th century are fols. 71, 290, 299-303. Furthermore, the final verso of some quires were marked “cor(rectus)” (e.g. on fols. 313v, 409v).

318 Nevertheless, despite the Fécamp Bible’s inclusion of liturgical texts, we cannot draw a firm correlation between the presence of extrabiblical texts added to portable bibles (signifying the manipulation of their texts for various uses) and the degree of decoration or illumination that 13th-century bibles contained (see Chapter 3 for further discussion). Although Laura Light has suggested that the reason why fewer Parisian bibles included extra texts may be attributable to the fact that so many of these manuscripts were illuminated, but notes that nevertheless, many very expensive bibles with illuminated initials did include extra texts. Of Light’s sample of 215 bibles, 35 were ascribed to Parisian ateliers by Robert Branner, and of these 8 (about one quarter) include extra texts; see Light (2011B): 173 and Branner (1977).


divided into chapters; the inclusion (or not) of the 64 prologues attributed to St. Jerome; the division of the Scriptural canon within its books, into chapters; and the inclusion (or not) of capitula (chapter lists, which summarized the contents of each of The Bible’s books, chapter by chapter.

The ‘Paris’ Bible is a descriptive term denoting a certain common “textual type” current in the schools; copies vary widely in terms of size and other details of their physical presentation. The ordering and sequence of the ‘Paris’ Bible text in the early 13th century had been shaped within the context of the ‘new’ biblical commentaries, which emphasized the need to separate history from prophecy, and to first understand the historical events of the Old Testament before proceeding to allegory; thus the narratives of ancient history – Genesis, Exodus, Kings, Chronicles, etc. – were placed into a chronological sequence before turning to the more timeless books of praise and prophecy.

Based upon these criteria, one may thus broadly characterize “proto-‘Paris’ Bibles” as pandects produced in the early 13th century (ca. 1200-30), generally closer to ‘lectern’ than ‘pocket’ size; in other words closer in size to the format of the 12th-century pandect bibles or glossed books of the Bible (with a maximum height exceeding 200 mm

Library, Ms. 15 (MMLB, Vol. II: 210-12), Liverpool Cathedral, Ms. 13 (MMLB, Vol. III: 171-3) and Ushaw St. Cuthbert’s College, Durham, Ms. 2 (MMLB, Vol. IV: 506-8).

321 The most detailed cataloging and interrogation of these prologues was chronicled by F. Stegmüller with the assistance of N. Reinhardt, Repertorium Bibliothecum Medii Aevi, 11 vols. (Madrid, 1950-80): IX-XI (#s 284-839); see also S. Berger, Les Préfaces jointes aux livres de la Bible dans les manuscrits de la Vulgate (Paris, 1902): 28; Donatien de Bruyne, Sommaires, divisions et rubriques de la Bible latine (Namur, 1914). These prologues are also helpfully recorded in Robert Branner, Manuscript Painting in Paris during the Reign of Saint Louis: A Study of Styles, California Studies in the History of Art 18, ed. W. Horn (Berkeley & Los Angeles, 1977): 154-5.

322 Light (2011): 230;


324 This order was doubtless followed in classes taught at the schools of Paris in their study of the books of the Bible; see de Hamel (2001): 121, cf. ibid on the ‘new’ commentaries: 92-113 (esp. 111-112 on the order of study).
but under 300 mm) and often written as a single column on the page - which feature the ‘new’ order of Biblical books and capitula lists, whilst retaining the Eusebian canon tables of earlier bibles, but are unlikely to include the IHN or Jerome’s 64 Prologues. By contrast, “mature ‘Paris’ Bibles” of ca. 1230+ are distinguishable as pandect volumes – more than likely, although not necessarily, in smaller ‘pocket’ format (i.e. with an height measurement of no more than 200 mm) – whose books are arranged in the ‘new’ order and feature the newly-numbered chapter divisions, whose Bible text is made more legible on the page by its arrangement into two columns and more searchable within the codex by the addition of running headers, and which is supplemented by the inclusion of the IHN and Jerome’s 64 Prologues.

i The Early or “Proto-” ‘Paris’ Bible

The circumstances surrounding the creation of the ‘Paris’ Bible – how and by whom - have been much debated. However, despite the fact that “It is commonplace today to speak of the Paris Bible as a Bible created sometime around 1230 to serve as the Bible of the Paris classrooms”; however Light has demonstrated that the Paris Bible, far from representing the result of an extensive revision of the Vulgate text, “Was the result of only minor modifications of a Bible already in existence which was created about thirty years before, sometime around the beginning of the 13th century.” More specifically,

---


the origins of the ‘Paris’ Bible (also termed the “proto-Paris’ Bible”) lie in France, centered on Paris, during the first three decades of the 13th-century.

Crucially, it was during this period that a one-volume format was adopted as the usual format for the Vulgate. This is extremely significant, and in some senses all the other alterations in both the text and physical presentation of the Bible characteristic of this period can be seen as growing from this first change. On a basic level this innovation raised the questions of what a Bible should contain and how these texts should be presented. As Light comments, together, these factors make this “A tremendously exciting period in the history of the Vulgate … An acquaintance with the Bible produced during these years leaves one with a feeling of experimentation and innovation”; Light’s scholarship has ably and repeatedly demonstrated this significance, while its resulting excitement is ever-present - indeed characteristic - of reading her work.

This is particularly true of Light’s groundbreaking 1994 essay focusing on a group of fourteen one-volume French bible examples, through which Light demonstrates the emergence of the ‘Paris’ Bible model ca. 1200-1230, developing in three stages: ca. 1200-10, ca. 1210-20 and ca. 1210-30. Based on Light’s group of examples, the

---

329 This early-13th century adoption of the pandect format for producing The Bible was innovative, although not without precedent, in terms of bible-production - see discussion above of Cassiodorus’s bible, the Codex Amiatinus, and the great 9th-century Alcuinian and Theodulfian Bibles in addition to examples from the 12th century. Nonetheless, it was not until the 13th century that the one-volume ‘pandect’ format was adopted as the ‘usual’ one for the Bible, and in its resulting effects on the use, ownership and circulation of bibles, was certainly an innovation of great consequence.


333 ca. 1200-10: Bibliotheque Mazarine, Paris, Ms. 7 (Paris?); BnF, Paris, Ms. lat. 14233 (Paris); BnF, Paris, Ms. lat. 16747 (Paris); BnF, Paris, Ms. lat. 14232 (Paris); Bodleian Library, Oxford, Ms. Kennicott 15 (Paris).
following conclusions may be drawn as regards the physical characteristics of the ‘proto-
Paris Bible’\textsuperscript{336}: they all include the complete Bible in one volume and all fourteen bibles
have been attributed to having been produced in Paris (eight certainly and six
probably);\textsuperscript{337} the majority of these fourteen proto-‘Paris’ Bibles are of a generous ‘lectern’
size, ranging in size from 480 to 300 mm to 260 x 190 mm\textsuperscript{338} - ten are in excess of 300
mm in height (including three which exceed 400 mm\textsuperscript{339}), while the remaining four
examples are comfortable ‘fits’ in the ‘saddle-bag bible’ category, ranging between 231-
294 mm in height,\textsuperscript{340} and certainly none are unquestionably ‘pocket’-sized, although the
smallest example (Bibliothèque Mazarine, Paris, Ms. 70) could perhaps, at a pinch, be
generously included in the category.

However, despite the large size of most of these bibles, they do exhibit a new
organization of the text on the page\textsuperscript{341}: all but one have the Bible text arranged in two
columns, mostly containing around 60 lines per column, with the overall number of lines
per column ranging from 49-52 lines per column (in BnF, Paris, Ms. lat. 15470; textblock
height: 220 mm) to 67 lines per column (Bibliothèque Mazarine, Paris, Ms. 12; textblock
height: 178-9 mm) except Bibliothèque Mazarine, Paris, Ms. 70 (Paris?, ca. 1210-20) in
which the text is written in a single column of 41 long lines (528 fols., 231 x 164 [142-3 x
87-8] mm). The sole exception is Bibliothèque Mazarine, Paris, Ms. 70, whose text is
written in a single continuous column (textblock height: 142-3 mm) of only 41 lines per

\textsuperscript{334} ca. 1210-20: BL, London, Add. Ms. 15253 (Paris); Bibliothèque Municipale, Troyes, Ms. 577 (Paris);
Bibliothèque Mazarine, Paris, Ms. 12 (Paris); Bibliothèque Mazarine, Paris, Ms. 70 (Paris?); BnF, Paris, Ms.
lat. 15470 (Paris?); BnF, Paris, Ms. lat. 15471 (Paris?); BnF, Paris, Ms. lat. 11933 (Paris?).

\textsuperscript{335} ca. 1210-30: BnF, Paris, Ms. lat. 15475 (Paris); BnF, Paris, Ms. lat. 11536 (Paris?).

\textsuperscript{336} On the physical characteristics of the proto-Paris Bible’ (and discussion of their presence in Light’s
sample group of examples), see Laura Light, “French Bibles c. 1200–30. A New Look at the Origin of the
Paris Bible”, in The Early Medieval Bible. Its Production, Decoration, and Use, Ed. Richard Gameson (Cambridge:

\textsuperscript{337} Of these 14 bibles, 12 are from French collections: 3 in the Bibliothèque Mazarine, Paris (Mss. 7, 12 and
70); 8 in the BnF, Paris (Mss. lat. 14233, 16747, 14232, 15470, 15471, 11933, 15475 and 11536); and 1 in the
Bibliothèque Municipale, Troyes (Ms. 577). The other two examples are in English collections, one in
Oxford (Bodleian Library, Ms. Kennicott 13) and the other in London (British Library, Add. Ms. 15253).

\textsuperscript{338} Following the classificatory measurements suggested by Schnurmann (fl. Light) for distinguishing bibles
by size: viz. ‘pocket’ size <200 mm in height; ‘saddle-bag’ size 200-300 mm; and ‘lectern bible’ >300 mm;
see Schnurman: ? and Light: ?. Cf. Ruzzier: ?

\textsuperscript{339} British Library, Add. Ms. 15253 and BnF, Paris, Mss. lat. 14232 and 14233; the largest is British
Library, Add. Ms. 15253 (479 x c.300 [272 x 164-5] mm).

\textsuperscript{340} Bodleian Library, Oxford, Ms. Kennicott 15 (263 x 193mm), Bibliothèque Mazarine, Paris, Ms. 70 (231
x 164mm), and BnF, Paris, Mss. lat. 15475 (268 x 180 mm) and 11933 (294 x 220 mm).

\textsuperscript{341} Light (1994): 158.
page. Therefore, in many of these bibles “there is a new reduction in the size of the script” (compared to the large, uncramped script of the 12th-century monastic bibles, suitable for public reading) and “a new tendency to reduce the space between each line of script, resulting in a smaller written space and large margins”; the dimensions of the written spaces in these bibles - ranging from about 270 x 60 mm to 180 to 120 mm, together with the number of lines per column (mostly between 59 to 62 lines) - further demonstrate their illustration of this new compression of the Bible text from the earlier 12th-century examples.342

Overall these ‘proto-Paris’ Bibles can be seen as a new type of Bible.343 Most were certainly too large to be packed in one’s baggage and carried effortlessly, however they would have been practical volumes for the scholar: they are large enough to be read without strain, yet compact enough to carry short distances, and “It is easy to imagine a master in Paris in the early 13th century transporting such a book from his lodgings to the home of another scholar for consultation.”344 Light argues that “The new compactness and manageability of these Bibles, which contrasts so vividly with the monumentality of the multi-volume 12th-century monastic Bibles, speaks eloquently of the fact that these Bibles were being used in new ways by a new community,” while the fact that the 13th-century Bible was being shaped by new needs and requirements is further underlined by their textual contents and orderings, together with their paratextual apparatus and inclusion of extrabiblical elements.345

ii A Textual Pluriformity of the 13th-Century Bible Text?

The perception of an increasing uniformity of format of 13th-century bibles can blind us to the textual pluriformity still visible in bibles being copied throughout the 13th century.346 When looking at the development of Bibles from the 12th to the 13th century,
we can see diversity not just in the order of books but even in the canon.\footnote{347} In particular, considerable variety can be found in the bibles’ Psalters; three versions of the psalms text were circulating throughout the Middle Ages, and until the 12\textsuperscript{th} century some psalters displayed all three versions side by side (witnessed, for example, in the Eadwine Psalter)\footnote{348} The Gallican psalter had been the dominant text (since the Alcuinian and Atlantic Bible-models) but nevertheless, some 13\textsuperscript{th}-century bibles contained both Psalters, their texts presented in parallel columns (e.g. Bodleian Library, Oxford, Ms. Kennicott 15; Fig. 1.7), while others included the apocryphal Psalm 151 (e.g. Bodleian Library, Oxford, Ms. Auct. D.4.10), and still other bibles, especially English copies, omitted the Psalter entirely (e.g. Bodleian Library, Oxford, Ms. Auct. D.5.8)\footnote{349} The omission of the Psalter from a copy of the Bible may suggest either that the reader had access to the Psalter in a separate volume – for the Psalter circulated independently as a liturgical book throughout the Middle Ages - or had the texts memorized and thus had no need of a written copy.\footnote{350} Nor does there seem to have been a systematic nomenclature for the various books that bear the name Ezra in the Middle Ages.\footnote{351} To complete an already confusing portrait, while the ‘Paris’ Bible model popularized the ‘Langtonian’ chapter-divisions as standard and added a new set prologues to the biblical books, based on Jerome, and invariably included a dictionary with the IHN, there could still be some divergence in the extra-biblical apparatus of 13\textsuperscript{th}-century Bibles as well.\footnote{352}


\footnote{352} For example there was considerable variety in psalm \textit{breves} and \textit{capitula}, the brief explanatory chapter headings at the beginning of each psalm, and rubrications to the Song of Songs: some bibles included allegorical rubrics for the latter (e.g. “vox Christi ad sponsam”), while some excluded \textit{breves} and \textit{tituli} for these books altogether (see Light 2011: passim).
The dangers of formulating blind assumptions about a bible’s contents based on its size and format are demonstrated in York Minster Library Ms. XVI.N.6, a portable-size one-volume bible copied in England in the middle of the 13th century (203 x 143 mm, 333 fols). From its external appearance this bible seems easily identifiable as a 13th-century portable ‘Parisian’ bible (Fig. 1.8A). However upon opening the book and inspecting its contents, one discovers that its text was in fact not copied from a ‘Paris’ model exemplar, but rather from a copy of a 9th-century text, as H.H. Glunz first noted.

J.P.P. Martin argued that the explanation of this bible’s “extraordinary text” was attributable to “The simple fact that this text was copied in the North from an ancient MS which may possibly have dated from the ninth century of even from an earlier period.” Martin was convinced that Northern Europe “had resisted longer the introduction of the new text” and that about 1270 “the majority of biblical manuscripts would prove to be not yet affected by the text of Paris.” Based on Roger Bacon’s notoriously scathing condemnation of the exemplar Parisiensis and almost everyone involved in its production and circulation), Martin supposed that the ‘Paris’ text as having been fixed and established by the masters of the University of Paris between ca. 1200-1230, and thus Martin suggested that at the time when Bacon was penning his invective, the Paris text “was...as yet little known outside Paris” (i.e. in the more distant parts such as England), the text itself being, at that time, “not more than about forty years old”.

Nevertheless it requires inspection of this bible’s text to realize that this is not a ‘typical’ 13th-century bible, for both this bible’s material features and contents (i.e. based on its size and format and the layout of its text on the page) appear to be quintessentially

---

characteristic of the 13th-century’s innovations in copying the biblical text: it is of small size, with its leaves of extremely thin vellum, and the text in minute handwriting arranged in two columns to a page, each containing 60 lines within a textblock measuring 135 x 86 mm (Fig. 1.8A); its pages features the ‘new’ chapter divisions (see Fig. 1.8B), and the bible includes 29 of the ‘Paris’ set of 64 prologues (plus 19 others) with the IHV also present (at fols. 318-333v; see Fig. 1.8C), its authorship here attributed to Remigius of Auxerre. YML, Ms. XVI.N.6 thus offers us a valuable lesson as we proceed in our dealings with these bibles: this bible may look like a copy of the ‘new’ ‘Paris’ Bible - both from the outside and inside – but appearances can be deceptive.

VIII The Articulation and Standardization of Paratextual Apparatus

With these technological innovations under our belt, I want to turn from the tools to their unique manifestations in 13th-century bibles. In both form and function, the bibles produced during the 13th century, and particularly those in portable form, capitalized upon the innovations in research tools and methods of accessing (Scriptural) knowledge developed during the 12th and 13th centuries I have discussed above. This is evidenced textually on the page through indexical schema, including alphabetization, and materially, within the form of the codex, and directly influenced the further technological changes of the coming centuries. These bibles’ incorporation of multiple new systems for ordering, navigating and searching the Scriptures facilitated and encouraged their use.

---

359 Or as Glunz puts it, “This Bible…has nothing to distinguish it from the University copies which are common in the thirteenth century” (Glunz 1933: 267).
360 The Bible text (fols. 1-316v) is in the usual order, without II Ezra after Nehemiah, and with the Prayer of Solomon after Ecclesiasticus; Psalms are numbered; Tobit and Proverbs begin new quires (quires 10 [inc. fol. 156] and 14 [inc. fol. 122]) and I Kings begins a new leaf (fol. 66), but not a new quire;
361 These include: “Qui (sic) post incensam a chaldeis iudeam…” to Ezra, and Stegmüller, nos. 455 (“…dubiis commodare”, to Wisdom not Proverbs), 527, 529, 532, 535, 540, 544, 596 (“…uiuis canendas”), 670, 678, 683, 701, 706, 721, 730, 766, 794 and 834. The Ezra prologue is as de Bruyne, Prefaces III, but continues after repperit “et in epistola regis persarum artaxerxes rex regum esdre sacerdoci scribe legis dei doctissimo: salutem et reliqua”, as after Nehemiah in the St Albans manuscripts Eton College Ms. 26 (MMBL II: 653) and Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, Ms. 48.
362 “Hie sunt interpretaciones hebraicorum nominum per ordinem alphabeti dispositorum et primo incipienium per a. Aar (sic) apprehendens … Zusim consilientes eos uel consihatores eorum. Expliciunt interpretaciones hebraicorum nominum per ordinem alphabeti dispositorum a remigio digeste.” Cf. Stegmüller, no. 7709.
363 See M.B. Parkes, “Layout and presentation of the text,” in CHBB II (2008): passim, but esp. on marking the beginning of a paragraph with littera notabilior, 65-6; on running titles, 66-7; on headings, 67-8; and on
As we have seen, new technologies for accessing the Scriptural canon were not innovations made solely within bibles themselves. That being said, the ways in which bibles used them must certainly be considered significant as they represent the material space within which the gap between the relative formats and uses of Bible codices and liturgical books was definitively bridged. In other words, the portable bibles of the 13th-century represent a pivotal moment in two important material histories: that of late medieval book production and ownership, and that of the Bible as book, of Christianity’s use of the codex and of Bible-access and use.

At this point, then, I want to forward two questions: First, How do 13th-century bibles reflect the efforts made from the 12th century onward to improve access to the Scriptures and to make the Bible more swiftly navigated and more easily searched? And second, how do 13th-century bibles reflect the larger contemporary transformation of attitudes to written text itself? In order to begin to answer these questions, I will look at these bibles from two perspectives: holistically, in terms of how they embody newly-transformed attitudes concerning written authority (namely a privileging of ‘the whole text’ over selected extracts taken out of context); and materially, in terms of the innovative material strategies that literally made the Scriptures easier to handle.

For the user seeking a particular text within the complete Bible, the pages and physical body of a 13th-century pandect bible (especially in ‘portable copies) could present practical challenges that were unique amongst contemporary material technologies for navigating the Scriptures. First, despite their ‘handier’ size, searching the Scriptures in a ‘portable’ bible did not expiate the physical act of searching through the book. In order to produce a pandect copy of the Bible in small format, the reduction in the dimensions of these bibles’ pages - achieved through compression of the length of the text and the reduction in leaf-thickness - was often offset by an increase in the number of leaves per copy. Thus, with their unusually high number of unusually thin leaves, these bibles still provided seekers with, simply put, a lot of material ‘book’ to physically search through.


365 Discussed further in Chapter 2.
For a user seeking a small section of text within a book/codex containing a great deal of text on a large number of leaves, it is important that the volume be as physically easy to use as possible if it is still to be a useful and attractive tool, or the user will simply put the book aside – possibly swearing - and go in search of a volume that is less bothersome.

However, the pages of portable pandect bibles, with their dense double columns of minute text, do not, on the face of it, seem conducive to making the reader’s search an easy task, for there is very little variation in the layout of the text on their pages. In other words, at a glance, one page is visually indistinguishable from any other. Therefore copies of the ‘portable’ Scriptures required extraordinarily clear and distinctive ‘signposting’ devices in order to ensure ease and speed of textual location within the codex and clarity of textual division and sub-division within the space of the page. The consultation of these bibles was facilitated through the strategic deployment of graphic devices to make it easier to identify features on the page that are fundamental in the presentation of the Scriptures, i.e. marking the beginnings and ends of books, prologues and other textual units and the internal sub-distinction of the chapters.366

In 13th-century bibles, visual guidance systems and indexical tools - such as rubrication, colored capitals and initials and running titles - became standard features of the sacra pagina.367 New aids to reference were introduced which helped to identify the disposition of the material; in addition to marginal numbers, 13th-century scribes and rubricators developed and extended the use of running-titles, and introduced the analytic table of contents as a guide to the organization of the work and to facilitate readers’ access to its component parts.368 These strategies and devices were all designed for a single practical purpose: they were to help the reader find his way around the Bible and facilitate access to and retrieval of Scriptural texts. Let us briefly consider some of them.

367 See Ann M. Blair on Early Modern Finding Devices in her Too Much to Know: Managing Scholarly Information before the Modern Age [New Haven & London; Yale University Press, 2010]: 132-60 [esp. Layout or Mise-en-Page, 152-60 and The Branching Diagram, 144-52].
368 “The use of running-titles was an ancient practice which had been somewhat neglected ... During the thirteenth century the potential of running-titles was explored and realized. They were used frequently in all kinds of texts, and were often made conspicuous by the use of the colors red and blue, and occasionally emphasized further by the addition of flourishes.” M.B. Parkes, “Ordinatio and Compilatio” (1979/91): 53.
The use of a hierarchy of display scripts

12th century scribes had employed an (inherited) hierarchy of scripts for different purposes alongside that used for the text: a primary display script (for titles of works, and for headings of major divisions within a text), a secondary display script (for the opening words of a major division of the text), and a tertiary display script (for litterae notabiliores within the text itself). Often the choice of script for a particular display function was left to the scribe. In the first half of the 12th century scribes continued to employ versions of three ancient scripts (Rustic Capitals, Square Capitals and Uncial), but over the course of the century many scribes began to employ a hybrid display alphabet incorporating decorative versions of letter shapes from all three scripts, and this hybrid variety (often dominated by Rustic Capitals) was in common use until the end of the 12th century. During the 13th century this hybrid variety was developed into a distinctive script (or a “more artificial alphabet”) of filled Lombards (sometimes referred to as ‘Gothic Capitals’) which artists and rubricators adopted for illuminated or colored initials, replacing older scripts for secondary and tertiary display purposes.

The use of colored and/or decorated initials (litterae notabiliores)

The colored initials called litterae notabiliores (or ‘more noticeable letters’) provided the users of 13th-century ‘portable’ bibles with much-needed assistance in navigating minute handwriting within dense textblocks, and helped to minimize the amount of

---

370 Rustic Capitals were employed for headings by scribes throughout the 12th century and later; for example see BL, Royal Ms. 8 D.XXII, 1225-50 (see CRASS, pl. 59) and ?, 1108–1114 [pl. 61] and ?, before 1173 [pl. 97] (see DMBL, pls. 61, 97). For Uncial letters, see ECM, pl. 12 (10th century). Later, Uncial forms appear most often in tertiary display script at the beginning of a sentence or a line of verse; for example, Kew, Cron. College, mid-12th century (see Thomson 1985: II, pls. 81) and The Winchester Bible, 1150-1200 (see Thomson 1985: II, pl. 226); examples noted in Parkes, “Layout”: 64 n.63; cf. figs. 4.10 (Trinity College, Cambridge, Ms. B.5.28/174; Augustine, Enarrationes in Psalmos C-CL, copied by Eadmer at Christ Church, Canterbury, before 1130) and 4.12 (Jesus College, Cambridge, Ms. 67; Bede, Expositio in Marcum, copied at Cirencester Abbey between 1149 and 1176).
371 For hybrid alphabets, see BL, Royal Ms. 15 D.IV, 1150-1200 and use of tertiary display script (see Thomson 1985: II, pls. 238–9); also BL, Cotton Ms. Nero C. V, inc. ca. 1105 (see DMBL: pl. 59b); DMCL, pl. 92 (inc. after 1184); and BL, Royal Ms. 7 F.III, running title, 1191/2 (see DMBL: pl. 109). Examples noted in Parkes, “Layout”: 64 n.64.
‘jumping back and forth’ between pages and passages a user would have to undergo in trial and error en route to the successful location of the passage he sought.\textsuperscript{373}

In the 1120s, Hugh of St. Victor remarked that in the past wise men had committed their knowledge to memory, and did not need to thumb through the pages of books to hunt for rules and reasons.\textsuperscript{374} Instead he encouraged his pupils to fix in their memories graphic features on the page – such as colored initials or shapes made by the patterns of words – to register the whereabouts of information within the text that they might wish to find again. He also provided some instruction in the use of mnemonic devices to help them. However, at about the same time scribes and readers were beginning to address the problems of making it easier to find one’s way about a book in order to locate the passages in the text which one wanted to consult.

As of the 12\textsuperscript{th} century these symbols had been used with increasing frequency to indicate the beginnings of a paragraph by offsetting the letter in the margin, or the space between columns of text, but over the course of the 13\textsuperscript{th} century scribes began to place prominent initials within the boundary allocated to the text to distinguish major divisions within the text.\textsuperscript{375} From the 13\textsuperscript{th} century onwards scribes employed \textit{litterae notabiliores} in a variety of alphabets which were colored, highlighted with color, or embellished with decorative penwork by the rubricator, for tertiary display purposes, for example to indicate the beginning of a chapter, a paragraph or a section of text.\textsuperscript{376} These illuminated or colored initials came to be known as filled Lombards (sometimes referred to as ‘Gothic Capitals’).\textsuperscript{377} When situated within the textblock, \textit{litterae notabiliores} were picked out with

\textsuperscript{377} They were developed from a hybrid display alphabet which many scribes began to employ over the course of the 12\textsuperscript{th} century, incorporating decorative versions of letter shapes from all three ancient scripts (Rustic Capitals, Square Capitals and Uncial). This hybrid variety (often dominated by Rustic Capitals) was itself based on the hierarchy of scripts that 12\textsuperscript{th}-century scribes had employed for different purposes alongside that used for the text: as primary display script (for titles of works, and for headings of major divisions within a text), as secondary display script (for the opening words of a major division of the text), and as tertiary display script (for \textit{litterae notabiliores} within the text itself). Often the choice of script for a particular display function was left to the scribe, since different display scripts were used for the same function by scribes working in the same community; M.B. Parkes, “Layout and presentation” (2008): 64.
splashes of color, and from the second half of the 13th century the decoration of an initial was often extended into the margin alongside the text, sometimes incorporated within a decorative panel, and were often executed by the artist responsible for the initial.  

iii The paragraphus and the paraph

13th-century bibles also made use of two symbols first adopted by 12th-century scribes and rubricators to indicate divisions within the text: the paragraphus, which appears in glossed books from the mid-12th century, and later, the paraph. 13th-century scribes continued to use the paraph before glosses in a glossed book, but the symbol also began to take over the principal functions of the paragraphus as a mark of separation. This extension of the use of the paraph to indicate divisions within a text was stimulated by developments which had taken place in the Schools during the second half of the 12th century. The paraph was also used as a signpost to indicate the beginning of a paragraph, and to indicate significant details in a text, while readers also inserted parahps in order to draw attention to notabilia in the text.

iv Running Headers

---


378 Primary display script employed for the title of the work was often smaller, and less distinctive, and secondary display script was usually confined to a few letters following the initial. M.B. Parkes, “Layout” (2008): 65; cf. examples given in M.B. Parkes, “Layout” (2008): 65, cf. ns. 67-70.

379 The paragraphus was an ancient *nota* employed as a mark of separation, shaped like a Greek ‘upper case’ gamma. By the 12th century its shape resembled a gallows, but rubricators also developed a more decorative form resembling an elaborate long-s. The paraph - based on a *littera notabilior* form of the letter C with a vertical stroke traced through it - emerged in the late 12th century, and represented an abbreviated form of capitulum (in the sense of ‘a head of an argument, chapter, or section’), thus replacing the letter K found in earlier manuscripts; see M.B. Parkes, *Paese and Effect* (1992): 41-49 (esp. 43-44), 305; cf. *eodem*, “Layout” 2008: 68-70, see also nn. 88-106; cf. figs. 4.1, 4.5, 4.6.).

380 It appears before each item in a list, before chapter numbers at the ends of lines of text, and was also used to separate text from run-overs at the ends of lines; see M.B. Parkes, “Layout and presentation of the text,” in *CHBB II* (2008): 68-9, figs. 4.7, 4.8.

381 Since “A reader was expected to assess the understanding embodied in a text (*textus intelligentia*) by analyzing its structural organization (which came to be known as the *forma tractatus*, or *ordinatio*) as well as the author’s procedure (the *forma tractandi*), in order to expound his *modus agendi*. When assessing the value of a text a reader was also expected to apply processes of reasoning: to pose questions on issues raised in the text, and to resolve these questions.” M.B. Parkes, “Layout and presentation of the text,” in *CHBB II* (2008): 69, cf. n. 96.

Running headers at the tops of pages in 13th-century bibles also provided the reader with signposts marking the divisions of the Bible’s constitutive books within its ‘whole text’, and thus facilitated navigation of both the bible book and its texts.\textsuperscript{383} Although the use of running headers became a common feature in books copied during the 13th century, these simple but effective navigational devices were not contemporary inventions; rather, 13th-century scribes and rubricators were following the example of their 12th-century predecessors, who had themselves revived the practice – which dated back to Late Antiquity, but had been neglected and dormant since that time - motivated by the practical challenges which the new academic and scholastic texts posed.\textsuperscript{384} These new challenges required new solutions (or in this case, old solutions used in new contexts), and 12th-century scribes added running titles at the tops of pages in copies of texts divided into ‘books’, and in manuscripts containing several texts by the same author, or works by different authors.\textsuperscript{385} Early in the 12th century some scribes had begun to copy headings of major divisions within a text, in the same script as the text, but in red ink, while others had adopted this practice for subordinate headings and for chapter or section numbers, but by the end of the 12th century most scribes used the same script for all headings as for the text.\textsuperscript{386} Running headers became a convention in 13th-century manuscripts, especially in bibles.

\textbf{IX Chapter Divisions and Organizational Systems}

\textbf{i The Establishment and Use of Fixed Chapter-Divisions}

Within the intellectual climate of 12th-century scholasticism, a transformation in attitudes to written authority becomes visible around the mid-century point, manifested in an acknowledgement of the higher authority of the text, as opposed to that of extracts

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{384} A new major division in a text was first indicated in the running title above the column at which it began, a practice which was convenient for authors as well as readers, enabling them to make cross references within the same work (for example, “secundum Augustinum supra. distinctio x”); M.B. Parkes, “Layout” (2008): 79.
\item \textsuperscript{385} M.B. Parkes, “Layout”: 66-67.
\item \textsuperscript{386} Although this practice could have originated as a space-saving device in a two-column layout, it also appears frequently in copies written in single columns of long lines. A more likely explanation is that by removing the headings away from the initials, the headings that identified the content of the text in the following section became more prominent for the reader.
\end{itemize}
taken out of context.\textsuperscript{387} For example, Geoffrey of Auxerre describes how, on the occasion of Gilbert of Poitiers’ defense at the consistory of Rheims in 1148, Gilbert and his colleagues arrived armed with “codices integri” to the confusion and consternation of Bernard and his other accusers who had brought with them only a selection of patristic auctoritates or extracts on a single sheet; the next day, these accusers returned, equipped with their own whole texts.\textsuperscript{388}

During the second half of the 12\textsuperscript{th} century, this emphasis on the authority of the whole work, and on the necessity of reading statements in context, grew to the point of generating a significant change in terminology.\textsuperscript{389} While Geoffrey used the expected term, ‘integri’ (“codex integer”) to designate ‘the entire text,’ the new term used [to refer to ‘the authority of the whole work’], or rather an old term put to new use, was ‘originalia.’\textsuperscript{390} By the middle of the 13\textsuperscript{th} century, the noun forms ‘originale’ and ‘originalia’ were universally accepted, and with them, the idea they represent, that the intent of a writer is best grasped through reading his words in context.\textsuperscript{391} This is how Stephen Langton used the word when contrasting the “glosa Ieronimi” with “Ieronimus in originali,” or simply “in glosa” with “in originali”; implicit in Langton’s choice of ‘originalia’ rather than ‘integri’ is the implication that the whole works possess the authority or authenticity of the originals, lacking in mere excerpts.\textsuperscript{392}

The emergence of a concept of a ‘whole’ work in contrast to extracts was accompanied by a parallel interest in the proper division of the whole work into its components; parts, books, chapters, distinctiones, quaestiones and such like.\textsuperscript{393} In order to ensure that the process of division would help the reader to understand the organization

\textsuperscript{392} See J. de Ghellinck, “‘Originale’ and ‘Originalia’,” Archivum latinitatis mediæ aevi (Bulletin du Cange) 14.2 (1939): 95-105 (on contemporary changes in use of terminologies, see 98-99; for examples see 98-103 [including Roger Bacon at 101]).
of the whole work and the intentions of its author, such divisions and subdivisions had to constitute coherent units, and in order to be useful for reference purposes, these units had to be small.\textsuperscript{394} The process of \textit{distinctio}, \textit{divisio} and \textit{ordinatio} - that is, of rationally subdividing previously undivided sections of text - that had commenced with Jerome's divisions of Holy Scripture into lines of sense and \textit{capitula}, was pursued with enthusiasm throughout the 13\textsuperscript{th} century.\textsuperscript{395} Unsurprisingly, the Bible was the first text to receive such attentions.

The earliest use of fixed divisions of any sort for reference purpose appeared almost simultaneously at the end of the 12\textsuperscript{th} century (ca. 1180) in the works of Herbert of Bosham, an Englishman, and Peter the Chanter, a Frenchman.”\textsuperscript{396} However, references that cite the new numbers first appeared in a series of \textit{quaestiones}, summas and early biblical concordances composed by English scholars in Paris and in England in the second decade of the 13\textsuperscript{th} century, one of whom was Stephen Langton (Archbishop of Canterbury 1207-d.1228).\textsuperscript{397}

It is to Langton that historians have long credited the invention of the modern chapter divisions of the bible, rooted in the intellectual context of the nascent scholastic culture of the university of Paris in the years prior to 1203; indeed, as we shall see, the authorship of these divisions has been attributed to Langton (although not universally) since the Middle Ages.\textsuperscript{398} However Paul Saenger has recently argued that the veritable

\textsuperscript{395} Cf. esp. Parkes, “\textit{Ordinatio…”} (1976). Both of these divisional schema employed by Jerome were emulations of ancient Hebrew and analogous Jewish practices; see Paul Saenger, “Biblical Citation” (2005): 79 \& n.8; cf. Saenger, “Jewish Liturgical Divisions” (2012).
\textsuperscript{396} Herbert’s employment of chapters in marginalia (in commentaries on the Psalter and the Pauline Epistles) was particularly significant, for his use formed in effect a concordance providing references to chapter and verse to historically appropriate references between the two Scriptural texts and to other biblical books, the verse usually being indentified by its incipit; see Paul Saenger, “Biblical Citation” (2005): 82.

Scholars have also come to challenge the proposed date by which Langton was using the ‘modern’ chapter divisions (i.e. by 1203), emphasizing that no codices of any of Langton’s works dating from the 12th century or ca. 1200 have survived.\footnote{400}{Beryl Smalley, _The Study of the Bible_ (1964): 224 and n.1.} In his commentary on Jerome’s prologue to Joshua (composed in Paris in the late 12th century) Langton emphasizes the utility of chapter divisions, which he describes as “Que valde necessaria sunt ad inveniendum quod volueris et ad tenendum memoriter” (‘Which are very necessary for finding what you want, and for remembering’), concluding (now-prophetically), “Hic habes auctoritatem distinguendi capitula”; ‘Here you have authority for chapter division.’\footnote{401}{Beryl Smalley, _Studies in the Commentaries of Stephen Langton_,” _Bulletin of the John Rylands Library_ 17 (1933): 121-129 [esp. 123].}

Nevertheless, although Langton insists on the utility of distinctions “per capitula” (which he identifies with Jerome’s _cola et commata_), he does not mention, nor does he imply a numbering for these divisions.\footnote{402}{BnF, Ms. lat 393, fol. 32; noted by Saenger (2013): 42; cf. Beryl Smalley, _Study of the Bible_ (1964): 224.} Indeed, manuscript evidence suggests that it was only during the final stage of compiling Langton’s _Summa_ or _Quaestiones_ (written on, or just before, his return to Canterbury in 1213) that secretaries close to Langton first began to employ numbers (in this case, modern chapter numbers) for the citation of Scripture.\footnote{403}{Cambridge, Saint John’s College, MS 57 (C.7); see Alys L. Gregory, “The Cambridge Manuscript of the _Questiones_ of Stephen Langton”, _The New Scholasticism_ 4 (1930), 162-226. It was likely at this time that a...}
Modern scholars have therefore surmised that this heterogeneous corpus of Langton manuscripts reflects the confusion in the early years of the 13th century generated by the reception of Langton’s newly invented system over a thirty-year-long period of transition to the new and standardized division, canonically established by secretaries and the stationers of the University ca. 1230, and disseminated by the scholars and students of diverse nations residing in Paris at that time.404

Langton later made copious references to modern chapter numbers in his Concordantiae reales, the classified index of theological topics, attributed to him by English scholars which was apparently composed and subsequently disseminated in England as may be witnessed in one of the earliest manuscripts of Langton’s Commentary on the Pentateuch, now The Free Library of Philadelphia, Ms. Lewis E 35 (281 x 202 mm; 205 fols.).405 The manuscript was copied in the first quarter of the 13th century, probably in

404 Furthermore, the earliest extant copies of Langton’s biblical commentaries (all of which date from 1210-20 or 1220-30) vary significantly in the mode in which they relate to the segmentation of the Bible; some manuscripts of Langton’s Commentaries or Postillae are divided in the margins into the modern divisions - some into numbered schemes of division, some into both - while other surviving copies evince no chapter divisions whatsoever; Paul Saenger, “Graphic Mise en page” (2013): 41; cf. Amaury d’Esneval, “La Division de la Vulgate Latine en chapitres dans l’édition Parisienne du XIIIe siècle”, Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques 62 (1978), 559-68 (at 561); Light, “Roger Bacon”.  
405 This real concordance, a work not intended for the classroom, but to aid priests in the preparation of sermons, resembles in organization the lost Concordance of Thomas Gallus and a later concordance erroneously attributed to Anthony of Padua; noted by Paul Saenger, “Graphic Mise en page” (2013): 44-45. 
406 Saenger suggests that FLP, Ms. Lewis E 35 was copied “presumably at Paris” (Saenger 2013: 43) although Debra Cashon’s 2005 FLP catalogue record suggests that the text was rather copied at Poitigny (see here); cf. Paul Saenger, “Graphic Mise en page” (2013): 43 and Fig. 2.2 [44]: FLP, Ms. Lewis E 35, repro. fol. 172r; cf. De Ricci II, 2048 (no. 127); Wolf II, Descriptive Catalogue of Lewis European MSS at FLP
France, at roughly the same time as the final confection of the Quaestiones, and its text, written in double columns of 36 lines, contains several contemporary insertions of modern chapter numbers in the margin to identify cross-references within the continuously written text of the commentary (e.g. at fol. 172r). That is to say, its text was written in a text format in which the commentary for each biblical book was not yet divided into the apposite biblical chapters by either spaces or paragraphs.

The question of where and when the modern chapter divisions had originated, and who had invented them has always divided opinions amongst chroniclers and scholars. Most French and Catholic authors even up until the first decade of the 20th century claimed that the modern chapters had been established by the preeminent French Dominican biblical commentator Hugh of St. Cher (d. ca. 1263), who lectured at the University of Paris in the mid-13th century and who, in his Postills, used chapter divisions which were almost exactly the same as those adopted ca. 1230 as standard by the stationers of the University of Paris.

However, from the late 13th and early 14th centuries, early on, the English view was quite different, with English scribes and chroniclers claiming paternity of the verbal biblical concordance. In the early 14th century the Dominican scholar Nicholas Trevet attributed authorship of the ‘Paris Bible’ chapter-divisions (and/or the establishment of the whole ‘Paris Bible’ text) to Stephen Langton in his (Trevet’s) Annales regum Angliae.

[1937]: 42; see also entry for Ms. Lewis E 35 in the FLP online catalogue here (with 2 images, of fols. 1r and 90r) and on Digital Scriptorium here.

407 Owing to loss of leaves, FLP, Ms. Lewis E 35 now contains the text of Langton’s commentary on the Pentateuch from Exodus 26 through Numbers: *incipit,* “In ingressu tabernacuii u. columpnae errant de lignis setim de aureatecapita habetes autrea bases vero eneas” (fol. 1r); *explicit,* “in tribu et familia patris earum in catholica ecclesia. Explicit liber numeri” (fol. 205v).

408 Paul Saenger, “Graphic *Mise en page*” (2013): ‘Langton’s use of the new chapters,’ 41-46 [43], cf. Fig. 2.2 (44): FLP, Ms. Lewis E 35, reprod. fol. 172r.


and English scholars and historians— from the influential 14th-century Benedictine chronicler Ranulf Higden’s *Polychronicon* through to the Protestant John Foxe in his *Book of Martyrs* (first English ed. 1563)— continued to attribute the invention of modern chapter divisions to Langton through the 16th century.\(^{412}\)

This meeting of 13th-century innovation and 13th- through 16th-century attribution is witnessed in Trinity College, Cambridge, Ms. B.10.1, a magnificently decorated 13th-century bible of mighty size (375 x 255 mm, 462 fols.)\(^{413}\) which was supplemented by a series of additions in the 14th century including the addition of two consecutive sections at the end of the book, comprising selections from Isidore’s *Etymologies* and the *IH\(N\) (fols. 399r-410v, 411r-462r),\(^{414}\) and a table listing the bible’s contents and the number of chapters in each book was added at the front of the book (fols. ii-vi). At the top of the table’s first page, at the beginning of the text, a contemporary hand has written the name “Langetoī” in the left hand margin on the ruled line marking the top of the textblock (Fig. 1.9A). The same hand also added the name “Langetoī” at the end of the book, on fol. 462r, directly after the final entry of the *IH\(N\) (“Zuzim consiliantes eos vel consiliaiores eorum”) in the blank space of the second half of the last line: “[-]liaiores eorum ~ Langetoī” (Fig. 1.9B).\(^{415}\) It seems clear that through his addition of these inscriptions this 14th-century reader-scribe is crediting


\(^{414}\) *IH\(N\)* (fols. 411r-62r): “Hic incipiert interpretaciones hebraicorum nominum incipiencium per A literam secundum dispositionem alphabetti” (fol. 411r), inc. “Aaz apprehendens”; ends fol. 462r, “Zuzim consiliaiores eos vel consiliaiores eorum”.

\(^{415}\) The bible was given to Trinity College in the late 16th century by Abp. John Whitgift (Master of Trinity 1567-77 and Abp. of Canterbury 1583-1603-4), and is recorded as “Biblia Archiepiscopi Langtoni” on the list chronicling Whitgift’s gift to the college of some 150 manuscripts (preserved in Trinity College, Cambridge, Ms. R.17.8), Trinity College, Cambridge, Ms. R.17.8 preserves the *Memoriale Collegii Trinitatis, or Register of Trinity College*, Cambridge’s benefactors (476 x 356 mm, 133 pp.), given to the college by Sir Edward Stanhope, who had the Register compiled. The manuscripts which Abp. Whitgift gave to Trinity College are listed in the “Catalogus Librorum repositorum in Bibliothecae Collegii Sanctae et Individuae Trinitatis in Academia Cantabrigiensis munificentia Benefactorum eiusdem Collegii” (at pp. 85-133) along with those of other donors (including Dean Nevile, George Willmot and others) together with lists of their donations; cf. M.R. James, *The Western Manuscripts in the Library of Trinity College, Cambridge. A Descriptive Catalogue*, II (Cambridge: CUP, 1901): 415-16 (James no. 994).
Langton with some sort of authorship, although the nature and extent of that attributed authorship is unclear. While Langton was commonly credited as the scholar who authored and established the system of chapter divisions and schema for organizing the contents of the Bible (which would explain the attribution at the opening of the prefatory table) it is unusual that he should be credited as author of the *IHN* (as seems to be the case in the second attribution, on fol. 462r).\textsuperscript{416} This conundrum aside, these attributions nevertheless bear testament to the enduring association of his name with these chapter divisions and his credited position as the prime agent of their establishment.

At the end of the 19th century French and English interpretations merged, when J.P.P. Martin discovered in BnF, Paris, Ms. lat. 14417 (a codex originating from the Augustinian Abbey of Saint Victor in Paris, dating from ca. 1230), a list of biblical incipits with a rubric that explicitly linked the modern division to Langton, identified as Archbishop of Canterbury (at fols. 125-6; Fig. 1.10).\textsuperscript{417} Soon thereafter, the modern scholarly explanation of the origin of modern chapter division coalesced under the influence of the great Samuel Berger, who conceded that Langton, the celebrated Englishman, had indeed originated the modern divisions, but insisted that the later Archbishop of Canterbury had invented them in Paris as a professor of theology.\textsuperscript{418}

In an attempt to substantiate his thesis Berger cited Bibliothèque Mazarine, Paris, Ms. 5, the oldest datable Bible to incorporate from its inception the modern chapter divisions (although not the modern order of books), which contains two numberings; spaces for the older Alcuinic division were placed within the text, and the new divisions

\textsuperscript{416} Another list of books and chapters which follows a similar English ordering of the Bible’s books and which also attributes authorship of the divisions to Archbishop Langton, survives in a 13th/14th century collection of sermons (now Magdalen College, Oxford, Ms. 168). The exact location of the list within Magdalen College, Oxford, Ms. 168 (small 4to, 162 fols.) cannot be discerned from the only published catalogue description of the manuscript’s contents, that of Henry Coxe’s 1852 *Catalogus Codicium MSS...* (in which Coxe describes the list of chapter divisions as “fragmentum tabulae initiorum capitum unius cum libri totius Bibliae. incip. cum cap. xxxiii. Paralipom. lib. ii.”). However it must be ca. fol. 82, since Coxe records its position at the end of Art. 5 (inc. fol. 54, ‘Sermones invendetum modo memorati,’), following the conclusion of Sermon 19; thus the list must be ca. fol. 82, as Art 6. (‘Sermones xxxii.-xxxviii. supra memorati’) begins on fol. 83. See entry in Henry O. Coxe, *Catalogus Codicium MSS. qui in Collegiis aulisque Oxoniensibus hodie adsercantur* (Oxford, 1852): II, 77-78 (no. CLXVIII).


\textsuperscript{418} Samuel Berger, *De l'histoire de la Vulgate en France* (Paris, 1887): 11-12.
were numbered in the margin. However this bible was certainly not Parisian, but English (alas for Berger!), likely copied at Canterbury Cathedral soon after Langton’s return to England in 1213, and well before 1231, a date added in a note on a flyleaf.

ii The Use of the New System of Chapter-Divisions in 13th-Century Indexing Systems

Putting the knotty question of authorship to one side, what we can say for sure is that, ca. 1200, a system of chapter-divisions was established, by Langton or whomever, that divided the biblical books into distinctions of relatively equal length based on the principles of Aristotelian logic. The formulation and widespread adoption of this new system of chapter-divisions generated new modes of biblical citation which fundamentally altered the way that the readers, scholars and theologians understood, accessed, studied and discussed the biblical text. In due course, this system of Biblical segmentation migrated to Paris, and was there modified in the milieu of the University and adopted by the Augustinian monks of the House of Saint Victor and the Dominicans of the House of Saint Jacques, where Hugh of Saint-Cher (d. 1263) employed Langton’s system for his Postilla. The earliest French bibles equipped with modern numbering originated at Cîteaux before 1200, while in Paris, the first bibles with modern divisions may be dated to

---

419 Paul Saenger, “Graphic Mise en page” (2013): 40; Saenger notes that “Previous English Bibles had, like the second Winchester Bible, Bodleian Library, Ms. Auct. E. inf. 1-2, been formatted into paragraphs conforming to the Alcuinic division” (ibid, 40 n.33).


between 1200 and 1210, and all come from the monastery Saint Victor, an abbey with numerous ties to England and to the abbey of St. Albans in particular.\textsuperscript{423} It was the Continental version of graphic chapter distinctions first rendered standard by the university stationers in Paris and then in Oxford which ultimately became the standard chapter divisions for the bibles produced in their thousands by professional scribes at both universities, most of them small-format portable bibles.\textsuperscript{424}

The ‘Parisian’ division of the Bible into standard chapters for convenience of reference undoubtedly provided the precedent for the contemporary practice of introducing new divisions into old books. Older bibles were sometimes updated, a practice which was increasingly seen as a ‘corrective’ process, through the reviewing and, if necessary, revision of the contents through the ‘updating’ the divisions and ordering of these bibles’ books (i.e. by drawing attention to any books not included which, according to the ‘new system’ of chapter-divisions, should be present, and noting any places in which the ordering of their books deviated from the ‘new order’) together with renumbering the sub-division of their chapters with added Arabic numerals.\textsuperscript{425} Conversely, Jerome’s \textit{IHN}, which had enjoyed only a limited run before 1200, was thoroughly revised around the turn of the 13\textsuperscript{th} century to become part of the biblical canon, appearing in virtually all bibles thereafter.\textsuperscript{426} The revised versions integrate the names into a single list, alphabetized by the first two letters, to make them searchable; their purpose was quite clearly to serve preachers.\textsuperscript{427}

\textsuperscript{423} Paul Saenger, “Graphic \textit{Mise en page}” (2013): 31; cf. \textit{ibid}. on late 12\textsuperscript{th}-century bibles with modern chapter divisions, see 51-54 and Fig. 2.4 [53: CCCC, Ms. 48, repro. fol. 45v]; on the Oriental origins of the new divisions, see 54-56 and Fig. 2.5 [57: CCCC. Ms. 48, repro. fol. 121r]; on the Arabic and Greek reception at St. Albans, see 58-59 and Figs. 2.6-7, esp. Fig. 2.6 [59: CCCC, Ms. 48, repro. fol. 7v].


\textsuperscript{425} See, for example, the Benedictine monks’ treatment of their ‘communal bible’ at Durham Cathedral priory, now Durham Cathedral Library, Ms. A.II.3 (discussed in following chapter); see Richard Gameson, “Durham’s Paris Bible and the Use of Communal Bibles in a Benedictine Cathedral Priory in the Later Middle Ages,” in \textit{Form and Function in the Late Medieval Bible}, Eds. Eyal Poleg & Laura Light (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2013): 67-104 & Pls. IV, V, VIII (Figs. 3.2, 3, 6).


\textsuperscript{427} In addition, early 13\textsuperscript{th}-century bibles not infrequently also contain brief indexes, in rational or alphabetical order, of biblical ‘themes’ for preachers, e.g. the index of texts useful for preaching against the Manichees (i.e. the Cathars) that is often found in early Dominican bibles; see Laura Light, “The New Thirteenth-Century Bible and the Challenge of Heresy”, \textit{Viator} 18 (1987): 275–88 and Light (2011). On the use of arabic numbers and the new chapter divisions, see Paul Saenger, “Graphic \textit{Mise en page}” (2013): 60-66 and Figs. 2.8-9.
In England, the birthplace of the system of standard chaptering, rubrication and marginalia offering the earlier Langton and pre-Langton chaptering persisted in numerous 13th-century bibles, a phenomenon that appears to be absent in Paris after the turn of the century. The art of rational chapter division was brought to its zenith in 13th-century England by scholars including the Oxford Franciscan Adam Marsh (d. ca.1259), the anonymous English Franciscan compilers of the *Tabula septem custodiarum*, and the Dominican friar Robert Kilwardby (d.1279), through their application of its principles to the corpus of Augustine, Ambrose, Boethius, Isidore and other Church fathers.

**iii The Use of Arabic numbers (in bibles; for numbering chapters and Psalms)**

Another common trait (and another almost exclusively English feature) was the use of Arabic numbers to number chapters in bibles, often including the angular form of ‘2’. In the first datable codex to be originally equipped with modern chapter divisions, Bibl. Mazarine Ms. 5 (from Canterbury), the chapter divisions were denoted with Arabic numbers with an alternative sign for ‘2’, resembling a question mark, a sign that is probably of English origin. A further example of the use of this ‘2’ form in a 13th-

---

428 See Light (1994); see N.R. Ker, *MMBL* for numerous examples, including Bristol Baptist College, Ms. Z.d. 39 (II: 193), Leicester University Library, Ms. 8 (III: 83-4), Chetham’s Library, Manchester, Ms. 6688/Mun. A.4.96 (III: 342), and Pembroke College, Oxford, Ms. 7 (III: 677-8).

429 On the early scholastic use of numbered chapters by French scholars in Paris, see Paul Saenger, “Graphic *Mise en page*” (2013): 46-47; see *ibid.* on Biblical citation by English scholars in Paris and in England (47-49) and on Parisian use of modern chapters after Langton (49-51). Saenger notes (2005: 83) that although 13th-century concordances, whether copied in England or on the Continent, may have always referred to the standard Parisian version of Langton’s chapter divisions, “to date no empirical research has been undertaken to verify whether or not any of the concordances, particularly English copies, referred to the anterior Insular scheme of Langton’s chapters.”


432 The same form of two was present in two early Bibles from Saint Victor (now BnF, Paris Ms. lat. 14233 and lat. 14232). Robert Grosseteste exclusively used Arabic numbers including the angular form for ‘2’ in his autograph marginal references to biblical chapters, and similar numbers present in Lyon, Bib. mun., Ms. 414, the English Bible dating from the early 1230s that can be associated with Grosseteste because it contains the only copy of his *Tabula* or Concordance. The chapter rubrics of this bible identify the new divisions with Stephen Langton and its chapter incipits include numerous English variants; see Philipp W.
century English biblical manuscript is to be found in UPenn RBML, Ms. Codex 1560, a small, slender New Testament copied in England, perhaps in Oxford, ca. 1235-70.433

The use of Arabic numbers in Parisian Bibles was rare and the angular form of ‘2’ was known only at Saint Victor’s.434 Instead, in French bibles produced before ca. 1220 (apart from those from Saint Victor) a visual distinction was made between old and new distinctions by the use of color and paraph signs of varying shapes, while after 1220, dicolored Roman numerals in which the letters forming the numbers were written alternately in either red or blue rapidly became standard for the modern chapter numbers of Parisian Bibles.435

It was rather in English bibles (produced at Saint Albans) and bibles prepared under English influence (at Saint Victor in Paris) that the use of the new Arabic numerals came to play a truly significant paratextual role.436 In an Insular biblical context, Arabic numbers effectively disambiguated the page by distinguishing numbers for the new chapter divisions from numbers denoting older schemes.437 Thus in English Bibles of the 12th and 13th century, Arabic numbers almost always denoted the modern chapter division, and Roman numerals were used to mark the older and less standardized distinctions.438 Although English bibles also commonly contained dicolored numbers in the 13th century, they continued to feature Arabic numbers to denote the new


433 UPenn Ms. Codex 1560: “Novum Testamentum Domini Nostri Jesu Christi” (196 x 132 [140 x 92] mm, 61 fols.); see entry on Penn in Hand here. Two further examples of the use of this ‘2’ form in 13th-century English bibles are in Merton College, Oxford, Ms. 7 (mid-13th century) and CUL, Cambridge, Ms. Ee.2.23, a Carthusian 13th-century bible where the right angular form was used in the lists of capitula; see Western Illuminated Manuscripts: A Catalogue of the Collection in the Cambridge University Library, Eds. Paul Binski & Patrick Zutshi (Cambridge: CUP, 2011): no. 97 (90-1, pl. XXXIV).

434 In about 1210, this ‘2/2’ form was still used in a glossed Bible from the chancellery of the University (BnF, Ms. lat. 17204) to denote a non-modern set of chapter divisions, and a variation of the _zed_ form was also used in an abbreviated liturgical Bible of Parisian provenance copied ca. 1215, possibly of Parisian origin (BnF, Ms. lat. 16267). Saenger notes that in neither Bible did there exist a nexus between the use of Arabic numbers and the modern schema; Paul Saenger, “Graphic Mise en page” (2013): 65.

435 For examples of the use of color and paraph signs to visually distinguish between old and new distinctions in French bibles see BnF, Ms. lat. 11537 and 16747.


439 Indeed they appear to have evolved in England ca. 1215 as indicated in Bibl. Mazarine, Ms. 5 and Oriel College, Oxford, Ms. 77. Both bibles start with the red and transition to dicoloring (which in Bibl.
chaptering from the 13th through the 15th century and were also frequently used for numbering columns, leaves and lines.\textsuperscript{440}

Two further reference tools of particular significance for the accurate identification, location and citation of passages of Scripture within the Bible, namely foliation and the numbering of columns, were also conceived and employed at this time (also in England). Although codices became the normal form of the book in late antiquity, ancient Latin codex books never had pagination.\textsuperscript{441} The numbering of pages and columns, which first appeared in the 13th century, was largely restricted to England and notably present in university manuscripts copied at Oxford.\textsuperscript{442} An excellent example of a 13th-century English bible with pagination is St. John’s College, Cambridge, Ms. N.1, which was written in England ca. 1250-75 (255 x 180 mm, 408 fols), and whose Bible text is followed by an abbreviated Missal and other liturgical texts, and preceded by a Calendar (\textit{inc.} fol. 3r) whose contents indicate that this bible once belonged to a Gilbertine house.\textsuperscript{443}

Mazarine 5 is employed for Arabic numbers); Saenger notes that red was reserved for the older numberings, which persisted far longer in England than in Paris; Paul Saenger, “Graphic Mise en page” (2013): 65-66 [65].

\textsuperscript{440} Saenger argues that the presence of Arabic numbers and of Hebrew and Greek in English medieval bibles and grammars into the 15th century represents “an enduring witness” to “the powerful influence that Oriental languages had first imposed on the mise-en-page of the Vulgate Latin Bible three centuries earlier”; Paul Saenger, “Graphic Mise en page” (2013): 65-66; cf. \textit{ibid.} 32-38, 54-56.

\textsuperscript{441} Beginning at the end of the 11th century and continuing throughout the Middle Ages, the occasional numbering of leaves was gradually introduced at centers scattered throughout Europe.

\textsuperscript{442} In fact, Saenger argues that both pagination and column numbering were “scarcely present on the Continent” (Paul Saenger, “Biblical Citation” [2005]: 84; cf. sources named in 84 n.32). Three centuries later in printed tomes produced by English antiquarians, pagination became the primary mode of scholarly citation, supplanting chapter and alphabetical distinctions for all texts, excepting the Bible, medieval scholastic \textit{summae} and the Latin and Greek classics that were only subdivided into standardized chapters in the age of print; Paul Saenger, “Biblical Citation” (2005): 79. For further remarks on this subject see Parkes (1976): 126, Saenger (1996): 258, 276 and Saenger (2001): 121; Paul Saenger, “Biblical Citation” (2005): 79 n.9.

The graphic device of numbering lines also originated in Oxford, associated primarily with the Oxford friars, as Richard and Mary Rouse and others have demonstrated. A limited number of 13th-century manuscripts containing examples of this practice have survived, the majority being bibles and copies of commentaries on the *Sentences* of Peter Lombard, most or all of them copied in Oxford. One such English 13th-century bible with numbered lines is John Rylands University Library, Manchester, Ms. 474 (420 fols.), which was written around the middle in the 13th century and was at Christ Church, Canterbury in the late-14th through late 15th centuries (ff. Neil Ker). Its text is arranged in double columns and features line-numbering by fives between the columns on fols. 161v-379. Recently another rare example of a 13th-century manuscript featuring numbered lines was offered at auction by Sotheby’s in London, consisting of five leaves from an English ‘pocket’ bible, dated ca. 1250-70 (161 x 106 [108 x 68] mm, 2 cols./45 lines), on one of which leaves, containing the prologue to Daniel, numbering has been added between the columns on every fifth line.

That the graphic format of numbered verses was not more widely adopted in the late Middle Ages can most likely be attributed to the fact that most clerics of the Middle Ages retained the entire Psalter in memory and thus verse numbers were not particularly

---


445 Although previously, Ancient Greek and Roman scribes had occasionally reckoned their output in terms of the number of lines; Paul Saenger, “Biblical Citation” (2005): 79-80; cf. Charles Graux, “Nouvelles recherches sur la stichométrie,” *Revue de la philologie de literature et d'histoire anciennes*, n.s. 2 (1878): 97-143.

446 N.R. Ker argued that the bible was at Christ Church, Canterbury, O.S.B., in the late 14th through late 15th centuries, based on the inscription “Per Iohannem Wodnysbergh” on fol. 297 (late 14th century) and since fols. iii, iv, 421-3 (previously part of the old binding) consist of three fragments of the mortuary roll of William Molashe, prior of Christ Church (d. 19 Feb. 1437-8); see N.R. Ker, *MMBL* III (1983): 466, cf. N.R. Ker, *MLGB* (1964): 37, 241 (Langdon). The bible was purchased by John Rylands Library from the Congregational College, Manchester, in 1976.

447 Although this use of manuscript line numbers generally disappeared in Insular manuscripts over the course of the 14th century, simultaneous with their disappearance across Europe, the graphic numbered verse as a unit of punctuation evolved in the context of Hebrew/Latin diglot Psalters, a characteristically Insular genre of book; Paul Saenger, “Biblical Citation” (2005): 80.

448 Sotheby’s, London, *Medieval & Renaissance Manuscripts* (Sale No. L15240), 7 July 2015, Lot 10; sold for £2,375; the other leaves containing sections from Numbers, Baruch, a prologue to Ezekiel, Ezekiel, each introduced by a 4- or 5-line initial; perhaps from a fragment of 112 leaves sold by Sotheby’s on 23 June 1998, lot 46. Cf. description of the leaves, with images, in the Sotheby’s catalogue online here.
Indeed, many 13th-century bibles and copies of the Biblical postilla did not even provide rubrics to identify Psalm numbers, let alone did they give indication of verse number. Most medieval clerics would have been able to swiftly identify a Psalm from only a few words extracted from its text without much difficulty, and if encountering a fragment of a psalm verse that formed, for example, a lemmata of the postilla of Saint-Cher, it seems fair to say that these clerics would not have found the task of placing this verse in its proper context too challenging.

**iv** Concordances (alphabetical indexing systems for the standard chapter divisions)

By the mid-13th century, an alphabetical indexing system for this standard chapter division had become a common mode of enhancing a learned reader of Latin’s access to a book. It was through the verbal concordance’s adoption of the ‘standardized’ system of chapter-divisions commonly attributed to Stephen Langton and its use in the composition of the *Concordancia* at St. Jacques and popularization through other Dominican tools in the 1230s that a single standard chapter structure really became firmly established and began slowly to replace the numerous and varying structures found in 12th-century bibles. The verbal concordance of the Bible represents perhaps the most “fruitful conjunction” of the new ideas of the 13th century - notion of the whole work, sensible division into chapters, alphabetical arrangement – and their combination produced was indeniably “the finest achievement of 13th-century arrangement”.

The earliest verbal concordances, which constituted highly sophisticated alphabetical dictionaries of persons and subjects occurring within the Latin Vulgate Bible were the fruits of the tireless labors of English Dominican friars, working in Paris and probably also in Britain. These monumental reference tools incorporated astounding quantities of data, and were used for preparing corrections of the Bible’s text, the

---

449 Numbered verses first appeared in printed texts of the late 15th century, but only became normative in early modern Europe within the second half of the 16th century (although they would have proved useful for those seeking to master Hebrew with its perplexing right to left form); see Paul Saenger, “Biblical Citation” (2005): 104-110, 110-111; cf. also Saenger (1996) and (1999): passim.

450 Paul Saenger, “Biblical Citation” (2005): 111.

451 Eusebius’ canon tables and the marginal concordances in the Gospels, common to bibles from Late Antiquity on, disappeared in the early 13th century then they were made redundant by the concordance. See M.A. & R.H. Rouse, “Statim invenire…” (1991): 214-15.

composition of theological treatises and the preparation of sermons.\textsuperscript{453} In Paris, the Dominican concordances were usually used to refer to the graphically numbered chapters of each chapter, ‘A’-‘G’.\textsuperscript{454} Beginning in the mid-13\textsuperscript{th} century, a few Parisian university scholars, almost all Dominican and Franciscan friars, used the same mode of citation, frequently in \textit{correctoria} and occasionally in theological treatises, to refer to Biblical passages.\textsuperscript{455}

These precocious English scholars of the 13\textsuperscript{th} century were also conspicuously active in the development and use of the alphabetical systems for indexing standard chapter division.\textsuperscript{456} The production and adoption of these new marginal alphabets - principally begun in England very early in the 13\textsuperscript{th} century, both in Latin Vulgate Bibles and in Biblical commentaries incorporating the apposite extracts of the Vulgate’s text - created, in the British Isles, for the first time what Saenger calls “A convenient, precise and entirely visual mode of citation for the Latin Vulgate.”\textsuperscript{457}

Although the compilation of the earliest version of the verbal concordance was already being attributed to Hugh of Saint-Cher by the early 14\textsuperscript{th} century,\textsuperscript{458} the principals in the development of the ‘second’ Bible concordance, later referred to as the \textit{Concordantie Anglicaenan} (which referred to seven alphabetical divisions of each chapter) were the English Dominicans, Richard of Stavensby and John of Darlington.\textsuperscript{459} A series of 14\textsuperscript{th}-century

\begin{itemize}
\item\textsuperscript{453} An excellent example of which is Newberry Library, Chicago, Ms. 179a verbal concordance (third version of the Dominicans), copied ca. 1300, reprod. in Saenger (2005): Pl. 1, reprod. fol. 193r.
\item\textsuperscript{455} Paul Saenger, “Biblical Citation” (2005): 78.
\item\textsuperscript{456} Paul Saenger, “The British Isles and the Origin of the Modern Mode of Biblical Citation,” \textit{Syntagma} 1 (2005): 77-123 & Pls. 1-8; esp. 91-97 (on 13\textsuperscript{th}-century bibles, 91-96; on the \textit{Manipulus flororum}, 95-6) and Pls. 1, 3 & 4; cf. 78-80, 81-87 [here, 78-9].
\item\textsuperscript{457} Paul Saenger, “Biblical Citation” (2005): 78-79; cf. Saenger (1999), although Saenger himself states that his remarks published in his 2005 article both complement and supersede those expressed in his 1999 publication (Saenger 2005: 79 n.10).
\item\textsuperscript{458} Ptolemy of Lucca was, in the early 14\textsuperscript{th} century, the first to attribute the ‘first draft’ of the concordance to Hugh of Saint-Cher (he says that Hugh “primus concordantius super bibliam cum suis fratibus advenit”); cf. comments of R.H. and M.A. Rouse on Hugh’s role in the compilation of the first concordance, “The Verbal Concordance” (1974): 7-8.
\item\textsuperscript{459} In fact both R.H. & M.A. Rouse and Saenger note that there exists more medieval textual evidence linking the verbal concordance with its chapter and alphabet references to Englishmen than to Hugh of Saint-Cher. It was Louis de Valladolid, a Spanish Dominican who taught in Paris, who, in the early 15\textsuperscript{th} century, was the first to credit the fully confected concordance - i.e. the second version - to Stavensby, referring to it as the \textit{Concordantie Anglicaenan} (while at the same time ‘seconding’ de Lucca’s attribution of the concordance’s ‘first draft’ to Hugh). Indeed Stavensby is the only specific compiler acknowledged in the

Scholarly texts produced in Paris - indeed, in France - in the 13\textsuperscript{th}-century rarely featured these alphabetical reference systems for the subdivisions of chapters.\footnote{In fact Saenger argues that the “first and only” reference work composed in Paris to incorporate marginal graphic alphabets as an integral part of its *mise en texte* was the work of an Insular master of theology, Thomas of Ireland,” whose hand has been identified by Richard Rouse as revealing “indisputably English” characteristics. Paul Saenger, “Biblical Citation” (2005): 95-6; for an analysis of Thomas of Ireland’s hand, arguing for its exhibition of “English” characteristics, see R.H. & M.A. Rouse, *Preachers, florilegia and sermons* (1979): 94, 97-8 and pls. 2, 3, 6. For further examples of contemporary English scholars see Paul Saenger, “Biblical Citation” (2005): 87-91 on the role of Thomas Gallus; and Beryl Smalley, “Thomas Waleys O.P.,” *Archivum fratrum praedicatorum* 24 (1954): 50-107.} The French Dominican Estienne de Bourbon, working in Lyon between 1250-61, cited the Bible by book, chapter and letter and incorporated marginal alphabets in his celebrated treatise, but the Parisian scribes who recopied his text did not understand his marginal apparatus and failed to reproduce it accurately.\footnote{Robert Branner dated the bible to before 1256 (Branner 1977: 207-8) although Saenger argues that the textual argument offered by Branner to sustain this date “is speculative at best” (Saenger 2005: 91 n.69).} In the Great Bible of Saint Jacques (BnF, Paris, Mss. Lat. 16719-21), which likely dates from the period 1260-70,\footnote{Although the bible does contain a few marginal cross references to book, chapter and letter; see BnF, Paris, Ms. Lat. 16721, fols. 166v and 172r, noted in Paul Saenger, “Biblical Citation” (2005): 91 n.69.} the book and chapter divisions were graphically delimited\footnote{The manuscripts of Estienne de Bourbon, see Jacques Berlioz, “Le Tractatus de diversis materiis praedicabilibus,” in *École Nationale des Chartes: Positions de thèses* (1977): 25-33 [31-2]; Paul Saenger, “Biblical Citation” (2005): 92 (Berlioz reference noted at n.70).} and contained no marginal alphabets; instead its references to alphabetical letters demanded the reader’s mental judgment.\footnote{Paul Saenger, “Biblical Citation” (2005): 91-2.} This absence may be seen as characteristic of the larger picture of French bible production in the 13\textsuperscript{th} century; despite the fact that the Dominicans’ concordance of the 13\textsuperscript{th} century had been widely adopted by the late 15\textsuperscript{th} century and was regularly included in the margins of contemporary printed Bibles, graphic letters similar to those in the printed tomes were never placed in the margins of 13\textsuperscript{th}-century Parisian Bibles.\footnote{See J.P.P. Martin (1890): 60; noted in Paul Saenger, “Biblical Citation” (2005): 91 & n.68 (91).}
In was in England, very early in the 13th century, that the mental system of alphabetical subdistinctions became graphic, both in Latin Vulgate Bibles and in Biblical commentaries incorporating the apposite extracts of the Vulgate’s texts.467 Numerous bibles of English origin and provenance contain these marginal alphabet reference systems, including examples which contain these kinds of cross-references to book, chapter and letter but do not contain the actual marginal alphabets.468 Furthermore, in addition to their inclusion of marginal concordances, English bibles contained supplementary tabular concordances to the Gospels with far greater frequency than did Parisian copies.469 These Insular tables frequently refer to book, chapter and letter, which surely made them useful to scholars composing treatises or sermons. These alphabetical references included in English bibles were rendered more useful still by supplemental dictionaries of Hebrew names and by other tables that indicated liturgical readings.470

Paul Saenger has recently argued that between the 12th and 15th centuries, the British Isles served as “Europe’s principal theatre for innovations in graphic Latin, producing books with page formats that were particularly conducive to direct visible

467 Paul Saenger, “Biblical Citation” (2005): 79-80.
468 Paul Saenger, “Biblical Citation” (2005): 94. Two fine examples of 13th-century English bibles which contain cross-references to book, chapter and letter but lack marginal alphabets are St. John’s College, Cambridge, Ms. I.28/224 (323 fols., 200 x 152 mm, 2 cols./59 lines) and Ms. N.1/239 (408 fols., 255 x 180 mm, 2 cols./48 lines); for fuller descriptions of both bibles, see M.R. James, A Descriptive Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Library of St. John’s College, Cambridge (Cambridge: CUP, 1913): 257-8 (Ms. I.28) and 277-8 (Ms. N.1).
470 Liturgical readings “according to the use of Salisbury and general content”; Paul Saenger, “Biblical Citation” (2005): 95. For an example of this kind of table of liturgical readings in a 13th-century English Bible cf. ibid. pl. 4 (Urbana, University of Illinois, Ms. 4135, reprod. fol. 2r).
access to the contents of codices.”

Perhaps the most significant medieval Insular innovation for the purposes of this study was the English use of graphic alphabets - employed in the system of alphabetical sub-distinctions of the 13th-century Verbal Concordance - for accessing portable bibles. In the same article Saenger boldly asserts that 13th-century bibles that feature these graphic marginal alphabets to divide chapters “all originate from outside Paris.”

Saenger illustrates his thesis by highlighting six examples of 13th-century portable bibles which were all made in England (or “reflect an English ambiance”): BnF, Paris, Ms. lat. 10419; Oriel College, Oxford, Ms. 77; Urbana University Library, Ms. 4135; Perth, Museum & Art Gallery, Ms. 462; British Library, London, Ms. Harley 1748; Christie’s, London, ‘Sale of the Library of William Foyle,’ 11 July 2000, lot 11. Of his

---

471 This process of introducing standardized textual segments continued throughout Europe into the 17th century (Saenger, “Biblical Citation” [2005]: 79, 81). Saenger aims “to readdress the question of the impact of Gutenberg’s invention on the structure of the page and the reading of books” - given the fact that “In the place of a simple dichotomy between impenetrable pre-1500 handwritten codices and readily accessible printed tomes, it is now clear that the manuscript volume and its pages underwent enormous alteration long before printing entered on the scene” - and “to place the changes wrought by printing into the context of the regional evolution of graphic Latin in the Middle Ages.” (Saenger, “Biblical Citation” [2005]: 79, 77).

472 Adelaide Bennett’s 1973 doctoral thesis on Princeton University, Ms. Garrett 28 remains one of the best studies on the distinguishing characteristics of bibles produced in England during the 13th century. In her thesis, Bennett considers the Garrett bible within the context of the textual features of 13th-century English bibles, their inclusion of double psalters, and defining characteristics of the programs of decoration and illumination visible in surviving examples In Adelaide Bennett (“The Place of Garrett 28 in Thirteenth-Century Illumination,” unpubl. PhD thesis, Columbia University, 1973), for discussion of the distinguishing characteristics of the text of 13th-century English bibles produced in England during the 13th century see 45-63 and Appendix I (307-12), listing the external criteria of English Bibles in the 13th century (order of their books, Appendix LA (308); on their prologues, Appendix LB-C (309-112). With particular reference to duplex psalters in English bibles of the 13th-century, see discussion of their text (64-113), their initials (165-187) and for a list of double psalters of Hieronymian versions, see Appendix II (313-332). For Bennett’s discussion of ‘English-style’ decoration and illumination in 13th-century bibles, see passim, but esp. 260-303 (Ch. VI) and 188-220 (Ch. IV); in particular see 261-2, 270, 282-3.

473 It is uncommon to find these marginal alphabet reference systems in contemporary Parisian bibles; Paul Saenger, “Biblical Citation” (2005): 92, 94 [94].

474 Paul Saenger, “Biblical Citation” (2005): 93 and n.76; Saenger also identifies two further examples, which are perhaps continental: Liège, Musée d’art religieux et d’art mosan, olm Grand Seminaire 7.D.11; the second at the University Library of Louvain (92, n.72).

475 Also possibly Birmingham, University Library, Ms. 6/iii/26, a copy of the Old Testament written in the mid-13th century (321 fols., 143 x 97 [112 x 75] mm, 2 cols./46-52 lines, written in several hands) which has marginal cross references to letters, but, suggests Saenger, “perhaps not the letters themselves”; Paul Saenger, “Biblical Citation” (2005): 93 n.76. For further details see N.R. Ker MMBL II (1977): 85-6; Ker describes the marginal references thus: “There are many nearly contemporary references in the margins, often a dozen or more on one page, to other books of the Bible by chapter and letter, for example at Genesis 31:7 “N 14 d. Job 19 a” (Numbers 14:22, Job 19:3).” [87].
six examples of English bibles, Saenger highlights two (BnF, Paris, Ms. lat. 10419 and Oriel College, Oxford, Ms. 77) as particularly important in confirming that the alphabets began in England at the same time as and in close proximity to the adaptation of the new and still evolving chapter divisions.

Although BnF, Paris, Ms. lat. 10419 (240 x 165 mm, 380 fols.) includes a colophon dating and localizing the bible’s Italian origin (“Completa Florentiae manu mei Franc. / Stroczae An.D.M.CCLXIII [1263]”), Paul Saenger has persuasively argued that this bible was instead made in England, referring to it unambiguously as “definitely English…copied, possibly at Oxford, before ca. 1230.” His attribution of English provenance is based upon several features in the presentation and arrangement of the bible’s text which are characteristically English, including the variance in its chapter division of the Song of Songs, which is the same as the text employed by Thomas Gallus for his commentary and conforms to the Insular version of Langton’s chapters. Indeed, one of the features identified by Saenger in this bible which contributes to his calling this copy “of peculiar interest,” is the fact that the fully confected presence of graphic alphabets and the precise demarcation of the seven parts of each chapter appear to be unique to this codex among all 13th-century bibles with marginal letters. The scribe who copied the bible’s rubrics added the alphabets in red ink throughout the Bibles, and also designated (with a red superscript sign of two points) the precise point of division between the septants of each chapter. It certainly seems likely that such a rigorous division would have been more useful to a monk or friar compiling a concordance than to

476 Contains the IHN (fols. 1-19r). On BnF, Paris, Ms. lat. 10419, see François Avril & Patricia Stirnemann, \textit{Manuscrits enluminés d'origine insulaire VII-XXe siècle} (Paris: BnF, 1987): 69 (no. 110); Laffitte, \textit{Bulletin du Bibliophile} 2 (1989): 310; entry for BnF, Ms. Lat. 10419 in \textit{Gallica}, the BnF’s online catalogue (available \url{here}).
478 The BnF acquired Ms. Lat. 10419 as part of 44 manuscripts from the library of Pope Pius VI (Giovanni-Angelo Braschi, d. 29 August 1799) ca. 1797; see bible’s entry in \textit{Gallica}, the BnF’s online catalogue (available \url{here}).
479 The BnF catalogue ascribes the bible an Italian origin (“Bible écrite à Florence en 1263”); see entry for BnF, Ms. Lat. 10419 in \textit{Gallica}, the BnF’s online catalogue (available \url{here});
480 Paul Saenger, “Biblical Citation” (2005): 92-3 & pl. 3 (reprod. fol. 353r).
481 Paul Saenger, “Biblical Citation” (2005): 92-3 [92]; on Thomas Gallus and his employment of Langton’s system of chapter divisions see \textit{ibid.}: 87-91.
482 Paul Saenger, “Biblical Citation” (2005): 93.
483 Although Saenger notes that in a few of the books in BnF, Ms. Lat. 10419, the process of introducing Langton’s system of chaptering is incomplete; Paul Saenger, “Biblical Citation” (2005): 92.
a reader seeking to verify a specific reference (whether consulting a concordance or a treatise containing chapter and letter citations).\textsuperscript{484}

Oriel College, Oxford, Ms. 77, copied at the very end of the 13th century, is another English bible which was evidently conceived in a similar textual format, i.e. with original marginal alphabets throughout.\textsuperscript{485} It too contains the early, Insular form of Langton’s chapter divisions, as well as alternative pre-Langton chaptering schemes, its alphabets added by the rubricator who added an early form of Langton’s chapter divisions in the margins.\textsuperscript{486} It is surely suggestive, if not outright significant, that the only surviving Bibles of a genre that logically must have served as tools for the preparation of the Dominican concordances were both English.\textsuperscript{487}

In several of the other English 13th-century bibles with graphic marginal alphabets Saenger identifies, “which all appear to date from after 1230,” the alphabets are not meticulously placed by a rubricator as they were in BnF, Ms. Lat 10419 and Oriel College Ms. 77, but rather “give the impression of being added after the initial confection of the codex, to aid the reader, rather than the compiler of the concordance.”\textsuperscript{488} Indeed, out of the corpus of 13th-century bibles examined by Saenger (and by myself), the alphabets have been added only in portions of the codex, usually including the Gospels and Epistles as well as sections of the Pentateuch and the Prophets.\textsuperscript{489} Several examples have not only marginal letters but marginal concordances providing cross-references to book, chapter, and letter.

\textsuperscript{484} Paul Saenger, “Biblical Citation” (2005): 92-3 [93].
\textsuperscript{485} Oriel College Ms. 77 contains 359 fols. and numerous additional texts; for bibliographical description (in Latin) and further details of bible’s contents see entry in Henry O. Coxe, ‘Codices MSS. Collegii Orielensis’ in Catalogus Codicum MSS. Qui in Collegiis Aulis Oxoniensibus hodie adservantur (Oxford: OUP, 1852): I, 27 (no. LXXVII: “Biblia Sacra Universa, ex editione vulgata, S. Hieronymi prologis instructa’, sec. xiii. ineuntis, binis columnis optime exaratus et ornatus; coll. Oriel. ex dono Roberti Pierrepont 1599, postea comiti de Kingston). Oriel College’s medieval manuscripts (including Ms. 77) are now on deposit at The Bodleian Library, Oxford.
\textsuperscript{486} Although the bible’s alphabets were not completed; see Paul Saenger, “Biblical Citation” (2005): 93; also noted in Parkes (1976): 126.
\textsuperscript{487} Paul Saenger, “Biblical Citation” (2005): 93.
\textsuperscript{488} Paul Saenger, “Biblical Citation” (2005): 93.
\textsuperscript{489} Paul Saenger, “Biblical Citation” (2005): 93-4.
The Changes in the circumstances of bible production from the 12th to 13th centuries

Alas, our knowledge of the circumstances under which portable bibles were produced and of the persons involved is neither as full nor as detailed as one might wish, despite the encyclopedic and ever-useful tomes on 13th-century Parisian manuscript production published by scholars such as Robert Branner and Richard and Mary Rouse. Frustratingly few of the surviving manuscripts offer any evidence of their early provenance, and even those bibles with known or identifiable provenances do not significantly inform our understanding of these ‘big picture’ circumstances of these bibles’ production, for a good deal of the provenance information to be found in 13th-century portable bibles often narrates neither their origin nor the circumstances of these bibles’ production but rather their later destination, and thus informs our understanding of the history of these bibles’ distribution rather than that of their production.

Such a situation is in contrast to the previous century. For 12th-century bibles, “Codicological facts about paleography, ruling practices, type and quality of vellum, textual exemplars, decoration and miniatures can be marshaled together to localize or group plain and luxury bibles and other texts” (for example to Durham, Bury St. Edmunds, Canterbury, Rochester St Albans or Winchester). Such manuscripts are usually the products of monastic or episcopal scriptoria which were all-inclusive workshops involving both scribes and illuminators. That professional scribes and illuminators were hired to work in a sedentary scriptorium is, as Michael Gullick has definitively shown, a well-documented fact of the 12th century.

The situation in the 13th century is much more difficult to assess. In particular, our efforts to group or localize bibles are seriously hindered by our incomplete understanding

---

491 For example, Adelaide Bennett suggested in her discussion of two English bibles that share a similar decorative style and, argues Bennett, a shared artist (Princeton, Garrett Ms. 28 and CCCC Ms. 484) may possibly have been produced in an all-purpose shop, employing different scribes side-by-side with illuminators and catering to different specifications of patrons, although neither bible offers any evidence of their early provenance. (A. Bennett 1972: 51-53 [51]).
492 A. Bennett (1972): 51-53 [51].
493 For example, as witnessed in N.R. Ker’s approach in English Manuscripts in the Century after the Norman conquest (Oxford, 1960).
494 See Gullick (1998); A. Bennett (1972): 51-53 [51-52].
of the exact nature of the relationship between the writing-shop which may have been a scriptorium (monastic or episcopal) or librarium-shop and the painting-shop which may be sedentary or itinerant. This problem has been further exacerbated by scholarly neglect of codicological features from the early stages of manuscript production, as Adelaide Bennett emphasized.

A further complication is that patronage underwent significant modification in both methods and personnel during the 13th century. In the 12th century, luxury bibles were made for the needs and regarded as treasures of claustral or episcopal institutions, but by the 13th century, there seems to have been a growing trend toward private proprietorship of manuscripts by the more important dignitaries (bishops and abbots) as well as less illustrious figures (friar provincials or lectors, deans and chancellors) and their ranks were swelled by users and owners of bibles who are not witnessed previously (friars, monks, canons and masters). Furthermore, 13th-century bible users were, as a group, more mobile than in the previous century, and although they probably often kept their bibles for a lifetime, but [they] were probably not [necessarily] kept in one place; ecclesiastics and secular authority figures who escalated to higher positions usually changed locations, and prior to their permanent deposits, bibles changed hands more frequently and more often through unrecorded transactions than in previous centuries. Finally libraries were often enriched by gifts rather than directly from scriptoria or shops, and in ensuing centuries, many manuscripts were removed from original libraries.

While these various factors frustrate attempts to recount the history of portable bible production in the 13th century they help to explain the anonymity of so many of the surviving copies. Let us now turn to consider these factors - concerning the places,
peoples and circumstances of the production of bibles during the 13th century - in greater detail.
Biblical production in the 13th century is characterized by the development of two kinds of books, each completely different from the other in both their format and their intended use. These are: the glossed bible, composed of numerous large-size volumes that circulated not only as a long set of volumes making up a complete Bible but also as individual books or groups of books; and the ‘portable’ bible, consisting of a single small volume, copies of which were disseminated throughout Europe in their thousands. It was, in fact, only at this time (as of around the second quarter of the 13th century) that such a structure which one might call unity, was beginning to circulate in the Christian West; as Laura Light puts it, “Pour la première fois, au XIIIe siècle, on a créé des Bibles qui apparemment se conforment à une idée précise de ce que devrait être matériellement une Bible.” The ‘portable bible’ constitutes the most striking manifestation of this phenomenon.

Although scholars have hitherto studied portable bibles for their decoration and their text, the physical characteristics of this type of book and the techniques used to make them have been, until recently, mostly overlooked. However, these innovative features are the very elements that can highlight the production mechanisms of the codex.

---


504 Light (1984): 93; Cf. ibid., 79-82, esp. 79-80, on “les caractéristiques extérieures de ces Bibles [du XIIIe siècle]”.

505 “Ce n’est qu’à cette période, en effet, qu’une telle structure, qu’on peut appeler monolithique, se généralise dans le monde chrétien occidental et la manifestation la plus frappante de la mutation est constituée par la ‘bible portative’,” (Ruzzier 2011: 74)

The Production of Portable Bibles; The 13th-Century Socio-Cultural Context

The Rise of the Universities and the Early Professional Book Trade

The secular book trade in western Europe is well documented in the 13th century. By the mid-12th century, professional scribes and illuminators were beginning to set up commercial and urban businesses independent of monasteries, and by around 1250, most manuscripts were being made not in monasteries or churches, but by professional craftsmen in urban workshops.507 Thus by the turn of the 13th century the monastic scriptoria were being replaced by secular workshops as the primary locations in which books where written, illustrated and illuminated, both to the order of patrons and for the open market.508 Such workshops supplied both the texts specific to the university and the basic works of reference for scholars’ private libraries. There were probably professional workshops at Bologna509 and Oxford510 by about 1200 and at Sens and possibly at Troyes in France even earlier.511 However the most important and best-documented early professional book trade was that in Paris,512 mainly, but not exclusively, thanks to the

507 This said, religious houses had long since institutionalized the practice of employing professional lay scribes and other artisans of the medieval book, either to produce books for them outright, or – usually in the case of professional illuminators and sometimes scribes - to finish or embellish books that the monks had themselves already partially completed ‘in-house’, and this practice continued throughout the Middle Ages. M. A. Michael, “Urban production of manuscript books and the role of the university towns,” in CHBB II (2008): 168-94 [169]. On professional scribes see Gullick in EMS.


509 After Paris, Bologna was undoubtedly the second most important city in Europe for the production of books in the 13th century. The city’s university was probably older than that of Paris, and it reigned supreme throughout the universities of Europe for the study of law, although Bologna was also prominent in the production of one-volume bibles and textbooks with pecia marks in Europe at this time. “Sometimes the manuscripts themselves still contain discreet notes in the margins where the scribe has jotted down the number of the pecia being copied, which is clear and satisfying evidence of a book being made in a university context.” (De Hamel 2010: 10).

510 In England, lay centers of book production grew around the emerging university centres, first at Oxford in the late 12th century and a little later, less actively, at Cambridge, but also around the law courts of London and St. Paul’s cathedral. (M.A. Michael, “Urban production of manuscript books and the role of the university towns,” in CHBB II (2008): 168-94 [169]).


emerging university in that city, which had been formed into a legally distinct corporation by about 1215, attracting students and literate laity from all over Europe.\footnote{De Hamel notes that although it is very easy “to look back with hindsight on Paris at the beginning of the 13th century and to imagine emerging booksellers commissioning manuscripts and selling them to students”; nevertheless, “the picture is not so simple, or so modern. The circulation of books preceded the evolution of the book trade. Manuscripts were always costly to make and therefore had a resale value, but buying a second-hand book from a fellow student or from his dispersed effects is not at all the same as purchasing a ready-made new manuscript from a professional bookseller.” (De Hamel 1994: 116; cf. M.B. Parkes, “The provision of books”, in \textit{HUO II} (1992): 407–83. As Michael points out, the types of book that were required by the university centers for the various faculties, canon and civil law, philosophy, theology and arts, were, in fact, rarely copied in monastic centers at this time. M. A. Michael, “Urban production of manuscript books and the role of the university towns,” in \textit{CHBB II} (2008): 168-94 [169-70].}

Although it is difficult to identify anything that we would now call a university in Paris before 1200, we may confidently identify the origins of the university of Paris as it later became in the intellectual climate centered around the lectures and teaching of the masters at the cathedral schools located in the precincts of the cathedral of Notre-Dame, at the church of Ste-Geneviève and at the abbey of St-Victor; the forerunners of the university.\footnote{The best work on the study of the Bible in the medieval universities remains Beryl Smalley, \textit{The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages}, 3rd ed. (Notre Dame, Indiana: Notre Dame UP, 1964/78): on the Monastic and Cathedral Schools, 37-82 (on the Carolingian revival, 37-46; the Gloss, 46-66; and the Quaestio, 66-82); on The Victorines, 83-111 (on Hugh of St. Victor see 83-97, and on Hugh as Exegete, 97-106); and on Andrew of St. Victor, 112-95 (including section on Andrew’s pupil, Herbert of Bosham: 186-195). Other excellent general studies include Beryl Smalley, “The Bible in the Medieval Schools” in \textit{CHBB II} (Cambridge: CUP, 1969): 197-220; and William J. Courtenay, “The Bible in medieval universities,” in \textit{The New CHB II}, Eds. Richard Marsden & E. Ann Matter (Cambridge: CUP, 2012): 555-78.} It was here that the ‘Masters of the Sacred Page’ including Hugh of St-Victor (d.1141) and Peter Abelard (d.1142) taught in the first half of the 12th century,\footnote{For discussion of ‘The Masters of the Sacred Page’ see Beryl Smalley, \textit{The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages}, 3rd ed. (Notre Dame, Indiana: Notre Dame UP, 1964/78): 196-263; cf. \textit{ibid} on the friars, 264-355. On the Gospels in the Paris Schools in the late 12th and early 13th centuries, see Beryl Smalley, \textit{The Gospel in the Schools c.1100-c.1280} (London: The Hambledon Press, 1985): 99-197 [including sections on Peter the Chanter, 101-118; Hugh of St. Cher and Alexander of Hales considered first together [118-124] then individually - Hugh: 125-143, Alexander: 144-171 - and finally on John of La Rochelle, 171-189]; on the Gospels in the Schools c.1250-c.1280 see \textit{ibid}: 201-71 [including sections on Bonaventure, 201-13; John of Wales, 213-27; John Pecham, 227-41; Albert the Great, 241-56; Thomas Aquinas, 257-71]; cf. \textit{ibid.} also on “An Early Paris Lecture Course on St. Luke”, 85-97. See also Lesley Smith, \textit{Masters of the Sacred Page: Manuscripts of Theology in the Latin West to 1274} (Notre Dame IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2001).} followed by the masters working in and around the cathedral schools in the 12th and 13th centuries,\footnote{As De Hamel notes, in considering this group of authors and masters, we are certainly “faced with a formidable senior common room”; Christopher de Hamel, \textit{A History of Illuminated Manuscripts}. 2nd ed. (London: Phaidon Press, 1994): 111.} including Peter Lombard (bishop of Paris 1158-d.1160), Peter the Chanter (d.1197), Peter of Poitiers (d. ca.1215) and Stephen Langton (d.1228).\footnote{Beryl Smalley, \textit{The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages}, 3rd ed. (Notre Dame, Indiana: Notre Dame UP,
From various sources we know a fair amount about the personnel of the book trade in Paris around 1300.\textsuperscript{518} The growth of the university had brought into new prominence the trade of bookseller or \textit{librarii} (laymen although technically clerics in minor orders) who were both dealers in secondhand volumes and entrepreneurs of new volumes.\textsuperscript{519} Although the university certainly exercised considerable control over the book trade in 13\textsuperscript{th}-century Paris, ostensibly to prevent over-charging and exploitation of a market on which scholarship depended,\textsuperscript{520} these \textit{librarii} played a crucial role in the contemporary production of middle-sized and small Latin bibles.\textsuperscript{521}

Location was key.\textsuperscript{522} The \textit{libraires} and members of related trades were concentrated in two locations. Second-hand books could be bought, and new manuscripts could be commissioned from Paris’ booksellers, or \textit{libraires}, the majority of whom were to be found established in the Rue neuve Notre Dame, a short street on the Île de la Cité (a neighborhood within easy reach of the cathedral church of Notre Dame and the royal and Episcopal palaces).\textsuperscript{523} However the actual production of manuscripts was

\textsuperscript{518} De Hamel (1994): 137; cf. 108-38.


\textsuperscript{520} From 1275, as far as we know, the Parisian \textit{librarii} were required to swearing oaths of obedience to the university authorities, against the security of a bond of 100 \textit{livres}, to deal honestly with used volumes, not to overcharge customers and in the case of new books, to keep correct exemplars and to submit them for inspection limiting the profits which they might make in the buying and selling of books. No one except a sworn bookseller, however, could legally practice his trade in Paris, apart from market traders offering used books valued at no more than 30 \textit{sous} and there were also strict regulations governing the hiring out of \textit{peciae}. For discussion see Branner (1977): 9-10; J.J.G. Alexander, \textit{Medieval Illuminators and their Methods of Work} (New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 1992): 22-3; De Hamel (2010): ?; cf. de Hamel (1994): 2. Cf. H. Demille-E. Châtelain, \textit{Chartularium universitatis Parisiensis}. 4 vols. (Paris: ex typis fratrum Delalain, 1889-97): I [1200-1286], no. 462 [532-4]

\textsuperscript{521} Indeed Branner went so far as to argue that the \textit{librarii} had “a near-monopoly” on the production of pocket and portable bibles (Branner 1977: 10).


subcontracted to the parchmenters, scribes and illuminators, who mostly lived on the Left Bank, in the rue des Ecrivains and the rue Erembourg de Brie, both in the parish of St-Séverin beside the rue St-Jacques. The commercial book trade of late medieval Paris was therefore a cooperative, collaborative enterprise in which neighborhood and family both played crucial roles.

The rising demand for books from the early 13th century onwards was the result of the fact that a great many texts were essential to the everyday functioning of late medieval society, from liturgical books (which were used in every church and chapel) and legal books (required for the administration of justice and the study of the law), to books for the university curriculum and bibles which were needed at universities and colleges, in addition to vernacular poetry and literature (which “was widely read or listened to by wealthy and aristocratic lay patrons”).

There was also a growing demand for luxury books and higher quality copies and books were increasingly being produced whose primary function was as luxury commodities, intended to serve as gifts or as symbols of status rather than as tools for study, teaching or learning.

---

524 No fewer than 58 booksellers and 68 parchmenters are known by name from 13th-century Paris, many of their names recorded in documentary sources such as taxation records, at least before 1307, when registered booksellers secured exemption from the taille, or royal tax. However the names of very few scribes have come down to us; De Hamel comments that “Probably they were very often students making books for their own use or supplementing their allowances with extra pocket money.” (De Hamel [1994]: 137).

525 Since this location was within the vicinity of the colleges, halls and teaching centers of the university of Paris (including the Sorbonne, the Dominican priory of St-Jacques, the church of Ste-Genevieve, the central meeting hall of the Mathurins, etc.) these bookmen were particularly, although not exclusively, involved in serving the needs of the students and masters in the schools; certainly, the development of such professional groups of book-craftsmen was of tremendous value to the religious establishments of the area (especially St-Victor but also Ste.-Geneviève, St.-Maur des Fossés and St.-Germain des Prés). Cf. Branner (1977): 7-9.


527 M.A. Michael, “Urban production of manuscript books and the role of the university towns,” in *CHBB* II (2008): 168. For excellent studies of the variety of books produced at this time, together with their different audiences and uses, see de Hamel, “Books and Society” in *CHBB* II (2008): 3-21 and for more detailed consideration of these users, see ibid., A History of Illuminated Manuscripts (1994): passim.

528 Books were considered valuable gifts and played a central role in the act of gift-giving throughout the Middle Ages: scholars donated books to institutions and libraries at which they had studied or taught, wealthy landowners ensured that their families were remembered for posterity through the daily use of
The rise of the university in Paris, and the resultant profit that this afforded the technically university-controlled *libraires*, through hiring out texts to university students, were clearly crucial factors in inspiring and nurturing the growth of the commercial book trade during the period. Furthermore, the presence of the king and his court clearly played a major role in stimulating the commercial production and sale of expensive books, particularly during the reign of St. Louis (1226-70), through attracting wealthy patrons of the arts and potential customers to the French capital in greater numbers than any other city in Europe.


“Although it may be argued that books were a luxury, possessed by few, they had both a symbolic and ritual meaning that cut across social barriers and that needs interpretation beyond their obvious function,” M.A. Michael, “Urban production of manuscript books and the role of the university towns,” in *CHBB II* (2008): 169.


See Branner (1977): passim (esp. 1, 6); and Rouses (2000): I, 51-71; II and Appendix 2A-G [152-55].


most part were expected to provide their own, De Hamel has argued that 13th-century Paris witnessed “considerable business in manuscript decorating for the student market,” and we do find surviving evidence in which we see students commissioning expensive illuminated textbooks, perhaps most infamously the lad who went off to study at the university of Paris and spent his father’s generous allowance on purchasing books with initials “filled with baboons (“babuinare de literis aureis”).

However this growing demand for luxury books was coming from others besides royal or ecclesiastical patrons and students. It is now clear to us that the early book trade, especially in Paris, Oxford and Bologna, was not only catering for an academic market but also had a local clientele that was both lower and higher than the university in the hierarchy of customers, for the principal university towns were a focus not merely for students, but also for royal and ecclesiastical administrators, wealthy aristocratic families, and communities of urban friars.

Most important of all the members of the early book trade’s local clientele were the friars. The Dominican and Franciscan convents in Paris, Bologna, and Oxford


De Hamel suggests that this evidence is witnessed in the corpus of manuscripts Branner ascribes to the Parisian ateliers, amongst which were “all sorts of books a student would need. Students with a hundred pounds to spend could acquire marvellous copies.” (De Hamel 1994: 127).

The story is recounted by a Bolognese lawyer, Odofredo (d.1265) (De Hamel 1994: 108). Its humor notwithstanding, the incident does permit a serious observation, in that it would have been impossible for a private individual to commission textbooks and have them expensively illuminated a century earlier Thus the displeasure of the youth’s father at his son’s actions certainly demonstrates a sign of the times, for not only did he resent the frivolous squandering of the allowance he had given his son (and at a hundred pounds a year, a generous allowance at that), but adding insult to injury, the young scoundrel had wasted the money in a way that he could not understand, for it was still a comparatively new possibility and thus to the father, probably seemed a new-fangled ‘craze’.

Located “At the bottom of the hierarchy...this is not insulting: they would ask to be there.” (De Hamel 2010: 43-44).
were among the largest and oldest in Europe, and it is increasingly clear that the inspiration, format, and extraordinary success of the portable bibles were due to their patronage. Friars were mendicants, travelling and preaching in public, therefore their books had to be small and portable. Thus the book trade witnessed the rapid development of a distinctive class of manuscripts of appropriate texts in response to these needs, such as sermon collections, theological *florilegia*, treatises on virtues and vices, and guides to confession. In them came forth the direct ancestors of the 13th-century bible as a small, portable book.

There are huge numbers of extant 13th- and 14th-century manuscripts from the university towns of Europe.\footnote{Apart from those made in Paris and Bologna, there are recognizably university books attributable to Montpellier, Toulouse, Oxford, and Padua, and later to Cambridge, Erfurt, and elsewhere.} Those from Paris include many texts of scholastic theology and biblical commentary\footnote{Among these are works by the great Dominican masters (such as Hugh of St-Cher, d.1263, Thomas Aquinas, d.1274, and Albertus Magnus, d.1280), and the Franciscans, including Bonaventure (d.1274), Duns Scotus (d.1308), and Nicholas of Lyra (d.1349). There were also textbooks of mathematics and science, especially new Latin versions of Aristotle, derived from medieval translations into Arabic. (De Hamel 2010)} and manuscripts from Bologna included books of Roman law, both secular and religious, often with extensive commentaries.\footnote{The corpus of civil law was centered on the late Roman legal codes of Justinian and its various imperial supplements. Canon law included huge compilations of papal or episcopal letters known as decretals, of which the best-known collections circulated under the names of Popes Gregory IX (1234), Boniface VIII (1298), and Clement V (1317). (De Hamel 2010) For an excellent recent study of the scribes and craftsmen of the early book trade in Bologna, see Giovanna Murano, *Copisti a Bologna* (1265-1270). Textes et études du Moyen Age 37 (Turnhout, Belgium; Brepols, 2006).} However these ‘university manuscripts’ may broadly be classified as usually being, for the most part, large, chunky volumes.\footnote{These university manuscripts were generally “Written on brownish parchment in highly compressed and abbreviated book-hands, decorated with simple trailing initials in red and blue, and with wide margins crammed with readers’ notes and glosses. Some have small sparkling illuminations, evidently by professional artists.” De Hamel (2010A): 43-44.} On the other hand, the new books produced in response to the needs of the friars were written on very thin parchment in minute scripts, within bindings that were often of limp parchment or leather, rather than great pieces of wood, all small and light enough to slip into a pocket or mendicant’s travelling pouch. Thus it was from these volumes’ production and the innovations in book technologies that made their production possible, particularly the strategies of compression and miniaturization, that
we find the birth of the 13th-century portable bible as a small yet comprehensive book that was simultaneously capacious and portable.\(^{543}\)

II The rate and scale of the production of portable bibles in the 13th century

First, a word on the use of the terms ‘Mass Production’ and ‘Standardization’ to describe the rate and scale of the production of portable bibles in the 13th century. The term ‘mass production’ is often applied to the scale on which portable bibles were produced during the 13th century while the term ‘standardization’ is frequently used to describe the effect of its impact on the form and contents of the medieval Vulgate, while both terms are used more broadly to describe the explosion in the quantity of books produced during the 13th century, the rate of their production and the changes in its means and methods through which these innovations were realized.

However, I argue that the use of these terms to describe these changes and phenomena are unhelpful and even misleading. To describe this production as ‘mass production’ (or to say that copies were production ‘en masse’) is to discuss manuscript production in the language of print. In the same way, to describe the effects of these portable bibles and the speed and scale of their pan-European dissemination as implementing a ‘standardization’ of the Bible’s material form and textual contents, is likewise flawed, for the term implies a degree of fixity and uniformity of these bibles’ physical size and textual contents unachievable before the mechanization of the production process in the 16th century, when

The invention of movable type allowed for the mass production of fixed, standardized texts. Mass production also allowed for a large-scale, speculative, and more profitable book trade which in turn enabled the wide dissemination of knowledge in fixed forms.\(^{544}\)

What’s more, the unsuitability of discussing these complete pandect bibles’ ‘mass production’ is further highlighted by dint of the speed, or rather the lack of it, with which they could have been produced; portable bibles could never have been copied quickly,

---

\(^{543}\) See De Hamel (2010A): passim.

their small dimensions notwithstanding,\textsuperscript{545} therefore the nature of their production process seems very much at odds with the concept of large-scale production of a duplicatable/replicatable product of which identical copies were reproduced at an unusually rapid rate to which the term ‘mass production’ typically refers.

Thus both terms imply concepts and processes quite alien to the medieval manuscript culture within which these bibles were produced, and must be avoided henceforth as the unhelpful and confusing anachronisms that they are.\textsuperscript{546}

III The circumstances within which portable bibles were produced in the 13\textsuperscript{th} century

Surviving records contain few clues as to the identity of the scribes who copied these bibles. It seems to have been very rare for scribes or illuminators to have signed or dated their work on portable bibles,\textsuperscript{547} for the number of surviving portable bibles which contain inscriptions recording the circumstances of their production is very small indeed.\textsuperscript{548}

\textsuperscript{545} Stallybrass (2013): 389-90.


\textsuperscript{548} Of Ruzzier’s census of portable bibles produced during the 13th century, a mere 1.3% contain any mention of date (Ruzzier, “Des armaria”, 2010/11: 81-82 [81 n.14]).
In five surviving examples whose scribes did record personal details, two are signed and dated (The Morgan Library & Museum, NY, Ms. M.163 and Dôle, Bibliothèque Municipale, Ms. 15), two were signed but not dated (Bodleian Library, Oxford, Ms. Rawl. G.126 and BnF, Paris, n. acq. Lat 3189), and one was dated but not signed (Bodleian Library, Oxford, Ms. lat. bib. f. 3). The oldest dated Bible of relatively small size seems to be The Morgan Library & Museum, NY, Ms. M.163 (216 x 152 mm), a bible with St. Jerome’s Prologues and IHN, written and illuminated in N.E. France, possibly Corbie, dated 1229 and signed (by “Brito”) in its colophon. Likewise Dôle, Bibliothèque Municipale, Ms. 15 (160 x 105 mm, 968 pp.), one of the earliest surviving French ‘pocket’ bibles, most likely copied in Paris was both signed and dated by its scribe, Thomas, “clericus de Pontisara” who records that he copied this ‘pocket’ bible (‘book’) in 1234. Another ‘pocket’ bible which was probably also copied in France, now

---

549 The Morgan Library & Museum, NY, Ms. M.163 (216 x 152 mm; dated 1229 and signed (by “Brito”) and Dôle, Bibliothèque Municipale, Ms. 15 (160 x 105 mm; dated 1234, and signed by Thomas, “clericus de Pontisara”)550 Bodleian Library, Oxford, Ms. Rawl. G.126 (254 x 178 mm; by Ricardulo [Richard?] de Samford, finished 20 January [no year given but copied ca. 1300]) and BnF, Paris, n. acq. Lat 3189 (signed by Raulinus of Fremington [in Devon]; not dated but copied during the third quarter of the 13th century).551 Bodleian Library, Oxford, Ms. lat. bib. f. 3 (153 x 120 mm; dated 1254) 552 216 x 152 mm, 2 cols./53 lines, 448 fols.) Noted by Ruzzier, “The Miniaturisation of Bible Manuscripts” (2013): 110, n. 16. Cf. Schnurman. Provenance of Morgan Ms. M.163: Abbaye de Corbie? Howell Wills sale (London, 1894, no. 191) to Pickering; Richard Bennett, bought Feb. 4, 1895 (MS contains Bennett’s bookplate); purchased by J. Pierpont Morgan (1867-1943).553 Likewise Dôle, Bibliothèque Municipale, Ms. 15 (160 x 105 mm, 968 pp.), one of the earliest surviving French ‘pocket’ bibles, most likely copied in Paris554 was both signed and dated by its scribe, Thomas, “clericus de Pontisara” who records that he copied this ‘pocket’ bible (‘book’) in 1234. Another ‘pocket’ bible which was probably also copied in France, now

Bodleian Library, Oxford, Ms. lat. bib. f. 3 (153 x 120 mm),\textsuperscript{557} was not signed but was dated “finita est biblia. Anno .m°.cc°.liiiij” (1254) in its colophon (on fol. 402v).\textsuperscript{558}

In contrast, twice as many ‘lectern’-size 13\textsuperscript{th}-century bibles whose scribes recorded the circumstances of the bible’s production have survived, including five copies whose scribes signed and dated their work,\textsuperscript{559} three that are dated but not signed\textsuperscript{560} and two that are signed but not dated.\textsuperscript{561} One such ‘lectern’-size signed bible, now British Library, Ms. Royal 1 B.XII, also known as the Bible of William of Hales, (308 x 202 [200 x 120] mm, 2 cols./50-52 lines, 431 folios.\textsuperscript{562} not only provides an unusually rich account


\textsuperscript{558} The scribe, clearly (and understandably) brimming with pride at the quality of his work (and probably also thoroughly relieved to have finally finished his work) begins: “Laus tibi sit Christe, quoniam liber explicit iste. / qui scripsit scribat, seper cum domino vivat. / finito libro reddatur gracia Christo. / Scriptor sum talis ostendit littera qualis,” and proudly concludes “finita est biblia. Anno .m°.cc°.liiiij / eo gratias et Beate virgine Marie / et omnibus sanctis domini Ihesu Christi.” ~ ‘This Bible was finished in the year 1254 / Thanks be to God and to the Blessed Virgin Mary / and to all the saints of our Lord Jesus Christ.’ (Bodleian Library, Oxford, Ms. lat. bib. f. 3, fol. 402v).

\textsuperscript{559} Wadham College, Oxford, Ms. 1 (A.5.2) (330 x 180 mm; signed and dated by “Guillelmos dictus miles Parisiensis” [‘William, called [a?] soldier of Paris’?], 1244 [fol. 434v]; British Library, Ms. Royal 1 B.XII (308 x 202 mm; signed and dated by William of Hales, 1254 [fol. 431r]); Bodleian Library, Oxford, Ms. Canon. Bibl. Lat. 56 (355 x 235 mm; signed and dated by “Lanfrancus de Pa[n]cis” of Cremona, 8 January 1265 [fols. 434r & fol. 449r]); St. David’s University College, Lampeter, Dyfed, Ms. 1 (335 x 250 mm; signed and dated by G. of Fecamp, 1279 [fol. 427r]); and a bible offered for sale by Dr. Jorn Günther in 1993 (315 x 220 mm; signed and dated by “Hermannus”, 1271 [fol. 408r]) (Dr. Jorn Antiquariat, \textit{Mittelealterliche Handschriften und Miniaturen. Katalog und Retrospektive} (Hamburg, 1993): no. 3 [21-30].

\textsuperscript{560} In contrast, twice as many ‘lectern’-size 13\textsuperscript{th}-century bibles whose scribes recorded the circumstances of the bible’s production have survived, including five copies whose scribes signed and dated their work,\textsuperscript{559} three that are dated but not signed\textsuperscript{560} and two that are signed but not dated.\textsuperscript{561} One such ‘lectern’-size signed bible, now British Library, Ms. Royal 1 B.XII, also known as the Bible of William of Hales, (308 x 202 [200 x 120] mm, 2 cols./50-52 lines, 431 folios.\textsuperscript{562} not only provides an unusually rich account

\textsuperscript{561} British Library, Ms. Royal 1.D.I (315 x 205 mm; signed by William of Devon [fol. 540v] but not dated [copied ca. 1250-75] – see Fig. ); Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Munich, CLM 10001-2 (a Folio-size bible in 2 vols. signed by ‘Rogerus’ but not dated).

of the circumstances in which this majestic bible was made, in a lengthy colophon recording the date and location of the bible’s production and the names of both its scribe and the patron for whom he copied the book (fol. 431r; see Figs. 2.1A-B) but also supplies a rare insight into a scribe’s commercial motivation for accomplishing his task:

Hunc librum scripsit Will[ielmus de Hales, magist[r]o Thome de la Wile, quem vocavit magist[er] Radulfus de Hehham tunc cancel-
F[at]u[s] fuit libere anno M cc.l. quarto. ab i[n]
carnatione domini.

Thus the bible’s scribe, William de Hales, records that he wrote this bible in 1254 for Master Thomas de la Wile, whom Master Ralph of Hehham, then Chancellor of Salisbury, had summoned to the mastership of the Schools of Salisbury. It is significant that William the scribe does not refer to himself as ‘frater’, thus revealing that he was not a monk, and that he was copying the bible not for his own use or for the use of the Cathedral, but rather for an influential client (Master Thomas) occupying a position of authority at the head of an important educational institution (the Salisbury Schools). William’s references to both his patron and the Chancellor

---

563 Neil Ker cites this bible amongst his dated examples for dating manuscripts based on 12th-13th century changes in scribal practices from beginning writing above or below the top line (here, below top line); N.R. Ker, “From ‘Above Top Line’ to ‘Below Top Line’: A Change in Scribal Practice,” Celtica 5 (1960): 13-16 [16], repr. in N.R. Ker, Books, Collectors and Libraries: Studies in the Medieval Heritage, Ed. Andrew G. Watson (London: Hambledon Press, 1985): 71-74 [74]. The bible’s provenance late medieval provenance is unknown; the book is included in the catalogue of the library of John Theyer, antiquary (d. 1673), left to his grandson Charles Theyer (cf. Catalogi librorum manuscriptorum Angliae et Hiberniae, 3 vols [Oxford: Sheldonian, 1697]: II, no. 6462?); Charles presumably sold his grandfather’s library to Robert Scott, London bookseller (d. 1709/10), in whose possession the bible is next recorded, on the list of John Theyer’s manuscripts in Scott’s possession, assessed in 1678 by William Beveridge and William Jane (cf. Royal Appendix: 70, no. 42); the bible was finally purchased from Scott, together over 300 other manuscripts from Theyer's library, by Charles II (1630-85), and was presented to the British Museum in 1757 by George II as part of the Old Royal Library.

by their academic titles, as “Magistro Thome” and “Magister Radulfus” are also revealing. These details not only tell us a great deal about the circumstances of book production in mid-13th century Salisbury, particularly with regards to their employment of professional scribes, but it is made very clear that from its very beginning, this bible was intended for a specific kind of use in a specific intellectual environment; namely for scholarly use in a scholastic community.

The fact that William included his own name in this chronicling of the book’s origins at all is also telling. This is a deliberate marketing strategy on William’s part, guided by commercial motives; by inserting his own name into this bible’s recorded history, William was, in effect, ‘signing’ his work in order to advertise his abilities since, as de Hamel evocatively describes, “The Bible would sit on the master’s desk in the Schools and every day the students would see it and be reminded that William of Hales was the man in Salisbury who wrote books.”565 William’s signature therefore acted as an advertisement, gloriously situated in the hope that potential clients might be impressed by his work seek him out with enquiries as to his availability to undertake further commissions.

IV The problem of the pecia system and the production of ‘pocket’ bibles in the 13th century

Although this innovative, efficient and effective system for the rapid reproduction of a great number of manuscripts from a limited number of exemplars in a very short time would surely seem the ideal solution to our conundrum of how so many of these pocket bibles were copied so swiftly and so widely in the 13th century, the manuscript evidence for 13th-century bibles copied in pieces remains both very slight (a small handful of bibles and a possible exemplar) and puzzling. Only a few portable bibles display marks of the pecia system, and no early 13th-century bible can be connected exclusively to one family of texts or to a single scriptorium.566

The rapid production of books during the 13th century was possible thanks to the sophisticated system of commercial production that developed in Paris and in other university towns. Within this new system of manuscript production, copyists worked under contract in specialized workshops, while the transmission of texts related to the university, including probably the Bible, might have benefited, as will be seen, from the pecia system, upon which the production of university books in particular depended, which made it possible for one to produce a large number of manuscripts starting from a limited number of exemplaria in a very short time. The pecia system was one of the most notable – and innovative – features of these new commercialized systems of book-production that developed in Paris and in other university towns at this time, and upon which the rapid production of university books in particular depended.

This special type of book production, which was regulated by the University to ensure students could rent ‘master’ copies of needed texts in sections (peciae) to make their own transcripts, began in the 1260s in Paris, as described by Jean Destrez, author of the landmark study on the subject in 1935. The pecia system is also one of the most divisive

567 “La fabbricazione dei manoscritti era ormai affidata a copisti ingaggiati a contratto e a officine specializzate, mentre la trasmissione dei testi legati all’università, compresa probabilmente la bibbia, potrebbe aver beneficiato, come si vederà, del sistema della pecia, l’unico che permetteva di produrre in pochissimo tempo un gran numero di manoscritti a partire da un ridotto numero di exemplaria.” Chiarra Ruzzier, “La Bibbia di Marco Polo e la produzione duecentesca di bibbie portatili,” in *In via in saecula*. La Bibbia di Marco Polo tra Europa e Cina, Ed. A. Melloni (Roma, Treccani, 2012): 3-20 [6].

568 Ruzzier, “The Miniaturisation of Bible Manuscripts” (2013): 108; Ruzzier notes (108 n.10): “I have found no evidence to support the dissemination of the biblical text through the pecia system in the portable Bibles that I have consulted. Nevertheless, since copying such a lengthy text might have taken as long as two years, it is highly improbable that there could have been sufficient exemplars including the entire Bible to satisfy the tremendous demand of scribes, especially in Paris in 1220s-1250s, when Bible production reached its peak.” See esp. Richard H. and Mary A. Rouse, “The Book Trade at the University of Paris, ca. 1250-ca. 1350” in *La production du livre universitaire au Moyen Age. Exemplar et pecia*, Actes du symposium tenu au Collegio San Bonaventura de Grottaferrata en mai 1983, Eds. J.H. Bataillon, B. Guyot & R.H. Rouse (Paris, 1988): 41-114 (at 57-58). For biblical manuscripts (none a small portable Bible) that include evidence of pecia, see Giovanna Murano, *Opere diffuse per exemplar e pecia*, Textes et études du Moyen Âge 29 (Turnhout, 2005): 318-19.


570 “Ainsi se trouvaient réglés, d’une façon simple, les rapports de toutes les parties en cause lors de la confection des manuscrits: stationnaires, copistes, correcteurs, maîtres, étudiants; chacun pouvait remplir son rôle, tout en conservant son indépendence. Cette simplification des rapports de toutes les parties n’était pas le moindre des services rendus par la pecia a tout ce monde jeune, ardent, extrêmement remuant, qui
subjects amongst paleographers, book historians and scholars of the early Gothic book trade, and many controversies about exactly how the system operated remain.\footnote{Indeed, as de Hamel observes, “Mention of the subject is the quickest possible way of starting an argument among a party of palaeographers.” (De Hamel 1994: 130-7 [134]).}


The question of whether Bibles were ever copied from \textit{pecia} exemplars later in the century remains contentious.\footnote{Light (2011): 238 n.47 (245). See Giovanna Murano, \textit{Opere diffuse per Exemplar e pecia}, Textes et Études du Moyen Âges 29 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2005): 318-20; H. Denille (1888): 277-93.} On the one hand, “This innovative, efficient and effective system for the rapid reproduction of a great number of manuscripts from a limited number of exemplars in a very short time would surely seem the ideal solution to our conundrum of how so many of these pocket bibles were copied so swiftly and so widely in the 13\textsuperscript{th} century.”\footnote{Ruzzier, “The Miniaturisation of Bible Manuscripts” (2013): 108.} On the other hand, the manuscript evidence for 13\textsuperscript{th}-century bibles copied in pieces remains both very slight (a small handful of Bibles and a possible exemplar) and puzzling.\footnote{Light (2001): 503-4 and (2013): 389-90.}

divided into small sections, or *peciae*, can be dated only to ca. 1260 or later in Paris.\(^{582}\) And although the Bible was included on two lists of exemplars available for rent from Parisian university stationers in 1275–6 and 1304,\(^{583}\) and despite the general physical similarity of the ‘pocket’ bibles of this period to manuscripts of other texts copied from university exemplars,\(^{584}\) very few bibles with *pecia* marks survive, and the role of stationers in the production of Bibles is at present far from clear.\(^{585}\) Further research is needed.

If not complicating our understanding of the speed and scale on which these handy new bibles’ were produced and disseminated, this certainly does not simplify matters. The lack of evidence in portable bibles to support their dissemination through the *pecia* system may, as Chiara Ruzzier has suggested, be attributable to the fact that since copying such a lengthy text could take as long as two years, it seems highly improbable that sufficient exemplars which included the entire Bible could have been available to satisfy the tremendous demand of scribes, especially in Paris in the 1220s through 1250s, when bible production reached its peak.\(^{586}\)

2 The University, the ‘Paris’ Bible and A ‘Uniformity’ of Text?

The production of ‘portable’ bibles developed over a relatively short period of time and is exceptionally not only within the production of copies of the Vulgate but within the context of contemporary manuscript production in general.\(^{587}\) Indeed, this is perhaps the only case of ‘mass standardization’\(^{588}\) to take place during the entire Middle

---


\(^{583}\) On the 1275-6 list: (“[87] Pro textu Biblie … v. sol.”); and on that of 1304 (“[67] In textu Bible … .cxx pec’[ias] de sex foliis. … .xvi. den.”); Giovanna Murano, *Opere diffuse per Exemplar e pecia*, Textes et Études du Moyen Âges 29 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2005): 87 [no. 87] and 123 [no. 67].

\(^{584}\) See Destrez...


\(^{587}\) “La production de bibles portatives se développe dans un laps de temps assez court et constitue une exception non seulement pour les manuscrits de la Vulgate, mais aussi pour la production manuscrite en général.” (Ruzzier, “Des armaria aux besaces” [2011]: 75).

\(^{588}\) (Ruzzier: “standardisation de masse”)

Ages, in so far as we are talking about the production, in the space of only a few decades, of tens of thousands of copies of a single text.\(^{589}\)

The particular features that characterize the production of this type of medieval book can be viewed from several perspectives.\(^{590}\) First, from a textual point of view: portable Bibles have been seen as a means for disseminating the new biblical text of the ‘Paris’ Bible and with it a specific and distinct set of textual characteristics.\(^{591}\) Second, from the perspective of these bibles’ material or physical uniformity (of size and format combined), or what Ruzzier terms “une uniformité matérielle.”\(^{592}\) By the second quarter of the 13\(^{\text{th}}\) century (ca. 1230) it had become increasingly common to copy the entire biblical text in “one thick, but not hopelessly cumbersome,” volume.\(^{593}\)

The idea that the ‘Paris’ Bible was the official Bible of the Paris theologians originated with the 13\(^{\text{th}}\)-century Franciscan Roger Bacon (d. ca. 1292)\(^{594}\) in an often-cited passage from Bacon’s \textit{Opus minus} – written around 1266–67, a date subsequently taken as a \textit{terminus ante- quem} – in which Bacon narrates, and characteristically criticizes, the production of a new version of the Bible in this novel ‘Paris’ model.\(^{595}\) Thus Bacon states

\footnotesize
\begin{itemize}
    \item \textit{En effet, au cours du Moyen Âge, il s’agit peut-être du seul cas de standardisation de masse: on parle de dizaines de milliers d’exemplaires, pour un seul texte, en l’espace de quelques dizaines d’années.”} Ruzzier, “Des armaria aux besaces” (2011): 75.
    \item Light (2012): 382.
    \item And widely acknowledged as The Grumpiest Franciscan in History.
    \item “Nam circa quadraginta annos [sunt] multi theologi infiniti et stationarii Parisius parum videntes hoc proposuerunt exemplar. Qui cum illiterati fuerint et uxorati, non curantes, nec scientes cogitare de veritate Textus Sacri proposuerunt exemplaria vitiosissima et scriptores infiniti addiderunt ad corruptionem multas mutationes. Deinde novi theologi non habuerunt posse examinandi exemplaria; et crediderunt stationariis a principio. Sed postea consideraverunt errores, et defectus, et superflua ibi multa esse: unde iterum proponunt immutare et maxime duo ordines, et jam inceperunt corrigere. Et quia caput non habuerunt quilibet corretit sicut yoluit, usque in hodiernum diem.” (‘About forty years ago many theologians, along with the booksellers (stationarii) of Paris, men of no vision, put forth the Paris version of the Bible \textit{(hoc proposuerunt exemplar)}. Because these booksellers were unlettered married men \textit{(illiterati et uxorati)}, careless and unable to discern the truth, they published \textit{(again, proposuerunt)} very corrupt exemplars of the sacred text, and countless scribes added further changes on top of the corruption. More recent theologians, who were not able to examine the actual exemplars, relied on the booksellers from the outset. Later on, though, \textit{[the theologians]} recognized that there were many errors, defects, and accretions in the text, and so they proposed to change it again; in particular the two [Mendicant] Orders began to make corrections. But
\end{itemize}
that forty years earlier, many theologians and booksellers in Paris published a copy of the Bible (‘hoc proposuerunt exemplar’). Because the booksellers were careless and lacking in knowledge, this Bible was very corrupt (‘vitiosissima’), and through the years scribal errors made it even worse. Theologians, and in particular the mendicant orders, began to make corrections: “But because there was no one in charge, everyone corrected the text just as they pleased; a practice that continues to this day”.

What is clear from Bacon’s account is that by at least the 1270s, a model of The Bible’s textual contents had emerged, a product of the commercial book trade centered around the University of Paris, that was sufficiently popularized to be understood by the term ‘exemplar’ - or ‘textus’ - Parisiensis’, a copy of The Scriptures which was complete but compact, portable and organized in a single volume, and which was both comprehensive and also swiftly searchable.

Later, John Bale (d. 1563), in his 1548 survey of *Illustrium maioris Britanniæ* (‘Illustrious Britons’), emphasized the role of Stephen Langton in developing the ‘new’ system of chapter divisions; Bale asserted that Langton had divided the Bible into chapters which were still in use (“& omnes Bibliorum libros per capita distinxit, quibus ad huc ecclesia utitur.”)

Much later, in the early 18th century, the biblical scholar Humphrey Hody synthesized the views previously expressed by Bacon and also by John Bale on the origins of the ‘Paris’ Bible text in his *De Bibliorum textibus originalibus* (1705).

---


598 “De exemplari Bibliorum Parisiensi non memini me alibi legisse. Nec quis fuerit ille sapientissimus, quem scripturarum versione emendadae tantum operae impendisse scribit Baconus, compertum habeo. Testatus Balæus Stephanum Langtonum, Cancellarium sive Rectorem Academies Parisiensis, Archiepiscopum postea
Hody accepted Bale’s attribution of the Langtonian chapter division, referred to the endurance of this division in modern editions, and concluded that it was the ‘Paris’ exemplar (as described by Bacon) which assisted in disseminating the Langtonian chapter division.\textsuperscript{599}

Hody’s comments proved highly influential for the subsequent study of the late medieval Bible, and much of the research done ever since can be seen to derive from the emphasis visible in Hody’s short analysis: antiquity and originality as yardstick in the analysis of medieval Bibles has left the study of the late medieval Bible in the shadow of its predecessors; the Paris exemplar as the point of origin for late medieval Bible; the novelty of the late medieval Bible, exemplified in the newly-integrated chapter division, which was to endure the test of time.\textsuperscript{600}

However it was with the scholars of the late 19th and early 20th century, who based their argument on Hody’s scholarship, that the idea of the ‘Paris’ Bible as the official Bible of the Paris theologians became established as the standard scholarly explanation.\textsuperscript{601} J.P.P. Martin was the first of these scholars to see in Bacon’s ‘exemplar Parisiense’ an ‘official Bible’ selected by theologians at the University of Paris at the turn of the 12th to 13th centuries, and the first scholar to attempt to distinguish and establish the defining characteristics of this “Texte Parisien”.\textsuperscript{602} Martin reasoned that Bacon’s Texte Parisien must have been identifiable by more than its ‘internal’ textual characteristics alone, given that Bacon could hardly have realistically expected his readers to examine every Bible from


\textsuperscript{600} Poleg (2008): 153.

\textsuperscript{601} This theory was first proposed by 19th-century scholars, particularly H. Denifle (“Die Handschriften” 1888); J.P.P. Martin (“La Vulgate latine” [1889] and “Le texte parisiien” [1889]) and S. Berger (Histoire de la Vulgate [1893] and Les préfaces jointes [1902]) and was later perpetuated by Henri Quentin (Mémoire [1922]), interrogated by H.H. Glunz (1930) and extended by P.-M. Bogaert, “La Bible latine” (1988): 75-82. For a handy summary and critique of the theories proposed during this era of scholarship on the history of the Vulgate Bible in the 13th century, see Light (1984): 75-82.

beginning to end before determining whether or not the volume contained the offending ‘version’; this *Texte Parisien* must therefore have possessed some ‘external’ material characteristics or signs (“quelque signe extérieur, un signe palpable et visible”) by which Bacon and his contemporaries could recognize those copies of the Bible which contained the ‘flawed’ text out of hundreds of manuscripts and identify those which did not.

According to this logic, Martin proposed that at the time of its denunciation by Bacon (in 1266-70) the *Texte Parisien* must have displayed sufficiently distinctive and recognizable characteristics (“présentait des caractères tellement saillants”) that he might confidently have expected his audience to understand which particular version of the biblical text his warning was directed against. If this had not been the case, Bacon would have had little expectation of success in his quest to anathematize that *particular* text of the Bible (i.e. the ‘Paris’ Bible).

Martin proposed that although early 13th-century bibles witness a striking absence of uniformity (“[un] manque d’uniformité et de regularité”) in their respective systems for ordering and sub-dividing the biblical text, this Pandemonium of parts from different origins and of different values (“ce Tohu-bohu de pieces d’origine et de valeur différentes”) was later replaced by a version of the biblical text whose survival always and everywhere (“toujours et partout”) in a whole and uniform form (“aussi une et aussi uniforme”) constituted “[une] révolution immense.”

---

603 “A quel caractère saillant Roger Bacon reconnaissait-il donc cette recension de la Bible, qu’il a si éloquemment anathématisée, puisqu’il ne la distinguait pas à son titre? … Si tous les caractères de cette recension de la Bible eussent été internes; s’il avait fallu examiner une bible du commencement à la fin avant de pouvoir se dire: ceci est, ceci n’est pas le *Texte Parisien*, Bacon aurait été difficilement compris; ses plaints eussent été vaines; elles n’auraient instuit ou corrigé personne, car on n’aurait jamaise pu se tenir en garde contre un livre avant de l’avoir examiné à fond.” (Martin 1889: 446).

604 “Il faut bien, en effet, que Roger Bacon et ses contemporains aient eu quelque signe extérieur, un signe palpable et visible, à l’aide duquel on pouvait démêler, entre des centaines de manuscrits, ceux qui contenaient le *Texte Parisien* et ceux qui ne le renfermaient pas.” (Martin 1889: 446).

605 “En 1266-1270 le *Texte Parisien* présentait des caractères tellement saillants que tout le monde pouvait comprendre le langage de Bacon et dire, en présence de quatre ou de cinq manuscrits de la Bible: ‘Voici le *Texte Parisien*! Voici qu’ne l’est pas.’” (Martin 1889: 447).


608 “S’il y a quelque chose qui étonne, c’est qu’on ne soit pas allé plus loin et que la Bible soit demeurée toujours et partout, dans son ensemble, aussi une et aussi uniforme.” J.P.P. Martin, “Le texte” (1889): 451.
Following J.P.P. Martin, his fellow scholars argued for Bacon’s “exemplar Parisiense” as an ‘official’ Bible which came into being as the result of a resolution taken by theologians at the University of Paris at some point during the first three decades of the 13th century, to the effect that “the Vulgate should be revised and made uniform for the purposes of University study,” and was to be reproduced by the *stationarii* in Paris (who had a virtual monopoly on bible production in the 13th century). However although S. Berger noted that the name of ‘University Bible’ is misleading (since the name implies that the new ‘Paris’ text was an ‘authorized edition’ of Scripture), Berger still used the two names interchangeably when referring to definitions of “La Bible de l’Université [de Paris]” or “Une Bible parisiens.”

However, neither the ‘pocket’ nor the ‘Paris’ types of Bible were officially authorized in either textual edition or format by any university of any city, be it Paris, Oxford or Bologna, neither in editorial shaping of the text (i.e. “this is the official edition of The Bible that we at The University of Paris have compiled and edited for use by teachers and students”) nor in espousing of a specific biblical format (i.e. ‘for ease and speed of reference in the classroom and lecture halls of Oxford, we insist on students acquiring small edition bibles for private reference and consultation in-class’).

I Modern editions of the medieval Vulgate and the perpetuation of the idea of a ‘13th-century University Bible’

Most modern research into the textual transmission of the Vulgate is built upon the foundations laid by the monumental editing project that was undertaken to replace the Sixto-Clementine edition of 1592. Between 1889 and 1954, John Wordsworth and Henry White published their critical edition of the Vulgate New Testament, based on the

---

609 Glunz (1933): 259-60.
oldest extant gospel manuscripts, most of which dated from the 9th century, and in 1907, Pope Leo VIII commissioned the complete critical edition of the Vulgate Old Testament, entrusting the project to the Benedictine order under the editorship of Dom Henri Quentin. The main aim was to establish the text of the Vulgate as Jerome had conceived it in the 5th century, thus manuscripts written after ca. 900 were considered unreliable witnesses, and for this reason, the more recent manuscript tradition of the Vulgate received only scant attention.

In the critical edition of the Old Testament compiled in Rome as of 1926 under Quentin, the circulation and transmission of the Vulgate text in the 13th century was represented by a model text based on the Bacon’s reference to an “exemplar vulgatum quod est Parisiense” which the editors called “Le Groupe de l’Université de Paris” or ‘The Bible of the University of Paris.’ Quentin et al. chose four manuscripts as exemplifying the text of their ‘University (of Paris) Bible’: BnF, Paris, ms. lat. 16719–22

---


617 The “Délimitation [and] l’étendue du groupe” based on “Roger Bacon s’est plaint à plusieurs reprises des fautes dont fourmillait un type de Bible en usage de son temps et qu’il appelle exemplar vulgatum quod est Parisiense.” Quentin, Mémoire (1922): 385-88 [385].

Although Light has stated that “These bibles were chosen by the Benedictine editors for reasons that can almost be considered random” - which is hard to argue with in spirit - it seems clear enough that the editors’ selection criteria were based upon their desire for exemplars that permit secure attributions of date and place to the ‘Paris Bible’ texts that they contain. Thus, Mazarine 5 includes a note dating the volume to before 1231 and BnF lat 15467 is also dated, 1270, while their third choice, BnF lat 1617-22, is an important corrected bible with a securely-identifiable provenance from the Dominican Convent of St. Jacques in Paris.

The editors explained (defended?) their choice of manuscripts by arguing that each of their trio of manuscripts represented a different aspect of the ‘Paris/University Bible,’ its textual origin and its transmission: BnF, Paris, ms. lat. 16719–22 (= Correct) is described as “La grande Bible des jacobins ou dominicains du couvent de Saint-Jacques à Paris…Les marges ont reçu de nombreuses variantes copiées de première main avec la texte et qui font de cette Bible un des plus célèbres Correctoria,” and written “en caractères gothiques du XIIIe siècle”; BnF, Paris, ms. lat. 15467 (= Univ) is “Une Bible qui provient de l’ancienne Sorbonne”; Bibliothèque Mazarine, Paris, Ms. 5 (= Maz) is described as “Une Bible complète, dont les marges ont reçu, au début, de très nombreuses notes


620 Quentin, Mémoire (1922): 385-88 [386].


622 In configuring the textual and chronological relationships of these bibles, Quentin and his fellow editors argued that Ms. Univ represents an intermediary between Correct and Maz, between Correct and 7664, and finally between Maz and 7664; therefore, the text of Univ, they concluded, “semble donc être le plus proche du type dont dépend le groupe.” Furthermore, they positioned “La place des manuscrits de l’Université dans le schéma général de nos exemplaires” as descendants of the Alcuin, Theodulf and Italian Bible groups (the Italian group itself descended from the Alcuin and Theodulf groups). Quentin, Mémoire (1922): 385-88 [386, 388]


625 Quentin, Mémoire (1922): 385-88 [385-6 & Pl. 59]

626 Quentin, Mémoire (1922): 385-88 [386].
marginales représentant sans doute la substance d’un cours professé au XIVe siècle par un professeur d’Université, mais sans intérêt pour la critique textuelle”, and it too is described as written “en caractères gothiques du XIVe siècle”;627 while Bibliothèque Vaticane, Ms. Lat. 7664 (= 7664), written “par plusieurs mains à ce qu’il semble, et au XIVe siècle,” is described as “Une Bible complète, prise au hazard.”628 Thus they claimed to have presented a bible whose text most accurately reflected ‘the common Paris text’ (that of BnF ms. lat. 15467), an example whose text was possibly closer to the text of 12th-century Glossed Bibles (Mazarine Ms. 5), and in BnF ms. lat. 16719-22, they had selected a bible whose text and marginal notes were both the product of the Dominican efforts to correct The Bible.629

Concerning these editorial choices, Laura Light issues the stern directive that “They are examples of a textual type and should not be regarded as the source of the Paris text or as more important than many of the other hundreds of manuscripts that could have been chosen.”630 However, leaving aside the wisdom that guided Quentin and his team in making their editorial selections, their choices are still valuable in that they do illustrate two points about the Paris text, namely its circulation and the fact that it was not confined only to Paris.631 The earliest of the three bibles, Mazarine, Ms. 5, was probably produced in England. Moreover, they also show that the Paris text circulated in bibles without all the extra-biblical elements of the Paris Bible632: Mazarine, Ms. 5 is arranged in a different order and includes other prologues; nor does the Dominican Bible, BnF, Paris, ms. lat. 16719–22, include the exact set of Paris prologues.633 Although all three of


628 Quentin, Mémoire (1922): 385-88 [386]


these bibles can be grouped together in the same general textual family, their texts do differ.\(^{634}\) Nor are the majority of these four exemplars ‘pocket’ bibles: only one is portable (Bibliothèque Vaticane, Ms. Lat. 7664 = 7664) measuring 180 x 120 mm (2 cols./42-5 lines; 456 fols.);\(^{635}\) the other three exemplars are all large ‘lectern’ bibles: BnF, Paris, ms. lat. 15467 (= Unio) measures 300 x 120 mm (2 cols./42 lines; 624 fols.);\(^{636}\) Bibliothèque Mazarine, Paris, Ms. 5 (= Maz) is larger still, measuring 348 x 250 mm (2 cols./56 lines; 362 fols.);\(^{637}\) whilst BnF, Paris, ms. lat. 16719–22 (= Correct) is simply enormous, measuring a gigantic 550 x 380 mm and furthermore, is not a pandect bible, but rather in four vols. (each 220-246 fols., 2 cols./32 lines).\(^{638}\)

The last word on “la légende d’une ‘bible parisienne’ issue du milieu des maîtres dans l’Université de Paris” must go to Guy Lobrichon, who comments, in addressing “la quête aventureuse, de l’exemplar mythique, de l’Ur-Text” which he also describes as “l’illusion d’une Bible en uniforme.”\(^{639}\)

II What was the importance of the ‘Paris’ Bible in imposing uniformity on the Vulgate Text?

In order to fairly assess the importance of the ‘Paris’ Bible text, we have to ask two questions: how influential was it, both in Paris and in the rest of Europe; and to what degree can it be said to have introduced a new uniformity to the manuscripts of the Vulgate.\(^{640}\) However, it is important to point out that although it is true that many Bibles that we can assign to Paris on the basis of script, illumination and the style of the minor

---

\(^{634}\) Light (2011): 235, cf. 235 n.30 (244).

\(^{635}\) Quentin, \(\text{Mémoire}\) (1922): 385-88 [386]

\(^{636}\) Quentin, \(\text{Mémoire}\) (1922): 385-88 [386].

\(^{637}\) Quentin records Mazarine 5 as containing 334 fols., measuring 35 x 25 cm: \(\text{Mémoire}\) (1922): 385-88 [386]; Cf. C. Samaran & R. Marichal, \(\text{Catalogue des manuscrits en écriture latine portant des indications de date, de lieu ou de copiste}\) (Paris: CNRS, 1959): I, 412; Light (1984): 86; description of Ms. 5 also available in the Bibliothèque Mazarine’s online catalogue here.


\(^{640}\) Light (2012): 388
decoration are copies of the ‘Paris’ Bible, ‘Paris’ Bibles were not not all made in Paris.\textsuperscript{641} Although in the majority of cases portable Bibles report the ‘Paris’ Bible text or a text with a strong Parisian influence, the correspondence of textual innovations with the reduction in size is by no means absolute.\textsuperscript{642} Light concludes that in 13\textsuperscript{th}-century Paris the majority of the Bibles produced were copies of the ‘Paris’ Bible, “Especially if we include, as we should, those with the characteristic textual variants and with the essential set of prologues, even if with some variation.”\textsuperscript{643}

Robert Branner noted that despite the increasing so-called ‘standardization’ of the Bible’s contents and order over the course of the 13\textsuperscript{th} century, copies still reveal a number of variations from the ‘standard arrangement’, particularly in their choice of prologues.\textsuperscript{644} He suggested that this variation could be attributed to the fact that the inclusion of a definite set of prologues was not considered obligatory owing to the fact that they consisted of patristic rather than holy writ, and thus variations were not regarded as a fundamental alteration of the text that required expounding in lectures.\textsuperscript{645} Prologues may have been made at the request of a patron who would [presumably] have specified the inclusion of any extra books.”\textsuperscript{646} As far as French copies’ adherence to a “standard University text” was concerned, Branner suggests that illuminated bibles were presumably not considered workaday textbooks and thus were not examined as closely as

\textsuperscript{641} Light (2012): 388
\textsuperscript{642} Nor does this necessarily mean that the bibles were written in Paris. Of the total corpus of portable Bibles examined by Ruzzier, only 30% use the ‘Paris Bible’ text. However, Ruzzier argues that the use of the Parisian text seems correlated with book size; “In the corpus the use of the Parisian text decreases progressively from 60\% of manuscripts of smaller size (size below 230mm) to 24\% in those of a bigger size (size between 380-450 mm).” Ruzzier, “The Miniaturisation of Bible Manuscripts” (2013): 108-9, 108 n.11. For example, from a sample of 59 volumes dating from ca. 1230 to the end of the century, selected from collections in Paris, England and the United States, Light found that 33 are examples of the ‘Paris’ Bible and include the new book order, the new set of prologues, characteristic textual variants, modern chapters and the \textit{IHN}. (Light 2001: 502-3). The remaining 26 Bibles were all arranged according to the new order and include modern chapters, and all but eight include the \textit{IHN}. Of this number, 13 of them are closely related to the Paris Bible, sharing textual readings, and the Paris prologues, with some variation and the remaining 13 are not copies of the Paris Bible in terms of their text or the prologues included (Light 2001: 502-3). Light concludes that although this is not uniformity “in the modern sense of the term,” nevertheless, it is significant. (Light 2012: 388)
\textsuperscript{643} Although “‘It is also important, however, that Bibles were still copied from exemplars unrelated to the Paris Bible’”, Light (2012): 388
\textsuperscript{645} R. Branner (1977): 16-17.
\textsuperscript{646} R. Branner (1977): 16-17.
such textbooks were. Nevertheless, Branner concluded that despite these numerous exceptions to the canon should not be over-emphasized since “the range of variation is limited” and “does not hinder our recognizing a Parisian text with ease.”

This circulation pattern of The ‘Paris’ Bible’s textual uniformity, together with an important degree of textual diversity, can perhaps be explained most easily in the light of the sheer quantity of Bibles copied in Paris after c.1230; in the context of greatly increased demand (and the prevalence of the pandect) and such rapid production, a relative degree of uniformity, although never a requirement, was inevitable. Given that, of course, every bible had to be copied from a preexisting copy, Light has suggested a hypothetical scenario that could explain how and why so many similar copies of this textual model of the bible came to be produced.

Guy Lobrichon has also proposed a similar model for viewing the dissemination of these ‘new’ bibles in the 13th century (“Un schema de diffusion des nouvelles bibles”) and for explaining the formation of modern historians’ misperception of ‘a uniform, standardized Paris Bible,’ produced in a strict, regimented culture of standardized and standardizing book production. Lobrichon’s schema unfolds in three phases. The first phase, taking place ca. 1200-20 in Paris and in northern France, shows the first tentative adaptation of these bibles to the needs of masters, university men and also, perhaps, members of the laity. During the second phase of ca. 1230-50, the Parisian workshops,

---

648 R. Branner (1977): 17. Branner adds: “I regret not having been able to establish the number or quality of the presumed exemplars, as the variations in the passages of text and even in the capitulation that I chose for examination proved too numerous and uncohesive to form stemmata. These questions must in the long run be solved by biblical scholars.” [17]
651 “We can perhaps imagine someone – a master from the theology faculty [of the university of Paris], a student, or a former student, possibly a Franciscan or Dominican – commissioned a Bible from a Paris bookseller and specified that it include the features we associate with the Paris Bible. This Bible, whose text and other features answered the needs of scholars, preachers, and collectors, proved to be much in demand, and in the context of a flourishing commercial booktrade it was inevitable that numerous similar Bibles would be produced.” Light (2011): 238; cf. Light (2012): 389, Light (2001): 501 and (1987), Lobrichon (2004): 33-4 and De Hamel (2001): 131-8.
responding to the external criteria outlined in Phase 1, polished a ‘standard’ model [“an edition?”] of the Latin Bible in a pocket size suitable for daily reading; their enterprise responding to demand, especially from the circles surrounding the Capetian court. Meanwhile, a group of mendicant friar preachers realized their first attempt to revise the biblical text in order to facilitate the professional bible-needs of masters and preachers, although their work seems to have circulated outside the Studium of the Dominicans (and Franciscans?) in Paris.654

The third and final phase, from 1250 onwards, saw the realization and flourishing of these previous initiatives. The Dominican ‘editors’ achieved their editorial attempts to produce a confirmed ‘corrected edition’ of the Bible text, although their success fell far short of achieving the results desired by the initiative’s promoters. Nevertheless, by this time, the formal model of the Parisian Bible seemed to have been established, thus creating the illusion of a uniform Bible, flooding the western kingdoms and lulling [placating] modern historians into docility with the image of an authoritarian and blocked [settled?] society.655

3 Methods of Production; Compression and Miniaturisation

The desire to miniaturize the Bible, to make it handier and easier to carry, required an overall restructuring of the physical attributes of the book, including the parchment, the quire structure, the layout and the script. This imposition of a physically restrictive material form on the biblical text was achieved through the integration of new handicraft techniques and new types of layout. Particularly important was the invention of extremely thin, almost translucent parchment (this is a true technical

654 “Les ateliers parisiens polissent une édition de la Bible latine, répondant aux critères externes définis plus haut, dans un format de poche adapté à la lecture quotidienne; leur entreprise répond à une demande émanant en particulier de milieu de la cour capétienne. Parallèlement, un groupe de frères Prêcheurs réalise une première tentative de révision portant, elle, sur le texte, afin de faciliter le travail des maîtres et des prédicateurs; leur travail semble d’avoir pas eu de diffusion en dehors du studium des dominicains (et franciscains?) parisiens.”: Lobrichon (2004): 34.
655 “La troisième phase voit l’épanouissement des initiatives antérieures. À partir de 1250 environ, les correcteurs dominicains attestent d’une véritable tentative d’édition. Leur succès est cependant loin d’atteindre les résultats espérés par les promoteurs. À cette heure cependant, le modèle formel de la bible parisienne s’impose, au point de créer l’illusion d’une Bible en uniforme, inondant les royaumes occidentaux et berçant les historiens dans l’image d’une société autoritaire et bloquée.”: Lobrichon (2004): 34.
innovation, and it did not appear before ca. 1230). Also important was the use of a condensed page layout and a minute compressed gothic script, which reduced the size of the written text to as little as one millimeter, generally descended from the glossing script found, for example, in manuscripts of the *Glossa ordinaria*.

The employment of such material and graphic innovations effected a reduction in size without jeopardizing the functionality of the book and the legibility of the written page. The use of such innovative strategies of compression made it possible to reduce the whole biblical text into a single column, smaller in size than a modern paperback; indeed, the overall dimensions of these new Bibles could be reduced to as little as 250 mm. It only becomes common to make bibles this way after ca. 1230 because it was only at this date that it had become possible to make bibles this way through employing innovative compression techniques. It is important to underline that these new techniques were not used to produce a few deluxe copies, “on the contrary, they were applied widely to produce a remarkable number of Bibles.”

In the production of these ‘miniaturized’ bibles the biblical text was always, or nearly, the same length and the miniaturization of the text faced clear physical limits.

656 “We do not know how this parchment was made. The use of uterine vellum, a traditional explanation, would have been impractical and costly. One can speculate that it was made either by shaving the parchment to the desired thinness or, perhaps, by splitting the skin.” (Light 2012: 382). For further discussion see de Hamel, *Scribes and Illuminators* (1992): 16; see also de Hamel (2001): 132. Other scholars have suggested that the skins of miscarried animals or newborns could have been used; see R. Fuchs (1991): 265–6; or even the skins of very small mammals, such as rabbits or squirrels.


Since the medieval craftsmen of the book desired to produce a book that was neither too thick nor too thin for its size, “The main element that determines the dimensions of a manuscript is the number of leaves”; thus the number of leaves in a [bible] codex and its overall size are interdependent.661

The two most common manuscript formats are small codices with few leaves and large volumes with many leaves, as witnessed in Carolingian Bibles and the Giant Bibles of the 11th and 12th centuries.662 However in the case of most 13th-century portable Bibles, copies are very small but contain a very large number of leaves; the average number of leaves in Ruzzier’s corpus is 492, but some examples contain as many as 600-700 leaves.663 Furthermore, in the case of 13th-century portable bibles, the relationship between the size of the codex and the number of leaves is reversed; the smaller their size, the larger their number of leaves.664 Because, in general, an increase in the number of leaves leads automatically to a significant increase in the thickness of the book, unless the text is divided into two volumes - an option that seems not to have been preferred by the users of 13th-century portable bibles - medieval craftsmen had to find a way to fit the entire Bible text into a small pandect codex format.665

I Method 1: Thickness of Vellum / Compression; Acting upon The Book

In order to ensure/safeguard the portability of the book and its convenience of handling, thinner parchment was used for making 13th-century pocket and portable bibles. In this way it was possible to increase the number of leaves in a book without making the book excessively thick. This procedure compensated for the decrease in size by increasing the overall space available. Another possible solution was to accept a slightly bigger size and thus to limit the number of leaves.666

In the production of small-format pandect bibles, the thickness of the parchment used by producers had direct consequences on how the text could be written, requiring decisions regarding the layout and density of the page. If thicker parchment was used,

664 See Ruzzier, “The Miniaturisation of Bible Manuscripts” (2013): Table 1 (114).
fewer leaves could fit into your book and therefore you would need to either increase the number of lines per page (and consequently reduce the size of your writing) or expand the dimensions of the written area in relation to the dimensions of the whole leaf (an option which had aesthetic consequences). However, the thinner the parchment you used, the greater became the number of leaves you could fit into a single codex of reasonable thickness, which made it less of a priority to fit as high a number of lines per page as possible (thus it would be not be necessary to drastically reduce the size of the writing, meaning that the space of the written page would not need to look so dense, and consequently protecting the text’s legibility). Thus choosing to reduce the size of writing, in fact, leads to increasing the number of lines per page.

The results of Ruzzier’s census reveal disparities between the three main countries of bible production and the size of bibles produced in each, suggesting that France demonstrated a clear preference for bibles in smaller-size formats (or ‘pocket’ bibles, measuring < 280 mm), particularly in Paris, while relatively larger formats were much less common, unlike in Italy, where the majority of bibles were produced in ‘saddle-bag’ size (i.e. ca. 281-330 mm). Ruzzier’s data suggests that the size of bibles produced in England during the 13th-century is harder to characterize; no particular English preference for a specific size is discernable, although the results suggest that few very small bibles were produced in England.

These variations of size may have been partly due to local preference (indeed, as Ruzzier notes, “it is not at all improbable that tiny Bibles became a fashion in Paris”) and the differences in dimensions can also be explained by the handicraft practices unique to each country. On the other hand, when one considers that the biblical text was always, or nearly, the same length, and that the miniaturization of the text faced clear physical limits that were universal to all European locations of bible-production, this question of why different geographical regions preferred certain sizes is an important one.

---

668 70% of bibles in the Parisian corpus are < 330 mm, with a significant preference for the ‘230-280 mm’ size-class (Ruzzier 2013: 112).
669 Analysis based on the 357 bibles that Ruzzier examined in person; see Ruzzier, “Miniaturisation” (2013): Chart 3, ‘Distribution of manuscripts according to size and place of origin’ (112), and 112 n.19.
The size and average number of leaves in 13th-century bibles also corresponds to their place of origin, i.e. French bibles contained a higher number of leaves, whereas the number of leaves in copies produced in England was generally slightly lower, and Italian bibles contained far fewer leaves. Ruzzier attributes this correlative relationship to the corresponding different thickness of parchment made in these countries; very thin in Paris, average thickness in England, and relatively thick in Italy. Furthermore, the average number of lines and average unit of ruling per page corresponds to the bibles' place of origin (France, England and Italy).

### Terminology

part of the broader confusion and blurred terminologies used for ‘parchment’ and ‘vellum’. This stems from the various and inconsistent terminologies used in medieval sources with reference to ‘vellum’, ‘parchment’, ‘fine’ (‘finer’/‘finest’) vellum’ variations of ‘skins’, ‘membranes’ (pre- and post-preparation) and modern differences of opinion regarding interpretation. For example, D.V. Thompson states that around the 13th century, “pergamenum vitulinum” was made from calf skin, that is, the ‘veal parchment’ which we call vellum, but R. Reed instead suggest that the same term is in fact

---

672 As illustrated in Ruzzier, “Miniaturisation” (2013): Tables 1 & 2 (114) and Table 3, on quire structure (116).
673 See Ruzzier, “Miniaturisation” (2013): 113-118 (esp. Table 5, 118) but also Table 2 (114) and Table 4 (118).
675 D.V. Thompson commented on this 20th-century confusion: “A curious tendency has become established in modern times to think of the word ‘vellum’ as somehow more elegant and complimentary than the word parchment. Etymologically, ‘vellum’ means calf skin and nothing else, while parchment is a general term applicable to any kind of skin, including vellum; but such is the force of refinement that the smaller and thinner a skin is, and the less the likelihood that it should be calf skin, the more likely we are to call it vellum out of politeness.” (D.V. Thompson, The Materials and Techniques of Medieval Painting [New York: Dover, 1936]: 27).
676 In his invaluable Vocabulaire Codicologique: Répertoire méthodique des termes français relatifs aux manuscrits (Paris: CEMI, 1985), Denis Muzerelle defines “parchmin” as “Peau d’animal épilée et effleurée ayant subi un traitement non tannant (ou très peu tannant) puis un séchage sous tension le rendant propre à recevoir l’écriture sur les deux faces.” (Muzerelle 1985: 39). By comparison, “vélin” is distinguished as parchment “de qualité supérieure” (“Parchemin fabriqué avec la peau de veaux mort-nés ou de très jeunes veaux” {sens strict}); but “plus généralement”, “Parchemin de qualité supérieure, qui se distingue par une grande finesse et une blancheur éclatante.” (Muzerelle 1985: 39). However, as Michael Gullick has wryly commented, “But when is parchment of a superior kind and when is it not? The judgement involved is bound to be subjective and therefore imprecise.” (Gullick, “From Parchmenter to Scribe” [1991]: 1, n.1).
677 Thompson (1936): 27.
another name for ‘uterine’ vellum ("pergamina virginea and pergamina vitulina").

It has been commonly said that the earliest medieval references to ‘vellum’, as distinct from ‘parchment’, date from the mid-15th century (for example, the OED dates the earliest use of the word to ca. 1440), although other resources (including the Middle English Dictionary) suggest that the word was in use as early as the late 14th century.

Medieval evidence for “perchameni abortivi” does survive, although it is not numerous, and of these references some do suggest, as De Hamel notes, “that aborted skin was valuable and considered desirable”. A record of a purchase of “perchamenti abortivi” at Oxford (“Walingforde”) survives in the accounts rolls recording the household expenses of Eleanor Countess of Leicester for 1265: “Per Dominum W. de Wortham. / In xx. Duodenis parchameni abortivi emptis Londini, per fratrem G. Boyun, ad portiforium Domisellae Alianorae, ad Purificationem, x.s.” Thus money was sent in Feb. 1265 (“ad Purificationem”: The Feast of the Purification of the Virgin Mary, 2nd February) to Brother G. Boyon, a friar in Oxford to buy 20 dozen leaves of fine parchment (“xx. Duodenis parchameni abortivi emptis”) for the specific purpose of producing a Breviary (“portforium”) for the Countess’ only daughter, Eleanor de

680 [1] “A fine kind of parchment prepared from the skins of calves (lambs or kids) and used especially for writing, painting, or binding; also, any superior quality of parchment or an imitation of this”: [1a]. ‘c1440 Promptorium Parvulorum 508/2 - “Velyme, membrane”; ‘Vellum, n.’: Etymology: Old French velin [velin, veelin, etc.; modern French vélin], ME “velym” (before 15th century, “velyme”. Use: “A fine kind of parchment prepared from the skins of calves (lambs or kids) and used especially for writing, painting, or binding; also, any superior quality of parchment or an imitation of this.” “Vellum, n.” in OED, 3rd ed. (March 2005), accessed on 5 April 2015.
681 The MED cites the earliest use of the word (vēlum [n.], also velim[c], velome]) as a 1388 entry in the Account Rolls of the Priory of Worcester (“In 2 duodenis de velym pro libro. claustri, 6s. 6d.”): Compotus Rolls of the Priory of Worcester of the XIVth and XVth Centuries, Ed. S. G. Hamilton, Worcester Historical Society 22 (1910): 43; cf. at MED here.
Montfort ("Domisellae Alianorae"), then only 6 or 7 years old. The parchment was then carried to Oxford, where the same friar, G. Boyon, was tasked with the writing of the breviary, a task he seems to have completed (or at least, was working on) by the Spring and for which he was paid 14s: “Eadem die soluti, per manus ejusdem, apud Oxoniam, pro scriptura Breviarii Domisellae A. de Monteforti, per visum fratris G. Boyon, xiiijs.”

Around 1250, Adam Marsh, Franciscan of the Grey Friars in Oxford, wrote to the Custodian of Cambridge ("Fratri R., Custodi Cantabrigiae") requesting that he send vellum to his Oxford brothers at his earliest convenience. The great scholar of the Franciscans, A.G. Little, suggests that although this parchment may have been intended for original compositions of the friars, “It was probably for a fair copy of some work – perhaps a Missal or a book of the Bible.”

**ii The Myth of ‘Uterine’ Vellum**

A characteristic feature of 13th-century ‘pocket’ bibles is that the parchment upon which a great number of these manuscripts were written is very thin and very white. The use of exceptionally thin (0.1 - 0.05 mm) parchment membranes (often referred to as ‘tissue-thin parchment’) in combination with the use of extremely small handwriting meant that the entire biblical text – comprising almost one million words - could be comfortably contained in a single ‘pocket’ volume, which, although often somewhat thick and chunky, was small, portable and “not hopelessly cumbersome.”

---


685 The preceding entry in the roll refers to the Feast of the Assumption (9th May).


689 Light, 2012: 382.
The innovative use of exceedingly thin parchment produced a profound effect on the physical structure of the book in the 13th-century. The number of bifolia per quire could increase dramatically; an impressive proportion of manuscripts made during this period were produced with gatherings consisting of twelve or sixteen leaves, and even quires of twelve bifolia (twenty-four leaves) were used, especially, notes Derolez, in “The famous small Parisian Bibles written in so-called ‘pearl script’ on extremely thin parchment.”

M.R. James’ collations for 13th-century ‘pocket’ bibles in his catalogue entries describe them as generally composed of from seventeen to thirty-four quires of twelve, sixteen, twenty or twenty-four folios. The legacy of this new bible format was profound; it has determined the structure of traditional bibles ever since. De Hamel comments that later medieval manuscript bibles (for example, early 15th-century Dutch lectern bibles) “are essentially thirteenth-century manuscripts reproduced on a larger scale.”

The thinness and quantity of these membranes has been a long-standing point of controversy, leading to extensive speculation as to their animal origin. This thin creamy parchment of which 13th-century ‘pocket’ bibles comprise hundreds of bifolia has long been described as ‘uterine’ or ‘foetal’ vellum, in other words, the prepared skin of an unborn, or deliberately aborted, animal, usually meaning a calf. However, over the course of the 20th century scholars have increasingly problematized this explanation for the extreme thinness and ‘high quality’ of the parchment used in the 13th-century production of pocket bibles. Where did this mythic idea of ‘uterine vellum’ come from?

D.V. Thompson argued that “The Latin word abortivum, occasionally applied to fine parchment in the Middle Ages (though rarely)” gave rise to another form of widespread superstition about (uterine) vellum, namely that “The finest medieval parchment, and particularly the very thin, flexible, opaque, small, thirteenth-century French Bible vellum was made from the skins of still-born calves.”

691 De Hamel, Bibles (Bodleian, 2011): 70-1.
at such an idea, since “There is as nearly as possible no evidence for this belief,” although he did add, rather begrudgingly, that “It may be true,” but concluded more boisterously: “I should be inclined to think that animal husbandry must have been in a very precarious condition if enough calves were still-born in the thirteenth century to provide all the pages which pass for ‘uterine vellum’.”

De Hamel is also skeptical. Both Thompson and Graham Pollard cautioned against how implausible is the production of so many bibles from aborted foetuses or indeed young calves (calf skin thickens rapidly as the animal grows and it would be difficult to make fine parchment from weaned animals). Likewise most medievalist paleographers are extremely skeptical, believing that this represented a prohibitively high number of aborted foetuses. Albert Derolez comments that “it is doubtful whether this writing-material … (carta abortiva, virginea) … apart from a few exceptions, was really made from the skin of unborn calves or lambs.”

However, contra Thompson, Leila Avrin argues that uterine vellum or abortivum, pergamina vitulina, or pergamina virginea first appeared (?) “In the late Middle Ages, especially in France” and that “This is known to have come from the skin of aborted or stillborn calves,” adding that “This soft fetal product is still manufactured by parchment makers and is very much in demand. In today’s abbatios of South American countries, there are some forty aborted calves per hour whose pelts are sold to parchment makers.” Bruce Holsinger also cites modern support for the medieval use of ‘uterine’ vellum in book production, claiming that “The few zooarchaeologists who have studied [the question] scientifically, by contrast, regard its existence as an established and even unremarkable

---

694 “It is true that parchment made from this rather unappealing material or from the skins of very newborn animals does indeed look and feel like that which antiquarians call uterine vellum. But it is very difficult to believe that thousands of cows miscarried for generations, or were deprived of their foetuses in such numbers to supply the booktrade economically … If the term uterine parchment must be used at all, it should perhaps refer to a quality of skin and not to its origin.” (De Hamel 1992: 16).
696 Derolez (2003): 31. Although Bischoff: “The ‘pocket bibles’ which were produced during the thirteenth century in innumerable copies … generally have a format of c. 14.5 x 10 cm, with a writing area of c. 9.5-10.5 x 6.5 cm, in two columns of 44-53 lines each. Because only the finest virgin parchment was used, they did not look too bulky, in spite of having four hundred to five hundred leaves.” (Bischoff 1979/1990: 25).
697 Leila Avrin, Scribes, Scripts and Readers: The Book Arts from Antiquity to the Renaissance (2010): 213. Frustratingly, Avrin does not cite her source(s) for this statistic.
fact”, and cites the high infant and in utero mortality rates among calves and lambs throughout the Middle Ages, “as evidenced by the many premature skeletons found in medieval bone pits.”

Graham Pollard argued that it was impossible that sufficient supplies of genuine ‘uterine’ vellum could have been found, and that other smaller animal skins must therefore have been used, suggesting that: “The small bibles of the thirteenth century were probably rabbit-skin duodecimos.” Thompson had been of a similar mind, stating 5 years previously that “It would not be altogether surprising if it turned out, as a result of experiments now in progress, that some of what now masquerades as ‘uterine vellum’ was actually rabbit or squirrel parchment.” While this idea seems somewhat less incredible when one remembers that squirrel skin was used by furriers and clothiers, recent research has definitively proven that neither not rabbit nor squirrel skin was used in the 13th-century production of portable bibles.

Central to the unfeasibility of the use of ‘uterine’ vellum in book production during the 13th century is the practical consideration of whether such parchment was, or could have been, available in sufficient quantities. For example, based on the twin principles that the skins used for manuscripts came from animals killed at about 3 months of age, and that half of the young males were generally culled in the summer, K. Ryan has attempted to calculate how large a standing herd (of cattle) would be needed to produce vellum for one scribe for one year. During the first half of the 9th century the production of 46 large ‘Alcuinic’ Bibles and 18 Gospels is recorded at Tours; each of

701 For example, see a large-format copy of the Terrier de l’évêque (now Lille, Archives dep. du Nord, Ms. 3 G 1208, [Musée 342]) copied in Cambrai between 1276 and 1285, which contains (on fol. 44r; Fig. 1) illustrations of a selection of animal skins and pelts under the heading “C’est li connius descoherie: pais de lievres…”, including the skin of a hare, a coney and a squirrel, and in the lower portion of the page, tunic-shaped garments made from hare-skin and squirrel-skin. Lille, Archives dep. du Nord, Ms. 3 G 1208 (Musée 342): 302 x 220 [215 x 138] mm, 1 col./30 lines, 317 fols.: see Alison Stones, Gothic Manuscripts 1260-1320 [Part I]. A Survey of Manuscripts Illuminated in France (London: Harvey Miller Publishers, 2013): II, 296-299 & pl. 51 (reprod. fol. 44r).
these Bibles would require from 210 to 225 sheep, not including animals that were diseased or had been injured.704 Others have suggested that a Great Bible of the 11th or 12th century would require the skins of somewhere in the region of between 200 to 400 animals.705 If we assume that 30,000 bibles were produced during the 13th century, based on Chiara Ruzzier’s estimates, of which 56% were produced in France, the vast majority of these produced in Paris (ca. 17,000), and that 44% of 13th-century French bibles (ca. 7,500) were produced in the middle of the century, then the rate of French bible production would average more than 200 bibles per year. A small foetal calf skin (500 x 300 mm) could conservatively only produce 4 bifolia, (average taille - width + height - of 280 mm), which assuming 300 bifolia per bible equates to approximately 75 animals per book or 16,000 aborted or 5,400 suckling calves per year.706

Today, the calf skin used for manuscript parchment is produced from the skins of very young (up to 3 months of age) or foetal calves.707 Skins range in size from an average of ca. 0.25-0.45 m² (3-5 sq. ft) for the ‘slunk’ skins – i.e. those of still-born or aborted calves - to an average size for young animals skins’ of ca. 0.5-0.7 m² (6-8 sq. ft), although larger skins up to 0.9 m²/ 10 sq. ft or more can be obtained.708

---


706 Ruzzier calculates this number through the application of the hypothetical survival rate of incunabula (a survival rate of 4.2%) developed by Uwe Neddermeyer. See Uwe Neddermeyer, Von der Handschriften zum gedruckten Buch. Schriftlichkeit und Lesinteresse im Mittelalter und in der frühen Neuzeit. Quantitative und Qualitative Aspekte, I. Text II. Anlagen, Buchwissenschaftliche Beiträge aus dem Deutschen Bucharchiv München 61 [Wiesbaden, 1998]: 72-81; Ruzzier, “The Miniaturisation of Bible Manuscripts” (2013): 107 & 107, n.7.

707 Sam Somerville, “Parchment and Vellum” in The Calligrapher’s Handbook, Ed. Heather Childe on behalf of The Society of Scribes and Illuminators, 2nd edition (New York: Taplinger Publishing Co., 1986): 58-83 [61]. Somerville notes: “It is often said that many of the small books of the Middle Ages were made from the skins of still-born calves. Although this may have been so, it seems there is little real evidence to confirm it.” [61]

skins from older animals require more scraping to remove the extra fat and to get the skin down to a suitable thickness for use as a writing medium.709

However, the longstanding controversy amongst codicologists and paleographers concerning the animal origin of medieval parchment has provoked many collaborations between scholars in the Humanities and their colleagues in the Sciences in joint pursuit of answers through the use of ever more effective methods of parchment identification and DNA analysis.710 However, none hitherto has been so inspired as the ‘Books and Beasts’ Project, lead by archaeozoologists Matthew Collins and Sarah Fiddyment of The BioArCh Department at The University of York, who, with their team, are devoting their considerable powers to providing the first significant – and ultimately, conclusive -molecular evidence to resolve the long-standing question of the animal origin of this so-called ‘uterine vellum,’ or “pergameno velym”.711 The project uses a simple and objective technique (‘eZooMS’) to analyze collagen samples from a wide selection of contemporaneous French, English and Italian ‘pocket’ bibles produced during the 13th-century and to identify the animal origin of their parchment.

Although the ‘Books & Beasts’ project is ongoing, the survey has, to date, sampled 72 ‘pocket’ Bibles, and from these, a total of 220 folia were analyzed. The results demonstrate that these 13th-century bibles in ‘pocket’ format were written on all three the skins of still-born calves. Although this may have been so, it seems there is little real evidence to confirm it.” [61]


species; of these 220 folia, 68% (149 folia) were calf, 26% (57 folia) were goat and 6% (14 folia) were sheep. The use of sheep in only one of 72 bibles indicates that it was not favored for these very thin membranes, despite that fact that sheepskin delaminates and that the range of thicknesses measured for calf and sheep parchment are similar (0.09-0.28 mm for calf and 0.07-0.26 for sheep), while the presence of goatskin and sheepskin parchment in the sample set would seem to indicate that ‘uterine’ calf skin was not necessary to produce very fine membranes.712

No evidence has been discovered of the use of parchment made from ‘exotic’ species, such as squirrel or the rabbit skin duodecimos suggested by Graham Pollard.713 In France this vellum rather derived from calf skin, while in other countries, other skins were used based upon local availability. Thus the project’s working conclusion, soon to be published, confirms our theory that “Ultra-thin parchment was an achievement of technological production using available resources, and would not have demanded unsustainable agricultural practices.”714

iii ‘Split’ Vellum: Obtaining Thinner Parchment through Preparation Methods

Some scholars, unconvinced by the various theories proposed over recent centuries to account for the extreme thinness of this parchment (i.e. the use of ‘uterine’ vellum, or the skins of squirrels or rabbits), have suggested that a simpler explanation might provide the solution to how the parchment’s surface could have been induced to its smooth and silky texture. Eric G. Millar, in explaining the origin of this ‘finer’ parchment used in small-format 13th-century bibles, as opposed to the heavier parchment of both earlier manuscripts and larger contemporary ones, proposes that in fact, “A new kind of vellum was manufactured … of astonishing thinness, often of the texture of India paper,


but sufficiently opaque to allow of both sides being written upon and read with ease. More recently, Laura Light has restated this theory, arguing that these tiny bibles were produced as a result of “The invention of extremely thin, almost translucent parchment,” discernible as of around 1230 (or at least not before). This invention constituted “a true technical innovation,” whose significance within the histories of the Latin Bible and technologies of the medieval book cannot be overstated.

However we do not know for sure how this new, thinner parchment was made, for no general study of how parchment was obtained in the early Middle Ages has survived. If one proceeds on the assumption that, as Light and others suggest, the use of ‘uterine’ vellum would have been impractical and costly, then one can perhaps surmise that it was made “either by shaving the parchment to the desired thinness or, perhaps, by splitting the skin,” a method commonly used for manufacturing parchment today. This would mean parchment produced from calf skins, since calf skin is the only kind of membrane that can be split. This conforms to the medieval equation of the degree of parchment’s thinness and smoothness with higher quality; the finest parchment would probably be made from calf skin since, as Reed describes, it combine thinness with great strength by virtue of the form and dimensions of its dermal fiber network.

---

716 Light, 2012: 382.
718 On the early tradition of parchment manufacture in England, see Julian Brown, “The distribution and significance of membrane prepared in the insular manner,” in *La paléographie hébraïque médiévale*, Colloques internationaux du Centre de la recherché scientifique, 547 (Paris, 1974): 127-35, rpt in *A Paleographer’s View*, Eds. J. Bately, M.P. Brown & J. Roberts (London, 1993): 125-39. Brown’s summary of early 20th-century scholarship on the subject is worth reproducing: “In 1912 Maunde Thompson observed that Insular manuscripts were generally written in ‘stouter’ vellum than their contemporaries abroad. One heard little more until 1934, when in the first volume of *CLA* Lowe put forward the idea that whereas Continental manuscripts were written on parchment (sheep-skin), Insular manuscripts were written on vellum (calf-skin). In 1935 he changed this idea (rightly) to suggest not that it was a difference of animals but simply a difference in preparation. But for ever afterwards, throughout CLA, he used ‘parchment’ as shorthand for Continental prepared membrane and ‘vellum’ as shorthand for membrane prepared in the Insular way. Professor Bischoff in his *Paléographie* says that Insular scribes wrote on calf-skin roughened deliberately on both sides to cause the disappearance of the distinction between hair-side and flesh-side. And that is the best short description of Insular membrane that I know.” Brown (1974/93): [125].
719 Light, 2012: 382.
721 “Originally parchment was made from the full-thickness of the skin, and if required thinner it was shaved. Today skins are split by machine and only the flesh side of a split skin is used for parchment. ...
The quality of parchment was certainly one great importance to medieval craftsmen of the book, particularly in producing bibles. In the case of the Bury Bible (Corpus Christi College, Cambridge Ms. 2), made around 1135, parchment was sourced from as far away as “in particus Scotiae” as narrated in the Bury Abbey Chronicle, the *Gesta Sacristarum*. Clearly there cannot have been any difficulty in getting good vellum to write upon in England, but the special vellum required by the painter was a superior and rarer article; all or almost all of the paintings in this Bible are done upon separate pieces of vellum which have been pasted onto the leaves of the book. Rodney Thomson has described how “Such special parchment was sometimes used by illuminators for their miniatures and pasted onto the normal parchment used for the book as a whole. Examples of this practice are found in several English 12th- and 13th-century Bibles, Psalters and Lives of Saints.”

According to Jewish law the ancient Hebrews used split skins. It is not clear how this was done, but it would seem to be possible to make a split only towards the end of manufacture i.e. when the skin is dry and the fibers are oriented in sheets.” R. Reed, *Ancient Skins, Parchment and Leathers* (London: Seminar Press, 1972): 118-73. Cf. K. Ryan, “Parchment as Faunal Record,” *MASCA Journal* 4.3 (October 1987): 124-138 [126-7]; Michael L. Ryder, “The Biology and History of Parchment,” in *Pergament: Geschichte, Struktur, Restaurierung, Herstellung*, Ed. Peter Kück (Jan Thorbecke Verlag Sigmaringen, 1991): 25-33 [27].

According to Jewish law the ancient Hebrews used split skins. It is not clear how this was done, but it would seem to be possible to make a split only towards the end of manufacture i.e. when the skin is dry and the fibers are oriented in sheets.” R. Reed, *Ancient Skins, Parchment and Leathers* (London: Seminar Press, 1972): 118-73. Cf. K. Ryan, “Parchment as Faunal Record,” *MASCA Journal* 4.3 (October 1987): 124-138 [126-7]; Michael L. Ryder, “The Biology and History of Parchment,” in *Pergament: Geschichte, Struktur, Restaurierung, Herstellung*, Ed. Peter Kück (Jan Thorbecke Verlag Sigmaringen, 1991): 25-33 [27].

According to Jewish law the ancient Hebrews used split skins. It is not clear how this was done, but it would seem to be possible to make a split only towards the end of manufacture i.e. when the skin is dry and the fibers are oriented in sheets.” R. Reed, *Ancient Skins, Parchment and Leathers* (London: Seminar Press, 1972): 118-73. Cf. K. Ryan, “Parchment as Faunal Record,” *MASCA Journal* 4.3 (October 1987): 124-138 [126-7]; Michael L. Ryder, “The Biology and History of Parchment,” in *Pergament: Geschichte, Struktur, Restaurierung, Herstellung*, Ed. Peter Kück (Jan Thorbecke Verlag Sigmaringen, 1991): 25-33 [27].

According to Jewish law the ancient Hebrews used split skins. It is not clear how this was done, but it would seem to be possible to make a split only towards the end of manufacture i.e. when the skin is dry and the fibers are oriented in sheets.” R. Reed, *Ancient Skins, Parchment and Leathers* (London: Seminar Press, 1972): 118-73. Cf. K. Ryan, “Parchment as Faunal Record,” *MASCA Journal* 4.3 (October 1987): 124-138 [126-7]; Michael L. Ryder, “The Biology and History of Parchment,” in *Pergament: Geschichte, Struktur, Restaurierung, Herstellung*, Ed. Peter Kück (Jan Thorbecke Verlag Sigmaringen, 1991): 25-33 [27].
This practice of sticking in parchment patches on which miniatures were then executed further demonstrates that the parchment surface was undoubtedly a matter of concern for illuminators. The practice continued into the 15th century, although as J.J.G. Alexander notes, “It has had unfortunate consequences in that many miniatures have either lifted or been peeled off and are now lost,” a misfortune which, alas, the Bury Bible suffered.

II Method 2: Script and Layout / Miniaturisation & Compression; Acting upon The Page


727 Other examples of bibles featuring parchment patches being stuck in for the miniatures include: The Lothian Bible from St. Albans (Morgan Library & Museum, Ms. 791 – “The most elaborately decorated English Bible of the thirteenth-century.” (ca.1220?, St. Albans or Oxford, 395 fols., 470 x 320 mm); The Carolingian Bible of San Paolo fuori le Mure of ca. 870; and The ‘Odilo’ Bible, 11th-century (BnF, Paris, Ms. lat. 15176), in which miniatures of the Evangelists were stuck over initials in the late 12th-century. See Nigel Morgan, Survey IV (1982): no. 32 [I: 79, II: Pl. 108, 112]. Cf. Rodney M. Thomson, Manuscripts from St. Albans Abbey 1066-1235. 2 vols. (Woodbridge, Suffolk: D.S. Brewer, for the University of Tasmania, 1982): no. 76 [I: 122-3, II: Pl. 247-9]. This method was also employed in the Lives of St. Alban and Amphibalus illuminated by Matthew Paris of St. Albans in the mid 13th century; see J.J.G. Alexander, Medieval Illuminators and their Methods of Work (New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 1992): 35. For an extensive list of other manuscripts with miniatures or initials on stuck-in parchment, see J.J.G. Alexander (1992): 35, n.12 [158].

728 Nicholas Hilliard described the use of ‘uterine’ vellum by the miniaturist in his Treatise Concerning the Arte of Limning (1600): “Knowe also that parchment is the only good and best thinge to limme one, but it must be virgine parchment, such as neue bore haire, but young things found in the dames bellye; some calle it Vellym, some Abertiue (deriued frome the word Abhortiue for vntimely birthe).” See Nicholas Hilliard, A Treatise Concerning the Arte of Limning (1600), ed. Philip Norman, Walpole Society, vol. 1 (1912): 1-54 [34]. A vellum/parchment distinction also made in an earlier 1573 work on the subject, A very propert treatise, wherein is briefly sett for the the arte of Limming (London, Fleet Street: Richard Tottill): “Which teacheth…the maner how to...limme withall vppon velym, parchement or paper & howe to lay them vpon the worke which thou entendest to make.” (STC [2nd ed.]/ 24252) Both references shared by Prof. Stallybrass (September 2014).

729 J.J.G. Alexander, Medieval Illuminators and their Methods of Work (New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 1992): 35. Alexander notes: “Michael Gullick comments to me on the great difficulty of controlling parchment when it is damp, and consequently on the technical skill needed to insert such pieces of parchment. Similarly they may have lifted when manuscripts were exposed to damp and their loss may be due to this rather than vandalism”: 35, n.12 [158].

730 Another example is the late 12th-century Life of St. Cuthbert, (British Library, Ms. Yates Thompson 26 [previously Add. Ms. 39943]), made no doubt at Durham, where the outline of the miniature can be clearly seen (fol. 9r) and also the overlap where the artist has painted a horse’s tail extending on to the surface of the manuscript folio; cited by J.J.G. Alexander, Medieval Illuminators and their Methods of Work (New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 1992): 35-6 & Fig. 53. On the Bury Bible see C.M. Kauffmann, Romanesque Manuscripts, 1066-1190. Survey III (London, Harvey Miller, 1975): no. 56 [88-90; Ills. 148-53 & Fig. 12].
However, it seems that increasing the number of leaves was not, by itself, sufficient to achieve the requisite compression of the biblical text necessary to produce the bible in a ‘portable book’ format. Thus the second device used concerns the layout of the page. In attempting to compress written text on the page, the three variables (of layout) that one may reconfigure consist of: the written space in relation to the dimensions of the page; the density of writing within the written space; and the length of the text itself. In practice, these three strategies for compressing the Bible’s text through reconfiguring the text’s layout on the page could be applied through the following methods: the dimensions of the written space in relation to the dimensions of the page were increased by sub-dividing the textblock into two columns and compressing the written text horizontally reducing spacing between words (i.e. copying words closer together); compressing the writing within the written space by increasing the number of lines (achieved by reducing both the average height of a line and the size of the writing); acting to reduce the length of the text itself through the use of abbreviations (the wider the selection of abbreviations used, and the greater the frequency with which they were employed, the higher the compression of the text and the more the text’s length was reduced and thus the lower amount of physical page-space required).\textsuperscript{731}

The degree to which these options are employed, and the combination in which they are used, influences the aspect of the writing (i.e. how dense it looked on the page) and on the legibility of the text. The scribes of 13\textsuperscript{th}-century ‘pocket’ bibles employed all three strategies together, achieving “an increase in the density of graphic signs on one page without compromising the legibility of the text.”\textsuperscript{732}

In other words, in attempting to fit more text onto a page - without increasing the size of the page (and book): first, you can choose to expand the size of the textblock (i.e. increase available space for writing text on page); your second option is to attempt to cram more words \textit{into} the space of the textblock; or third, you can try to increase the number of words on the page by altering \textit{how} you write the text. The first two options involve changing the size of the writing and may consequently have a negative impact upon the legibility of the text (in other words, if the size of the writing is reduced, it makes

\textsuperscript{731} Ruzzier, “The Miniaturisation of Bible Manuscripts” (2013): 118.
\textsuperscript{732} Ruzzier, “The Miniaturisation of Bible Manuscripts” (2013): 118.
it harder for the reader to see, and thus read, the text). The third option requires no reduction in size of the written text (and thus risks no visual impairment of the text’s legibility in terms of making it harder for the reader to see the written text). However, although the intensive use of abbreviations does effect a decreasing in the length of the text, by effectively ‘encoding’ the words of the text, this option does require the reader to be able to recognize the coding system and to be able to decipher the coding symbols used in order to interpret the words and ‘receive’ the text; you are, in fact, risking an illegibility of text of a different kind.

i Page Layout: The Layout of the *Sacra Pagina* in the 12th to 13th centuries

As in the glossed books of The Bible of the 12th century, the text/content of the 13th-century bible was inseparable from its (pandect) format and (‘pocket’ size) form. Within the context of bible production during the 12th and 13th centuries, the small-sized writing of the 13th-century ‘pocket’ bibles was taken from the size of writing [and the choice of scripts?] used in the 12th through early-13th-centuries to supply the glosses in Glossed Bibles and Glossed Books of the Bible along with independent works of commentary.733

a The Page Layout of Glossed Books of The Bible

For the schoolmen of the 12th and 13th centuries, the most fundamental textbook was the Bible, and the form in which the Bible was studied in the cathedral schools734 was in the


twenty or so separate volumes which made up the Glossed Bible. Broadly stated, the Gloss (Glossa or Glosa in Latin), sometimes called the Glossa ordinaria, was a group of volumes containing the whole of the Vulgate Bible, written continuously and distinctly, surrounded both in the margins and between the lines by a mass of individual explanatory ‘glosses’ or short comments, culled from the works of the church fathers and later scholars, with the occasional gloss added by the compiler. The principal compiler of the Gloss was probably Anselm of Laon (d.1117) with help from his younger brother Ralph (d.1133) and a collaborator from the schools in Auxerre, Gilbert the Universal (d.1134). Although neither the practice of supplementing bibles with short glosses, nor the positioning of these explanations in the margins, was new, the Gloss produced in the 12th century took this basic concept and turned it into the ubiquitous text of the scholastic world.

The format of the Gloss also “illustrates vividly the medieval scholar’s conception of the Bible as a bibliotheca – a library – rather than a single book.” Contemporary references to ‘full sets’ of the glossed Bible (i.e. including all of the 20 or so volumes of the whole Bible text glossed) as “bibliotheca” - meaning both ‘Bible’ and ‘library’ - indicate

---


736 Teachers compiled collections of explanatory notes, adding their own comments and selecting expositions of the text from patristic commentaries, and arranged them according to the *ordo narrationis* of the Bible text; short glosses were inserted between the lines of the text, and longer ones were copied in the margins. Teachers compiled collections of explanatory notes, adding their own comments and selecting expositions of the text from patristic commentaries, and arranged them according to the *ordo narrationis* of the Bible text; short glosses were inserted between the lines of the text, and longer ones were copied in the margins.

737 The authority of these glossed Bibles derived from the sources of the glosses, and together they were included in Sacred Scripture as defined by Hugh of St. Victor; the Old and New Testaments, the decrees of canon law and the writings of the Fathers and Doctors of the Church; see Hugh of St. Victor, *Didascalion*, Bk 4, Ch. 2 (*The Didascalion of Hugh of St. Victor*, ed. J. Taylor (NY & Oxford: Columbia UP, 1991): 103-4; cf. Smith (2013): 363-379 [363].

738 See M.B. Parkes, “Layout”: 60-62. Since Late Antiquity different generations of readers had added glosses *ad hoc* to copies of texts which were regarded as having canonical status. As Parkes notes, “It was not difficult to follow glosses inserted between the lines of the text, because many were placed above the words and phrases to which they referred, but longer glosses and glosses by later readers had to be added wherever space was available, usually in the margins, and seldom alongside the relevant passage in the text.” (*ibid.*: 60; cf. Smith (2013): 363.

739 Furthermore, as Lesley Smith notes, the various parts of the Bible all have rather different histories as part of the Gloss; Smith (2013): 364, cf. 364 n.4.
that these books were primarily regarded as Bibles, since they contained the entire, unabridged text of the Bible as well as the Gloss.\textsuperscript{740}

The success of the glossed Bible cannot be separated from its distinctive format, and the characteristic look of the pages is one of the clues that a manuscript might contain the Gloss text.\textsuperscript{741} Broadly speaking, the pages of glossed Bibles measured approximately 240 x 170 mm, with one column of text and annotation to the left and right, ruled – at about half-spacing in relation to the text - to accommodate annotation, with interlinear and marginal reference signs connecting individual glosses to the words of the text.\textsuperscript{742} The content and format were inseparable and both were dictated by how these books were used. The glossed books of the Bible produced during the ‘second phase’ could be used in two (or three?) ways: one could pick up a glossed book and simply read the Bible narrative without the interpretation; or alternatively, one could follow the commentary, occasionally referring back across the page to the Bible text; or one could read both texts in combination, slowly moving down the page following the biblical text in the central column section by section, referring to the indicated sections of marginal gloss as one went, rather like a horizontal version of modern footnotes.

In addition for use in and for private reading, glossed Bibles could also be used to teach from, this type of layout is excellent for use in the type of oral teaching from an authoritative text that was the characteristic of medieval schools.\textsuperscript{743} “The text was writ large, literally, and easy for the teacher to keep track of while the glosses are smaller and need only act as aides-mémoire for the teacher, and the presence of the whole biblical text, distinctly and continuously visible, makes it easier for a teacher to talk ex tempore, outside the scope of his prepared glosses; as Smith comments, “Unlike a lemmatized

\textsuperscript{740} For example the use of the word in the contemporary chronicles and, slightly later, catalogue of Christ Church Canterbury, to describe the glossed Bible volumes gifted by both Archbishop Becket (just before 1170) and Ralph of Sarre (ca. 1176); see De Hamel (2001): 110-112 [110-11].

\textsuperscript{741} Smith (2013): 364.

\textsuperscript{742} M.T. Gibson (1989): 233-7 [233].

commentary, which contains only the text of *lemmata* which are commented on, and which may well not constitute the whole scriptural text, here everything he needs is before his eyes.”

In the second half of the 12th century scribes often had to work out how to deal with new, complex layouts, whilst maintaining the space required to separate words. Achieving the proper layout of text and gloss in glossed books of the Bible could be particularly challenging; the pages of these books of glossed biblical texts needed to incorporate both text and the commentary referring to it on the same page, with their layout determined by the extent of the longer glosses. As J.P. Gumbert emphasized, the layout was governed by three main problems: how to fit an amount of text on a page together with the commentary pertaining to it; how to make clear which part of the commentary refers to which part of the text; and how to distinguish visibly the text from the commentary.

The changes in the layout of the pages of glossed Bibles may be broadly characterized as developing in two phases. The glossed books of the Bible produced during the first, ‘simple’ format, from the earliest copies to around 1170, were slender volumes with a narrow central column containing the whole, unabridged text of one or more books of the Bible. In these earliest manuscripts of the *Glossa Ordinaria*, the distinction was by size of writing; gradually three sizes rather than two came to be employed, the interlinear gloss being written even smaller than the marginal gloss. In this type of layout the text itself was a rigid feature: its width and line spacing, and its number of lines per page, remained constant through the book. Each page was divided

---

748 The earliest glossed books of the Bible (in circulation by ca. 1100) were the Psalms and the letters of St. Paul. They were followed soon afterwards by the books of Job the Song of Songs, the Gospels of Matthew and John and so forth until glossed copies of the entire Bible were available, in about 1135; De Hamel (2001): 108-9.
into three unequal columns – the innermost column being narrower than the other two. The central column hosted the biblical text, written in a large script on lines widely spaced to allow for interlinear glosses; the outer columns housed the marginal gloss, written two to three times smaller than the text. The ratio of inner gloss column to biblical text to outer gloss column is approximately 2:3:2. Depending on this ratio of gloss to text, some pages appear packed, with gloss written into the upper and lower margins, but other pages can be almost blank, apart from the text. The biblical text was thus visually separate and distinctive and could not be confused with the glossing commentary - consisting of short quotations from the recognized commentaries of the past - which was written in smaller script on either side of the central column and between the lines of the biblical text. A reader could follow the central biblical text and glance to left or right for supplementary explanations or interpretations.

This is illustrated in UPenn Ms. Coll. 591, Folder 16, two bifolia from a glossed copy of the Pauline Epistles copied in France, perhaps in Troyes, ca. 1135-50. The Penn leaves are from Romans (7:4-8:18) with the glossa ordinaria. Each page measures 242 x 297 mm and is divided into three columns (see fols. 3v-4r; Fig. 2.2A-B) with the biblical text (large and bold) in the slightly wider central column with the gloss text in smaller writing, positioned in the two outer columns (at a ratio of about two lines of gloss to each line of Bible text), and between the lines of biblical text.

The Bible text and gloss (marginal and interlinear) are both written in protogothic bookhands, but in different sizes. The larger biblical text is extremely round with letters that are compressed vertically (particularly d, whose ascender is extremely short). There is very little horizontal compression within words; letters rarely touch and words are infrequently abbreviated (note the macron written as two diamond-shaped punctus side-by-side instead of the more usual horizontal stroke found later), and although words are

---

550 Smith (2009): 95; cf. Diagram 1 (95) and Figs. 1a (96-7) and 1b (98-9).
553 UPenn Ms. Coll. 591, Folder 16 on Penn in Hand here.
554 Christopher de Hamel has suggested that this France fragment may have been part of a manuscript written between 1135 and 1150, possibly near Troyes (suggested in a letter to E. Ann Matter; a copy of the letter is stored with the fragments).
555 The outer edge of marginal glosses lost at one edge of each bifolia due to trimming for use in a binding (found in the binding of a Cologne imprint of the sermons of Rupert of Deutz, pr. Franz Birckmann, 1526).
not amply spaced within the unit of the line, the lines themselves are widely spaced to accommodate the interlinear glosses. The smaller, more precise glossing script is squarer, with considerable horizontal compression, written on closely spaced lines. The gloss text includes more frequent use of abbreviations – particularly the terminal “us” abbreviation symbol – in addition to employing narrower forms of abbreviations used in the biblical text, such as ‘7’-shaped “et” instead of the larger rounded ‘&’ form; see fol. ) and rather more elongated ascenders.

Biblical text and glossing commentary are similarly distinguished by comparable contrasts in size of script and proportions of layout in Rosenbach Museum & Library, Ms. 484-13, an early 12th-century copy of the Pauline Epistles with marginal and interlinear glosses (see Fig. 2.3). The volume’s pages are divided into 3 columns (gloss, text, gloss) with 21 lines of biblical text per page and gloss at a ratio of about 2 lines of gloss to each line of biblical text. The biblical text is written in a rounded early transitional Caroline-Protogothic bookhand which is fairly broadly spaced horizontally; the scribe abbreviates words but only infrequently resorts to horizontal compression of letter-spacing (there are few examples of letters either ‘kissing’ or ‘biting’) and there is, in general, little vertical compression (excepting ‘d’, whose ascender is extremely short). The glossing script is essentially a smaller version of that used for writing the biblical text, but with rather more elongation of ascenders and descenders.

The scribe of Rosenbach Ms. 484-13 has used symbols to ‘hyperlink’ marginal gloss with passages of text glossed. For example, on fol. 7v, indexical symbols link eight sections of gloss in the left hand column and four in the right column to the pertinent text in the central column upon which each gloss comments. Thus the symbol resembling an upside-down question mark above the ‘n’ in “Non eni[m]” in the first line of biblical text links this text to the gloss at the top of the right hand column, while the first of five glosses in the left hand column is linked via its symbol to the biblical text it glosses in the fourteenth line of the central column (“contra spe[m]”, symbol above the ‘n’).

A contemporary of the Rosenbach volume which also features both marginal and interlinear glosses is FLP Ms. Lewis E 42, a Glossed Gospel of Mark written in Northern Italy, ca. 1140-60. Its pages measure 232 x 154 mm (121 fols.) also arranged in 3 columns (gloss, text, gloss), although with wider outer columns ruled separately for gloss, with 17
lines of biblical text and up to ca. 41-2 of gloss per page (ratio of 2 lines gloss to one of text). The biblical text is written in an extremely rounded script, broadly spaced horizontally with minimal touching of letters and considerable vertical compression with short, curved ascenders (again, d’s ascender is noticeably unextended) with few abbreviations.

However instead of employing superscript symbols to link text and gloss, as in Rosenbach Ms. 484-13, here the scribe simply connects text and marginal gloss by intra-column alignment (Fig. 2.4; the commentary is positioned immediately adjacent to the biblical text glossed), the use of paragraphus signs (the scribe places one above the glossed biblical text and another at the beginning of the related gloss in the margin) and lemmata (i.e. he opens each section of gloss by re-writing the biblical text here glossed, without visually distinguishing this biblical text by underlining or rubrication). For example the first gloss at the top of the outer margin on fol. 6v, beginning “¶ N. Tu es filius…” glosses the second line of biblical text (line 2 reads “tu es filius me”), while at the top of the outer column on fol. 7r, beginning “¶ Hieronymus. Predicans…” glosses the fourth and fifth lines of biblical text in the central column (“predicans euan/gelium”), the abbreviations opening each glossing entry (“N.” and “Hieronymus” indicating the Authority whose commentary on the respective sections of text is being supplied (i.e. N and St. Jerome).

This practice deserves comment, for it is, in general, uncommon in manuscripts of the Gloss for most other books of the Bible, although it is a characteristic found in copies of Mark with the Gloss.\textsuperscript{756} Compare, for example with the penultimate gloss in the left-hand margin ofUPenn Ms. Coll. 591, Folder 16, fol. 4r (Fig. 2.2B), whose glossing citation of St. Gregory’s \textit{Moralia in Iob} simply references “Moralia.”

The glossed Bibles of the second phase (the ‘complex’ format, as of ca. 1170) were in a larger format, and the arrangement of their pages had become much more elaborate.\textsuperscript{757} To achieve a closer fit, flexibility per page was introduced (around the

\textsuperscript{756} See Smith (2009): 58; and Light Light & Christopher de Hamel, \textit{The Idda Collection: Romanesque Biblical Manuscripts c. 1000 to 1240} (Les Enluminures: Chicago, 2015): no. 15, ‘Gospel of Mark with Glossa ordinaria, N. Italy (Tuscay?), ca. 1150-75’, 278-95 [281].

\textsuperscript{757} The production of glossed bibles (both \textit{Ordinaria} and Lombard) ceased after the middle of the 13th century; Gumbert attributes this cessation to market-saturation, commenting that although the gloss was indispensable for serious Bible reading, by this date “Everyone could, if he wanted to, reach a copy to consult”; J.P. Gumbert, “The Layout of the Bible Gloss” (1997): 10.
middle of the 12th century); the width of the columns could be modified in accordance with the amount of gloss expected on that page.\textsuperscript{758} Another development was a gradual change in line ruling; whereas the biblical text had previously been written on generously spaced lines, the later gloss ruling tended to become harmonized with the text ruling, one text line corresponding to two gloss lines.\textsuperscript{759} In addition, the text was now written in the space between two lines in large letters which more or less ‘fill’ that space, and the next space is either left empty or contains a line of interlinear gloss in small script, as the case may be.\textsuperscript{760}

Thus the blocks of Bible text and Gloss were integrated together on the page to form a single unit in which the Bible and its commentary were interlocked together.\textsuperscript{761} Now that the columns were no longer static, commentary could spread into the text, and \textit{vice versa}, so that the entire page was always filled, and the larger text script and the smaller gloss “appeared interwoven.”\textsuperscript{762} De Hamel likens this visual union of biblical text and gloss to “an elegant pattern of bricks” and emphasizes its fluidity: “Sometimes the effect resembled a waterfall, in which the clearly recognizable column of Bible text flowed and tumbled down the page, running and jumping through the blocks of the Gloss.”\textsuperscript{763}

Whilst this layout effected a visual union of the biblical text and gloss on the page, at the same time, it emphasized a visual distinction between them, its design intended to prevent any possible ambiguity between the Bible text, written in large script, and the commentary, in much smaller rounder writing. Thus the two texts were “visually distinct but written in parallel.”\textsuperscript{764} De Hamel has argued that the fact that the text of the Bible became so graphically distinct in these books reflects the new contemporary interest in the

\textsuperscript{758} Gumbert argues that this was partly dictated by a contemporary aesthetic response to the ample quantities of blank space present in previous layouts; blank space “which to our eyes is clear and restful … was to ‘Gothic’ eyes unclear and wasteful.” J.P. Gumbert, “The Layout of the Bible Gloss” (1999): 8.


\textsuperscript{760} “In the end full local flexibility was achieved, with both line width and spacing fluctuating according to the demands of the moment”; J.P. Gumbert, “The Layout of the Bible Gloss” (1999): 8.

\textsuperscript{761} Other layouts of the glossed \textit{sacra pagina} besides the ‘Simple’ and ‘Complex’ layouts, included the ‘Transitional’ format and the Gilbert de la Porrée \textit{cum textu} format; see L. Smith (2009): Ch. 3, esp. Diagram 4 (117) and Diagrams 5a-b (125).

\textsuperscript{762} Smith (2013): 372. Cf. Smith (2009): Diagrams 2 and 3a-c (106-8) and Figs. 3 (118-19) and 4 (122-3).

\textsuperscript{763} See De Hamel (2001): 108-113 [109].

\textsuperscript{764} See De Hamel (2001): 108-113 [109].
Bible as an unadulterated text, allowing readers to consider the biblical text “without the accumulated clutter of centuries.”

One of the basic characteristics of ‘gothic’ script was “the reaction away from carefully spaced letters and lines towards a script whose appearance depends on the effect of the whole page.” Thus, as the alternate-line pages of glossed books became more sophisticated and the text and gloss interlocked fully with each other, “so the balance of the whole page became of great importance.” This was a script that must remain distinctive to the eye yet also adaptable for a limited column space. Thus the introduction of characteristically ‘gothic’ features such as the use of broad strokes in letter-formation and the increasing use of contractions and of ‘biting’, while the legibility of the script was safeguarded against potential interference of the interlinear gloss – from above and below - by the lessening of the differences in height of letters and the flattening-off of the heads of ascenders and of the feet of descendents. “Features of 12th-century script favorable to the development of gothic script include the gradual discovery that the legibility of a script lies in the upper and not the lower art of a letter, and so attention is given to creating heads and (to a lesser extent) feet of letters … The clear black horizontal guidelines ruled in a later 12th century glossed manuscript draw further attention to the upper and lower edges of each line of script.” It was this biblical script on alternate lines, which had been invented for the biblical text that which had been introduced into the continuous gloss in the 1160s, that evolved into that “most aristocratic of scripts”, the liturgical display hand of the gothic period.

However, unlike the newly-invented script used for the alternate-line biblical text, the script of the gloss did not undergo such innovative changes - essentially it retained its original small round squat features which had been used in the marginal gloss since the early 12th century and in the catena Glosses in the mid-12th century. It underwent some of the modifications which occurred in gothic hands, “but only as required by considerations

---

of column space and speed of writing (an angular hand is simpler to write quickly than a round one).”

It is an important stage when this type of script ceases to be a glossing hand and becomes a script in its own right. It appears then in classical texts, a number of them associated with the Paris schools, and finally (“one of its most interesting developments”) as the standard script for the small portable one-volume Bibles which became popular from the later 12th century: “Thus the script had reversed its role: the glossing script had in these manuscripts become the script of the Bible text itself.” With the advent of the 13th-century practice of copying the Scriptures unglossed in a smaller, pandect volume, the script and size of writing, that had previously been external and supplementary to the Scriptural text (used for writing commentary in the page’s outer columns) was now employed to write the Scriptural text itself; the biblical text was now copied in one continuous stream, arranged in two columns, that occupied the whole of the page.

Durham Cathedral Library, Ms. A.III.4, a late-12th-century copy of Glossed I-IV Kings (ca. 1150-75), demonstrates an example of this handwriting “used about 1200 for writing commentaries in the margins of texts” which later influenced the development of smaller, simpler hands shaped by the needs both to conserve space (in order to keep books within a manageable format) and to accelerate the process of production. The results are sometimes referred to nowadays as the smaller ‘gothic’ book hands; highly compressed, closely spaced, and full of abbreviations. The size and compression of these hands gave little scope for style, and the traditions of the earlier hands were soon

---

772 This shift in perception is witnessed in a donation of books unusual for its mention of script is that of 1231 to Penpont (Paimport) by Master Adam, treasurer and later archdeacon of Rennes, including not only “omnes libros suo theologie glossatos” but also “quamdam bibliotecam in minuta littera” - The script was still admired because of its minuteness, though it was no longer thought of as a glossing hand. See A. de la Broderie, “Notes sur les livres et les bibliothèques au moyen age en Bretagne,” Bibl. De l’Ecole des Chartres, 5th ser., iii, 1862, p. 50, cited by de Hamel, Glossed Books of the Bible (1984): 37 n.67.
Durham Cathedral Library, Ms. A.III.4 contains the four books of Kings, glossed. The volume measures 330 x 222 mm, its texts copied in several good hands in 25 long lines within a written space measuring 255 x 155 mm (Part I) and in two columns of 40 lines within a 250 x 160 mm textblock (Part II).

The biblical text and gloss are copied within a written space of 255 x 155 mm at a ratio of 2 lines of gloss per line of biblical text; thus, for example fol. 4v (Fig. 2.5) contains 24 lines of biblical text (in the wider central column) and 49 lines of gloss (in the outer columns), both biblical text and gloss written by the same scribe. The biblical text is written in an elegant angular, upright calligraphic bookhand, ascenders clubbed and generally quite short, upright r (‘2’-shaped r employed only as or ligature in “uxores”, line 9 of biblical text) beautiful rounded tironian ‘et’.

The gloss in a similar but more highly-compressed script (both horizontally and vertically, written on reasonably well spaced lines (in both columns the first line of gloss starts above top bounding line). The glossing script is also angular and upright, but with squarer letters and employs horizontally-compressed shapes of letter forms and abbreviation symbols (aka ‘less formal’) not used in the script of the biblical text, including round d and ‘7’-shaped tironian ‘et’, with straight s more commonly used than its round form. However, there are still stylistic embellishments where space permits, for example the finishing flourish of ‘f’ in “fenenna” at the end of col. c, line 10 (and again at the start of col. c, line 24), and the extended cross stroke’s concluding upstroke of the terminal ‘t’ of the stretched-out “pa ri e bat” concluding the gloss in the right hand column (col. c, line 41), both embellishments recalling the same treatment of respective letters in the biblical text (i.e. “fueruntq[ue]” and “immolauit” in lines 11 and 19 of the biblical text).

---


777 I Regum, fols. 1-37; II Regum, fols. 37-64v; III Regum, fols. 64v-105; IV Regum, fols. 105-135v, followed by Richard of Saint-Victor, Benjamin Minor (fols. 136-154v).

778 Decorated with capitals in red, blue and green, and rarely bistre; contains four large initials of ‘split-petal’ type in red, green and blue (on fols. 4v, 37r [gold is used on fol. 37] and 136r); on fol. 64v, an initial of foliage and tendrils drawn in ink but not colored; and on fol. 79r is a plan of Solomon’s Temple.
Durham Cathedral Library, Ms. A.I.19 is a magnificent copy of the Pauline Epistles (“In Epistolas S. Pauli”) with Peter Lombard’s Gloss, which first belonged to Bishop Hugh le Puiset.\textsuperscript{779} The volume was produced in the late 12\textsuperscript{th} century (before 1195), probably in Northern France. (317 fols., 397 x 273 [240 x 160] mm, in 2 columns with 23-24 lines of text and 45-48 of gloss).\textsuperscript{780} In this example (see fol. 250r; Fig. 2.6), the 13 lines of biblical text occupies about half of the right-hand column (a written space ca. 133 in height, each line a little over 10 mm in height; running from lines 15 to 40 of the gloss’ ruling) amidst a sea of surrounding gloss (45 lines to the page, each line ca. 5.3 mm in height). Magnificent illuminated initials mark the preface and the start of each epistle, on this page, the beginning of II Thessalonians (fol. 250r), the initial is historiated, depicting St. Paul’s martyrdom,\textsuperscript{781} although the other initials are mostly decorated with foliate tendrils and leaf-bursts, along with assorted figures, dragons and grotesques.

The biblical text is larger and bolder to the eye, in an angular, upright bookhand with a broad-nibbed pen, compressed horizontally but handsomely decorated, copied on alternate lines widely spaced and with ample space around its textblock. The glossing text is written in a square, angular script with considerable compression both vertically and horizontally, on closely spaced lines with frequent abbreviation via contractions, suspensions and ligatures.

\textbf{b The Layout and presentation of text in 13\textsuperscript{th}-century portable bibles}

As discussed above, the 13\textsuperscript{th}-century craftsmen of the book faced clear physical limits in seeking to ‘miniaturize’ the Bible. Since the biblical text was always, or nearly, the same length, and since they desired to produce a book that that was neither too thick


Contains the following inscriptions of medieval ownership by Durham Cathedral priory: “Liber Hugonis Dunelm episcopi | Epistole Pauli Glosate” (late 12\textsuperscript{th} century), fol. 2; “Epistole Pauli Hugonis Episcopi” (12\textsuperscript{th}-13\textsuperscript{th} century), fol. 1v; “Liber sancti Cuthberti de Dunelmo” (ca.1200), fol. 2r. On fol. 3r: “B.” (late 14\textsuperscript{th} century); “B.” (14\textsuperscript{th}-15\textsuperscript{th} century); and “Epistole Pauli glosate de communi libraria monachorum Dunelm In le Spendement” (early 15\textsuperscript{th} century).

\textsuperscript{780} 14 initials remain (one lost) all except 2 of which were protected with sewn on linen guards of which 9 remain; there are 4 figure subjects, the remainder are filled with foliage: see Mynors, DCM (1939): pls. 54-55.

\textsuperscript{781} Three further historiated initials on fols. 87v, 175r and 218v (I Corinthians, Galatians and Philippians).
nor too thin for its size, medieval craftsmen had to find a way to fit the entire Bible text into a small pandect codex format.\footnote{Ruzzier, “The Miniaturisation of Bible Manuscripts” (2013): 113-14.} Together with the material compression of the body of the codex (effected through using thinner parchment, permitting the inclusion of a greater number of leaves), the best solution was to effect a compression of the written biblical text on the page through reconfiguring the three variables of arranging text on a page, namely: the written space in relation to the dimensions of the page; the density of writing within the written space; and the length of the text itself.

For small 13th-century bibles, as for the Glossed books of the Bible produced during the previous century, content was inseparable from format (in terms of page layout and codex size); their function (as portable books) dictated their form (as necessarily smaller, lighter books) and although this format did dictate these books’ content to a certain extent, it more significantly dictated the way in which that content was written. Thus, in a ‘typical’ smaller format unglossed copy of the Bible of the 13th century, the size of writing employed was, of necessity, reduced. Just as the script in which portable bibles were written had been elevated from its previous use as a glossing script used for writing commentary to use for writing the biblical text itself, so too did this script become centralized within the 
\textit{mise-en-page} of the medieval \textit{sacra pagina}, translated from its previous marginal status.

The production of the biblical text in portable pandect format maintained the concept of the unity of the \textit{sacra pagina} as a single entity first established (theologically and visually) in 12th-century glossed books of the Bible. By the mid-12th century, a sense of what consisted the written area on the page of a glossed text had been established, in which the gloss and biblical text were copied in three columns of carefully adjusted widths (arranged as gloss | text | gloss) to maintain both biblical text and gloss as a single \textit{visual} unit within the whole written area of the page, written within a textblock whose outer parameters were dictated by ruled bounding-lines down each side of the page and its first and last horizontal lines forming the limits at the top and bottom of this rectangular space.\footnote{De Hamel, \textit{Glossed Books of the Bible} (1984): 17.}
This concept of the written space of the page constituting a unified visual unit continued into the arrangement of the biblical text on the page in 13th-century ‘portable’ bibles. However whereas in the Glossed Bibles, the *sacra pagina* consisted of the Gloss and biblical text as a single visual unit in three columns of ‘elastic’ widths, in the ‘pocket’ bibles of the 13th century the visual unit of the page contained only the biblical text, copied in a written space disposed in two columns of equal width and ruled for an equal number of lines of text in both columns (usually around 50) per page, which number of lines remains constant throughout the codex. The page was thus generally sub-divided by six lines, four vertical and two horizontal; thus four lines (two vertical and two horizontal) ruled the outer boundaries (or ‘frame’) of the written space with two further vertical lines - in the center of the page, a short distance apart – sub-divided the textblock into two columns.784

As Neil Ker showed, the 13th century was the period during which, in England at least, scribes gradually adopted the practice of writing their first line of text below, rather than above the top ruled line.785 In other words, “up to the 13th century every page of writing is as it were open at the top: there is nothing but the margin above the top line of writing,” but from the 13th century “every page is enclosed within a complete frame of ruled lines”;786 thus, “The position of the first line of writing, whether it is above or below the top ruled line, is therefore one of the noteworthy points about a thirteenth-century manuscript.”787 Although this change in scribal practice witnessed, at least in England, in the 13th century was not peculiar to the production of bibles in particular, this change is witnessed in contemporary bibles of all formats. It is thus a reliable and extremely useful rule to remember when attempting to date and localize a bible’s production.


This sub-division of the textblock into two columns typical of 13th-century ‘portable’ bibles was one of the compression strategies scribes employed in order to reduce the Bible’s lengthy text by increasing the dimensions of the written space available to them in relation to the dimensions of the page.\footnote{During the 12th century scribes had employed two-column layouts for copying ‘library’ copies of texts, especially patristic works. However from the end of the 13th century scribes tended to adopt single-column layouts more frequently for well-written copies of other prose texts. For examples see See G. F. Warner & J.P. Gilson, Catalogue of Western Manuscripts in the Old Royal and King’s Collection, 4 vols. (London: The British Museum, 1921): pls. 8 (William of Hales) and 10 (William of Devon); but for a smaller copy in double columns of 53 lines, see Keble College, Oxford, Ms. 80 (M.B. Parkes, Kehle College, Oxford 1979: pl. 172); see also discussion in M.B. Parkes, “Layout and presentation of the text,” in CHBB II (2008): 56 n.7.} This solution allowed for “an increase in the density of graphic signs on one page without compromising the legibility of the text;” significantly, nearly all 13th-century portable bibles were copied in this double column layout.\footnote{Ruzzier, “The Miniaturisation of Bible Manuscripts” (2013): 118, n.29. Cf. Bozolo and Ornato, Pour une histoire du livre manuscrit: 318-30.} Books of Hours were copied in a large script in a single column of long lines; this layout and its ruling are particularly clear in The de Brailes Hours, produced in Oxford ca. 1240 (British Library, Add. Ms. 49999: 150 x 125 (115 x 80) mm, 1 col./12 lines, 105 fols.; Fig. 2.7).\footnote{The best single study of the de Brailes Hours is that of Claire Donovan, The de Brailes Hours: Shaping the Book of Hours in Thirteenth-Century Oxford (London, British Library, 1991): passim; cf. Nigel Morgan, Survey IV.1 (1982): no. 73. Cf. on ruling patterns in Books of Hours: Claire Donovan, “The Mise-en-page of Early Books of Hours in England,” in Medieval Book Production: Assessing the Evidence, Ed. Linda L. Brownrigg (Los Altos Hills, CA: Anderson-Lovelace, 1990): 147-62, fig. 1; and John Higgitt, The Martyr Hours: Devotion, Literacy and Luxury in Paris, England and the Gaelic West (London: British Library/Toronto: Toronto UP, 2000): 51, Table 5 and Figs. 15, 16 and 19; cf. ibid. Appendix 2 (305) for variant ruling patterns; cf. Roger S. Wieck, Time Sanctified: The Book of Hours in Medieval Art and Life (George Braziller, Inc., NY in assoc. with The Walters Art Gallery, Baltimore, 1988): passim.} Psalters, whose layout had to accommodate psalms as well as prayers, were copied in single or double columns, for example see a Psalter-Hours copied in France ca. 1250-75 (Free Library of Philadelphia, Ms. Widener 9: 185 x 133 mm, 1 col./20 lines, 241 fols.; Fig. 2.8).\footnote{On the layout of the Psalter see William G. Noel, “Psalters,” in Leaves of Gold: Treasures of Manuscript Illumination from Philadelphia Collections, Ed. James R. Tanis (Philadelphia: Philadelphia Museum of Art, 2001): 44-5, cf. nos. 8-15 (46-67); cf. Parkes, Pause and Effect (1979): pls. 12, 13; also N. Morgan, Survey IV.2 (1988): no. 158, pl. 284; Survey V, nos. 134–5, pls. 358–9. However Psalters with parallel texts in two languages were generally copied in alternate columns of a two-column layout; for example, see the parallel texts in Latin and French in the Winchester Psalter, 1121–61 (see DMBL: pl. 66); noted in M.B. Parkes, “Layout” (2008): 64 & n.61.}

By copying the biblical text in a much smaller module of handwriting and the more frequent use of a wider selection of abbreviations, the scribes of 13th-century ‘portable’ bibles were able to compress the text within the written space both vertically...
(by reducing the blank space between lines, thus increasing the number of lines which they could fit into each column; often 50 lines or more) and horizontally (by reducing spacing between words and between letters, through frequent use of ligatures). 792

The number of words abbreviated by two or more syllables is much greater in small hands than in medium-sized ones, although this was not an innovation by 13th-century scripts; the frequency of simplified spellings indicated by abbreviation symbols had been one of the most characteristic features of texts copied in small handwriting since the beginning of the 12th century. 793 However, for the 13th-century scribes copying bibles in smaller formats, the increased use of abbreviation techniques and symbols was not only motivated by a desire to shorten the text; it was also a necessary by-product of their copying the text in two narrow columns. 794 Although this two-column layout with shorter lines containing fewer words was convenient for readers, it required scribes to anticipate the justification of the ends of lines of text, in order to reduce the intrusion of text into the narrow space between columns. 795 In order to avoid breaking the conventions of word-

792 The best study of premodern punctuation (including discussion of abbreviation symbols) remains Malcom B. Parkes, Pause and Effect: An Introduction to the History of Punctuation in the West (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992); see esp. 20-29, pls. 8-12 (on components in the ‘Grammar of Legibility’); 30-4, pls. 13-15 (on the Carolingian Renovatio); 35-40, pl. 16-19 and 76-80, pl. 19 (on notation employed for the liturgy and the requirements of public worship); also the Glossary of Technical Terms and Punctuation Symbols (301-7). On 12th century developments in the use of abbreviation symbols in particular, see Parkes, “Handwriting in English books,” in CHBB II (2008): 117-120 and fig. 6.3.

793 The system of abbreviation inherited by 12th-century scribes was based on suspension and contraction; scribes now combined the two methods, producing simplified forms of common words, and occasionally formulaic terms, which appeared frequently in a text. 12th-century scribes had also inherited the convention of separating the different parts of speech according to the morphological criteria discussed by the grammarians of Late Antiquity. However, although word-separation was well advanced by the beginning of the 12th century, it was not always consistent; on the development of word-separation by insular scribes see M.B. Parkes, “The Contribution of Insular Scribes of the Seventh and Eighth Centuries to the ‘Grammar of Legibility,’” in his Scribes, Scripts and Readers (London: The Hambledon Press, 1991): 1–17. Parkes notes that, since Late Antiquity, the principal function of serifs has been “to prevent (or discourage) the eye of the reader from slipping inadvertently from one line of text to another.” (Parkes 2008: 112 n.12. Scribes compressed the letter shapes laterally to reduce the amount of space occupied by words, and to leave spaces (usually the width of m or n) between them. In order to assimilate the letters within the larger patterns of individual words, scribes traced the serifs at the tops of the ascenders, and at the feet of the minims and the stems of other letters, with symmetrical strokes to bind the letters together within a word. For the same reason they sought to trace the repetitive strokes in the lobes of b, p and d, q and the stems of c, e and o so that the thickest parts of the strokes were symmetrical. Cf. M.B. Parkes, “Handwriting in English books,” in CHBB II (2008): 117.


division at the ends of lines, scribes adopted simplified spellings indicated by abbreviation symbols, or, conversely, adapted forms of r and s in different ways to extend the final letter of a word.  

**ii Miniaturization of Script**

The minute writing used in the innumerable ‘pocket’ Bibles written in the 13th century was related to the rather less formal ‘university’ hands used to copy textbooks for the universities in Paris and Oxford. In the smaller handwriting of the 13th century, scribes adopted the other 12th-century practice of completing the minims by turning the strokes to the right into a diagonal serif. This variety of textura came to be referred to as *littera semi-quadrata*. Scribes used this smaller, less formal variety of the textura script alongside the formal precissa and quadrata grades for copying other kinds of texts, especially academic texts. The high quality of some of these scribes’ handwriting brought this treatment of the minims into the contemporary canon of features of style,
and thus the text of certain 13th-century ‘pocket’ bibles can be described as written in textura semi-quadrata.\textsuperscript{801}

Parkes cites five copies as typical examples of these ‘small Bibles’ written in littera semi-quadrata,\textsuperscript{802} including British Library, Arundel Ms. 303, an early English ‘pocket’ bible (138 x 93 mm, 484 fols.), copied between 1228 and 1234, possibly in Oxford but probably for Dominican use (Fig. 2.9);\textsuperscript{803} and Bodleian Library, Oxford, Ms. Lat. bibl. e.7,\textsuperscript{804} an English ‘pocket’ bible-missal\textsuperscript{805} (168 x 108 mm, 440 fols.) also copied in Oxford for a Dominican, ca. 1225-50 (before 1234), and extensively illuminated by William de Brailes; probably the earliest of the bibles chiefly illuminated by de Brailes (Fig. 2.9).\textsuperscript{806}

\textsuperscript{801} For examples see M.B. Parkes, “Handwriting in English books,” in CHBB II (2008): 126 n.96.


\textsuperscript{803} This bible’s Oxford Dominican provenance is witnessed by the table of re

\textsuperscript{804} This bible’s Oxford Dominican provenance is witnessed by the table of re

\textsuperscript{805} Includes a Missal, positioned between the Psalter and Proverbs (fols. 199r ff.) and written across the page, unlike the rest of the manuscript which is written in double columns. St. Dominic is the only saint named in the missal text (fol. 204r) with an additional office for his Translation inserted in a different hand on the lower margin.

\textsuperscript{806} Claire Donovan dates this bible more specifically to “ca. 1234 (or earlier) - 1240” in The de Brailes Hours (1991): 203 (no. 16). For discussion of the bible’s de Brailes connection see Graham Pollard, “William de Brailes,” Bodleian Library Record V.1 (1955): 202–9 [204]; Sydney C. Cockerell, The Work of W. de Brailes: An
As opposed to the squareness and angularity of formal Gothic quadrata formata scripts, the texts of these bibles written in the semi-quadrata grade of textura display the following features: the shape of the letters can be rounded (with, at times, a near-cursive visual effect in their compactness); both ascenders and descenders can be less pronounced in height, tending to raise their necks (like d) or lower their legs (like g, y, q, p) less distance above or below minim-height (or cue-height); with frequent use of junctures and ligatures (like de, do, pe etc.)

The other grade of textura sometimes referenced is Textus rotundus (or textualis rotunda), the bottoms of whose minims lack formally applied feet and are simply rounded off with a natural upwards curve of the pen, conveying an impression of increased regularity compounded by some tendency towards lateral compression.

A Perlschrift: Is it a script or a size (style)?

Although scholars and cataloguers do sometimes identify a ‘grade’ of textura when describing the text and ‘script’ of 13th-century ‘pocket’ bibles, paleographers have commonly used the term “perlschrift”, or ‘pearl script’ to encompass the variety of

---

808 Or littera minuscula gothica textualis rotunda libraria; M. Brown (1990): pl. 31 (88-89). For examples of texts copied in textus rotundus in the 14th and 15th centuries see the following manuscripts in UPenn’s Special Collections: UPenn RBML Ms. Codex 60 (De description terre sancte; ca. 1350-1450, Bologna; 70 fols., 169 x 111 mm); Ms. Codex 1226 (Ordo judicarius; ca. 1300-50, Italy; 20 fols., 460 x 285 mm); Ms. Codex 1248 (Liturgical miscellany; ca. 1450-99, S. Gothic; 123 fols., 82 x 60 mm); and cf. their respective entries on Penn in Hand available here; Ms. Codex 60, Ms. Codex 1226 & Ms. Codex 1248.
809 Although as Derolez notes, this treatment of minims is less marked during the first quarter of the 13th century, and further suggests that of the four grades of textura, Textus Rotunda is perhaps the closest to the ‘original’ form of Gothic script, and may be considered the ‘normal’ Textualis (Derolez 2003: 75). For studies of textualis rotunda see M. Brown (1990): pl. 31 (88-89); also Raymond Clements & Timothy Graham, Introduction to Manuscript Studies (Ithaca & London: Cornell UP, 2007): 135-178 (Italian Gothic Rotunda, 156-7); and James J. John, “Latin Paleography”, in Medieval Studies: An Introduction, Ed. James Powell, 2nd ed. (New York: Syracuse UP, 1992): 3-81 (Gothic scripts, 29-38; on rotunda see 33-34 & Fig. 1.16).
810 For further discussion of perlschrift see J. Stiennon & G. Hasenohr, Paléographie du Moyen Age (Paris: Colin, 1973): 247; for facsimiles see New Palaeographical Society, ser 1, 2, plate 217; Ernst Croux & Joachim Kirchner, Die gotischen Schriftarten (Berlin, 1928): pl. 9; Hermann Degering, Die Schrift, atlas der schriftformen des Abendlandes vom altertum bis zum ausgang des 18. jahrhunderts (Berlin: E. Wasmuth a.g., 1929): pl. 81 (Berlin, Ms. lat. oct. 277, fols. 135v-136r); Exempla scripturarum (Romae, apud Bibliothecam vaticanam, 1929-): Fasc. I, pl. 11; Otto Mazal, Buchkunst der Gotik (Graz, 1975): pl. 4 (Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Cod. 1138, fol. 65r);
forms that these bibles’ scripts could take. Overall, of all the various terms applied to these bibles’ writing, this paleographical descriptor is perhaps the closest thing that one can identify as a synonym frequently cited to mean ‘A ‘Pocket’ Bible Script.’ How is the term defined, and how is it used?

Otto Mazal characterized “perlschrift” as ‘a dainty little writing’ (“eine kleine zierliche Schrift”), ‘almost at the limit of legibility’ (“fast an der Grenze der Lesbarkeit”), and explains that the term is so-called “da sich ihre Buchstaben wie Perlenschnüre an den Zeilen aufreihen” (because its characters are arranged on the line like strings of beads). Mazal’s definition of “perlschrift” thus stems from its stylistic features, as a style of writing characterized by the shape and size of its letters (very small and round), the impression created by their alignment within word and line units (uniformity). So far ‘pearl script’ sounds very pleasant; neat, regular and dainty, pleasing to the eye and soothing to the nerves. However, alas, together these features generate an aspect which is rather less mellifluous; ‘pearl script’ may be ‘dainty’ and its letters may resemble ‘strings of beads’, but it renders text practically illegible.

---

*Catalogue des manuscrits en écriture latine portant des indications de date, de lieu ou de copiste*, Eds. C. Samaran, R. Marrichal et al (Paris: CNRS, 7 vols. by 1984); vol. 5, pl. XXIIIb and vol. 6, pl. XXa.

---

811 In the 11th century, Greek manuscripts were also copied in a style now referred to as ‘pearl’ script. Although this writing obviously looks different to 13th-century Latin *perlschrift*, the same styles of letter formation and aspect of its written text are recognizable in both Greek and Latin scripts of this name; Greek ‘pearl’ script is also extremely regular, legible and distinctive, as Kathleen Maxwell describes: “It is easily differentiated from the ‘low epsilon’ script of the more than one hundred decorative style manuscripts of the period ca. 1150-1250.” Kathleen Maxwell, *Between Constantinople and Rome: An Illuminated Byzantine Gospel Book (Paris gr. 54) and the Union of Churches* (Ashgate, 2014): 25, n. 50. In re: the archaizing Greek script used for script of Paris, BnF Ms. gr. 54, a bilingual (Latin and Greek) gospel codex of the second half of the 13th century, Maxwell comments: “This handsome revival script is distinguished by its ample, regular, and legible letter forms, as well as by the renewal of the minuscule forms of such letters as β, η, κ and λ. Abbreviations are relatively rare with the exception of the *nomina sacra.*” (Maxwell 2014: 25) On Greek archaizing scripts of the 13th century, cf. Giancarlo Prato, “Scrizioni librarie arcaizzanti della prima età dei Paleologi e loro modelli,” *Scrittura e civiltà* 3 (1979): 151-91; and Herbert Hunger, “Die Perlschrift, eine Stilmittel der griechischen Buchschrift des 11. Jahrhunderts,” in *Studien zur griechischen Paläographie* [Biblos-Schriften, Band 5] (Vienna: Verlag Brüder Hollinek, 1954): 22-32 & Plates II-X [30].

812 Josephine Case-Schnurman commented that although “The scripts of the pocket Bibles are often discussed and commented on as one – as if all the manuscripts were written in one printing type,” aside from the basic Gothic shape of the letters and their very small size, many of the differences “seem to be occasioned rather by the personal than the national styles of the scribes.” (Schnurman [1960]: 68-9).

Mazal opens his definition by qualifying “Perlschrift” as a style of writing specific to copies of a specific kind of text (bibles) which were copied at a particular time (the 13th century) in a particular place (France): “In vorwiegend französischen Bibelhandschriften des 13. Jahrhunderts” (in predominantly French Bible manuscripts of the 13th century), and in conclusion, states that “Die als Perlschrift benannte gotische Buchschrift gestattete die Herstellung bequemer Taschenausgaben des Alten und Neuen Testaments”814; in other words, the use of this ‘Gothic book script designated as Perlschrift’ (“Die als Perlschrift benannte gotische Buchschrift”) permitted, or made possible (“gestattete”) the production of copies of the Old and New Testaments in ‘convenient pocket-size’ (“bequemer Taschenausgaben”).

This specificity of definition was echoed by Bernhard Bischoff, who used the term in his 1979 classic Paläographie des römischen Altertums und des abendländischen Mittelalters (trans. Latin Palaeography: Antiquity and the Middle Ages, 1990).815 Bischoff, like Mazal, defines ‘pearl script’ as ‘tiny’, and reiterates the view that ‘pearl script’ was ‘created’ or ‘shaped’ (“geschaffen”) in the 13th century specifically for the purpose of writing small-format bibles, but unlike Mazal, Bischoff characterizes it as ‘clearly legible’. Bischoff also extends Mazal’s definition, suggesting a genealogy of the style, as an even more refined descendant type of the ‘university’ scripts’ simplified textura and stating that the style was used not just for copying bibles, but also ‘pocket’ copies of the New Testament (“Taschenexemplaire der Vulgata und des Neuen Testaments”).

This sequence of these bibles’ format dictating their script’s format is supported by Albert Derolez, who offers the following definition: “‘Perlschrift’ (‘pearl script’) is an


815 “Vereinfachte Textura ist z. B. im allgemeinen die abkürzungsreiche Universitätsschrift des XIII. und XIV. Jahrhunderts von Paris und Oxford und erst echt ihre verfeinerte Abart, die winzige und dabei doch klar lesbare ‘Perlschrift’, die für Taschenexemplaire der Vulgata und des Neuen Testaments im XIII. Jahrhundert geschaffen wurde.” (The heavily abbreviated university script of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries in Paris and Oxford is, for example, generally a simplified textura, and even more, its refined descendant type, the tiny though clearly legible ‘pearl-script’ that was created in the thirteenth century for pocket copies of the Vulgate and the New Testament.) Bernhard Bischoff, Paläographie des römischen Altertums und des abendländischen Mittelalters (Munich?: Erich Schmidt Verlag, 1979): 173. Bischoff also notes the need for further investigation into the distinctions between ‘scriptura Parisiensis’ and ‘scriptura Oroniensis’ (see Cencetti, Lineamenti, 220 ff., and Compendio, 76 f.): Bischoff (1979/1990): 135, n. 49; trans. from Bernhard Bischoff (translated by Dáibhí Ó Cróinín & David Ganz), Latin Palaeography: Antiquity and the Middle Ages (Cambridge: CUP, 1990): 135.
extremely small size of *Textualis*, developed by scribes in the thirteenth century especially in order to copy the famous ‘Parisian pocket Bibles.’” Derolez’s description of the emergence of ‘perlschrift’ qualifies Bischoff’s to include morphological characteristics of the style.

Beyond the general statement that the ‘perlschrift’ style of *textura* was used for copying pocket bibles in the 13th century, these definitions of ‘perlschrift’s genealogy are predicated upon two implications: namely that this style of writing was ‘created’ (i.e. developed deliberately, by design); and furthermore that this writing style was invented by a particular group of scripts copying a particular kind of text, i.e. specifically for use in writing these bibles in particular. This poses something of a ‘Chicken and Egg’ stalemate; which came first, the writing style or the physical format of the volume being produced? On the one hand, one may argue that this style of writing was the result of contemporary innovation influencing the production of a wider variety of texts, including ‘pocket’ bibles, in smaller formats that ever before that generated this development of a new style of copying *textura* scripts. In short, that it was necessarily created in response to scribes’ need to reduce the size of their writing on the page in order to compress the entire biblical text into the new single-volume, small-format codices; that codex format shaped form of script. Or one can argue that the organic development of this smaller, more compact form of writing led to an increase in the production of texts being copied in small-format copies as a result of capitalizing on the compression potential of this small-sized writing to shorten lengthy texts and thus make it possible to copy them in small volumes; that form of script influenced codex format. Ultimately the puzzle is probably unanswerable.

Paleographers’ reference for the term “perlschrift” when describing the writing of these bibles summarizes my point rather neatly; namely that the so-called ‘mass standardization’ of 13th-century ‘pocket’ bibles’ ‘scripts’ is really the result of scribal conformity to a common pattern of writing (layout and tiny writing) which resulting in a standardization, or uniformity, of the visual aspect of text, which can be witnessed in copies

---

817 “Although it was intended to be a luxurious, high-level script and thus one might expect to call it *Textualis Formata*, its letter forms, because they are so small, are simplified, often irregular (incorporating, for example, various shapes of a) and have few ‘Gothic’ refinements. Where these do occur, as in the bifurcation at the top of the ascenders, they tend to be exaggerated.” Derolez: 100, cf. pl. 20.
produced across Europe. Very rarely do paleographers cite 13th century ‘pocket’ bibles as [paleographical] exemplars on the basis of their script; in other words, citing particular 13th-century portable bibles on the basis of their scripts or writing demonstrating datable or localizable stylistic features distinctive to a specific kind of script or style of writing witnessed at a particular date or in a particular place.

Likewise, the standardized character of the style of writing found in ‘pocket’ bibles affords only very fragile indications for localizing their production by attempting to identify distinct nationalistic features in the scripts in which they were copied. It is often extremely difficult to differentiate between, for example, an English and a French portable bible of the 13th century; to be able to do so is uncommon and extremely difficult, but it is usually almost impossible. Identification between Insular and Continental hands is made all the more challenging (and important) as a result of the standardized character of 13th-century book scripts in general. S. Harrison Thomson makes tentative suggestion of ‘French’ characteristics of letter forms in analyzing a 13th-century hand which demonstrates “a French influence,” suggesting more generally that French *textura* “maintained a high degree of calligraphic gothic precision.” However these generalizations are certainly too broad to permit precise identification and attribution of date or place of production in the study of 13th-century ‘pocket’ bibles. This challenge can thwart even the most expert *oculus palaeographicus*; for example, Paul Saenger has described how Malcolm Parkes, upon attempting to distinguish between a number of French and English 13th-century bibles at The Newberry Library in Chicago on the basis of their respective hands, looked long and hard and concluded: “You really can’t tell the difference!”

---

818 Including the looped r following an o or a p; the forked ascenders b, h and l; the backward swing of the final downstroke of the h, m and n; see Thomson (1969) No. 12 “France 1277” (‘Varia SS. Augustini et Isidori,’ Bib. Royale, Brussels, Ms. lat. II, 2297 [1116], fol. 1v) for Thomson’s selection of 13th-century French scripts see *ibid.*, nos. 6-17.


820 Paul Saenger, “The Birth of Modern Chapter Divisions,” Rosenbach Lecture II: 15 April 2008; Saenger comments on the standardized character of 13th-century book scripts, particularly those of the early 13th-century and including those used for copying bibles throughout the 13th century.
Where did perlschrift come from?

The Scripts used in 12th-century Glossed Books of The Bible

The *sacra pagina*, or sacred page, thus consisted not merely of the biblical text on its own, but of the text surrounded by a panoply of post-biblical glosses. Text and glosses were perceived as a single entity, and the arrangement of the glosses in relation to the text produced a form of hypertext. The text was written in a large or medium-size script, the glosses in a smaller version of the same script, and both were usually copied by the same scribe. The hierarchy implied in the two sizes of handwriting reflected the difference between the status accorded to the content of the gloss and that considered to be inherent in the sacred text itself.

In 12th-century glossed books of the Bible, the biblical text was written in a formal script of large size at the center of the page, whilst commentary and gloss are written in a slightly less formal script (less formal because it had to be written in letters of a smaller size) in the outer columns around the Scriptures. The Scriptural text is visually distinguished within the space of the page not only by the higher degree of formality in the choice of script used but also by its larger size and by its boldness – it is written with a broader-nibbed pen to make the strokes of its letter-formations thicker and thus to stand out from the commentarial discourse that surrounded it. Because of the elaborate arrangement of large and small scripts on the page, glossed books “were no doubt among the hardest 12th-century book to write.”

Each page was designed separately, presumably by a process of calculation and careful alignment in the exemplar(s), assisted by the ruling which could accommodate both text and commentary. Writing such an elastic layout was a job requiring much attention from the scribe. First he had to finish any glosses left ‘open’ from the preceding page, then copy in a section of Bible text, having first judged how much

---

821 See M.B. Parkes, “Layout and presentation of the text,” in CHBB II (2008): fig. 4.6 (Trinity College, Cambridge, Ms. B.3.11)
822 De Hamel writes: “Scribes tended to adopt particular types or classes of script for particular texts. … The purpose for which a book was intended sometimes determined its script. But different categories of text tended to develop (sometimes almost by hazard) characteristic scripts. … A lectionary, for instance, would have been written in a different handwriting from a verse manuscript and this, in turn, would differ from the script (for example) of a cartulary.” (De Hamel 1984: 33.)
gloss this carried and selected the text width accordingly; then he added the gloss, before calculating how much space this left for the next section of biblical text.\textsuperscript{825} It seems likely that, in order to ensure accuracy and to facilitate the copying process, a scribe unfamiliar with the conventions and patterns of his exemplar would find it easier to make a facsimile of the original – the term is that of the modern calligrapher Edward Johnston – as exactly as was allowed by expense and time,” adjusted the commentary on a page whenever necessary.\textsuperscript{826} The actual positioning of the glosses themselves (whether, for instance, to the left or the right of the central column or even whether interlinear or marginal) varied from copy to copy and does not seem to provide any clear patterns of sequences or common exemplars. However the script, like the layout, was imitated very carefully.”\textsuperscript{827}

The script used for the biblical text in early glossed books probably derived from the scholar’s hands used in the northern French schools where the text itself originated. It was written in the central column and is legible at close distance.\textsuperscript{828} The script for the gloss was written in a smaller hand and is sometimes more angular and contains a rather greater number of abbreviations, however its only real difference lay in its size. An important feature of the hand used for marginal glosses in the first half of the 12\textsuperscript{th} century was that it was possible to write a book entirely in this script. The same type of hand was employed for writing glosses even when the biblical text was not present,\textsuperscript{829} indicating

\textsuperscript{826} De Hamel, Glossed Books of the Bible (1984): 33. Such adjustments would explain the presence of a signe-de-renvoi at the foot of a column, which links an incomplete gloss to its continuation in another column, or on the next page; cf. Trinity College, Cambridge, Ms. B.3.11 (M.B. Parkes, “Layout” 2008: fig. 4.6). For further examples of such signes de renvoi, see DMCL, pls. 69, 70 and 71 (all in the bottom margins); De Hamel 1984, pl. 15 (Rouen, Bibl. Mun., Ms. A.203); also 31 & n. 25.
\textsuperscript{827} De Hamel, Glossed Books of the Bible (1984): 33.
\textsuperscript{828} It is a small regular hand, often with quite angular feet to the minims; the round letters, such as o and d, preserve their full curved bows through ‘biting’ of two adjacent round letters; the tyronian e is often interchangeable with the ampersand; and there is not a great difference in height between the ascenders and the body of the script (which proved convenient for a line of text with interlinear gloss parallel to it and just above it) and the spacing of the words could be expanded or contracted to take up more or less space in a line (which was suitable for the very narrow columns in a glossed book). (De Hamel, Glossed Books of the Bible [1984]: 33-34).
\textsuperscript{829} E.g. The early manuscripts of the Glosses of Gilbert de la Porrée were written as continuous catena-type texts in the same script – cf. De Hamel, Glossed Books of the Bible (1984): 34-5 & n.47.
that this script, which descended directly from its use in the margins of early 12th-century glossed books, “was evidently considered to be the one appropriate to a patristic gloss.”

This new script used for the biblical text uses many of the features associated with gothic hands. However, although gothic script obviously has no single origin, and as De Hamel points out, “It would be unwise even to hint that it was artificially devised for the biblical text of glossed books or for any other specific type of book”, the fact remains that some of the earliest recognized examples of ‘gothic’ bookhands are in glossed books of the Bible.

In the second half of the 12th century (as of around the 1160s) the commentaries assembled by Peter Lombard (d.1160) on the Psalms and the Pauline Epistles, then regarded as the most important collections of texts in the Bible for the study of theology, supplemented and then superseded the different compilations of glosses of his predecessors. Lombard’s commentary, which became known as the Magna Glossatura (or Great Gloss), constituted a very different type of gloss, whose principal problems were fit, and distinction of text from gloss. Various techniques were experimented with in essaying to best distinguish text and gloss: the distinction could be by size (text big, gloss small); or by color (red); or by placing the text in a half-column using color as a distinction; or by using a half-column layout with size as a distinction. In this ‘new’ layout, the disposition of text and gloss, and the sizes of the columns on each page, were determined by the length of the commentary on that particular section of the text. The pages in these copies were ruled for the gloss, and the text was copied on alternate ruled

---

831 Indeed, as De Hamel reminds us, “The origin of gothic scripts is one of the most celebrated problems of paleography”. De Hamel, Glossed Books of the Bible (1984): 35.
833 For examples of early glosses, see DMOL, pls. 63 (before 1167) (Bodleian Library, Bodley Ms. 862); cf. De Hamel (1984): 26, n. 64, and 64 (1158–64); R.A.B. Mynors, DCM: pl. 43 (ca. 1150-75; Durham Cathedral Library, Ms. A.III.4).
lines, while in the commentary, the cues to the biblical text were underlined in red, and each of the Fathers quoted there was identified in the margins.\footnote{See De Hamel (1984) and Parkes (1991). The design of the page in copies of the \textit{Magna glosatura} is illustrated in Bodleian Library, Ms. Auct. D.2.8 (see de Hamel 1984: pl. 10); cf. M.B. Parkes (1991): 36-7 and pl. 4. For an example of the problems in the early stages of the design of the page in glossed books, see Leonardi, Morelli and Sancti (1995): pl. III, following p. 41. On Peter Lombard \textit{intercisum} format, L. Smith 2009: Diagram 6 (131). See M.B. Parkes' analysis of one of the earliest surviving copies of the \textit{Magna glosatura} (Bibl. mun., Dijon, Ms. 79) in Parkes' “Folia librorum quaerere” (1995, repr. 2012): 23-50 [28-9 & Facsimile III] (on Ms. cf. De Hamel 1984: 23-84).}

An alternate layout was also employed for copying other contemporary glossed works, including Peter Comestor’s \textit{Historia scolastica},\footnote{Peter Comestor’s \textit{Historia scolastica} (completed before 1164) was a condensed history from the narratives of the whole Bible, compiled from the Bible, the Church Fathers and various classical sources; it was a consistent feature of the core curriculum at the universities of Paris and Oxford through the 15th century.} which became the standard manual for biblical history.\footnote{For example, see FLP, Ms. Lewis E 168 (France, ca. 1300-15; 214 fols., 292 x 206 mm); cf. record in the FLP online catalogue here. Further examples with similar layout include British Library, Royal Ms. 4 D.VII, and CCCC Ms. 29. The author supplied his own hypertext by inserting \textit{incidentia}, observations on the history of the pagans, within the chronological framework of biblical history. Scribes usually copied the text in a two-column layout, but divided some columns into two narrower columns: one for the text, the other to accommodate the \textit{incidentia} alongside it (the \textit{incidentia} were sometimes also written in smaller handwriting) thus distinguishing between pagan and sacred history. British Library, Royal Ms. 4 D.VII illustrates this kind of layout (reprod. in R.M. Thomson, \textit{Manuscripts from St. Albans Abbey, 1066-1234} [1985]: II, pl. 244, reprod. fol. 9r); on the author’s responsibility for the hypertext, see the dedicatory letter to William, archbishop of Sens: “De historis quoque etnichorum quedam incidentia pro ratione temporum inserui” (fol. 9 col. a), where it is glossed “Que non pertinet ad regnum Iudeorum”.} The process of replacing annotation with hypertext is also visible in copies of other texts,\footnote{On innovations in layout for hyperlinked texts (ca. 1250-75), see M.B. Parkes, “Layout and presentation of the text,” in \textit{CHBB II} (2008): 62-3; see ibid. on the development and use of a hierarchy of display scripts as a layout device, 64-5 (14th-century hierarchy of scripts discussed at 65).} including early copies of Gratian’s \textit{Concordia discordantium canonum}\footnote{For example see Durham Cathedral Library, Ms. C.II.1, late 12th century (Mynors, \textit{DCM} [1939]: no. 134 [77] & pl. 47, reprod. fol. 3r). However, Parkes notes that in some 13th-century English copies of Gratian the \textit{glossa ordinaria} was not added until the 14th century; see examples of gloss added later in BL, Royal Ms. 9 C.III (see CRMSS, pl. 64c); also in BnF, Ms. lat. 11713 (see Avril and Stirnemann (1987): pl. kxv, no. 165).} whose scribes anticipated glosses by providing wide margins, sometimes ruled to receive them.\footnote{This is particularly visible in copies of texts produced for the study of canon law, a field which developed rapidly in the second half of the 12th century, particularly in Italy, and as scholars augmented the commentaries of their predecessors, they expanded the explanations of the text and added references to other texts. Parkes notes that most of the copies of Gratian and of the other major collections of the sources of canon law, the \textit{Decretals} (and the later \textit{Novellae, Sext} and \textit{Extravagantes}), which circulated in England from the late 13th century onwards, were produced by Italian scribes and artists working to ‘facsimile’ layouts; in these manuscripts the apparatus was copied in all four margins around a two-column layout for the text. In some copies the separation of words is irregular or non-existent, suggesting that scribes were cramming the same number of words in a line that they found in the exemplar; see Michel (1953): tavv. III & IV, and Eheim (1959); tav. VII.}
This expansion of the Gloss (known as the *Magna glosatura*), featuring the insertion of the alternate-line biblical text into Peter Lombard’s continuous text, represents “the single most significant development in the history of the Gloss layout,” stimulating further developments in the layout of the page. Perhaps most significant of all developments produced was that it generated innovation in the script used for writing the biblical text. However, the spacious constraints imposed by this new layout on the size and choice of script which could be used to distinguish the biblical text amongst the different texts co-habiting the same page, resulted in an important scribal innovation; that of “deliberately invent[ing] a new display script for the alternate-line biblical text.”

This bold script used to write the biblical text, which is generally more angular and upright than hands used in other contemporary Romanesque texts, is clearly distinguishable from the glossing script in both size and mass. The large size of the script made it clearer and more distinctive, meaning that it could be read at a greater distance that the earlier biblical text scripts, a feature which became important as the pages of glossed books became larger.

The script’s size thus served an indexical function, both within the space of the page, allowing the reader to differentiate the biblical text from gloss, but also within the body of the codex, “So that the reader could pick it out easily when leafing through the manuscript seeking a particular passage.” The script was written with a broad pen possibly cut diagonally across the nib and it exaggerates vertical lines and straight strokes; the shape of o tends to be more oval than circular and ascenders often have quite pronounced heads while the feet of minims are frequently flattened off or turned to the right.

---

845 Although the script previously used for the continuous gloss remained unchanged (despite having been partly pushed to the side of the column).
848 De Hamel notes that there is some uncertainty regarding this, since a square-cut nib held at right-angles to the ruled lines produces the same effect: De Hamel, *Glossed Books of the Bible* (1984): 35, n.49.
These innovations of script and layout are witnessed in UPenn Ms. Codex 1603, a gathering from a copy of the Pauline Epistles with Peter Lombard’s *Magna glossatura*, written in Paris, ca. 1210, consisting of six conjugate folios from II Corinthians ("Nam gloria nostra ... nos credimus", 1:12-4:13). Each page measures 352 x 256 [242 x 150] mm and is arranged in four columns of 55 lines of gloss with the first line of text above the line; the Bible text, where present, is written in the first and third columns, in a larger script on alternate lines spanning half a column.

In addition to using the usual methods to distinguish between biblical text and commentary (size of writing and layout), the two sets of text are also distinguished by the use of color (see fols. 3v-4r; Fig. 2.11). In the biblical text, numerous 1- to 4-line initials mark the beginnings of section of text in alternating red and blue ink (with contrasting penwork flourishes that extend beyond the textblock’s left boundary into the margins), with smaller replica *litterae notabiliores* in the opposite color marking the matching section of gloss (i.e. if biblical text’s initial is in red, the gloss initial is in blue, and *vice versa*). For example see fol. 4rb, where the “Qui” in the section of biblical text corresponds to the “Qui” in the outer column of gloss. Furthermore, in the gloss, the *lemma* of the biblical text being commented upon are underlined in red; thus on fol. 3va, the “Aliis quidem” in the first line of biblical text is underlined in red when reproduced at the beginning of its adjoining gloss (“Aliis. qu[u][i]...”)

Similar uses of contrasting proportions of layout and of script size were used in UPenn Ms. Coll. 591, Folder 18, a leaf from a glossed book of the Gospels of Luke and John, written around 1300 in northern France, probably Paris. The Penn leaf (Figs.

---

850 UPenn Ms. Codex 1603 on *Penn in Hand* here. Parent manuscript sold at auction at Sotheby's, 17 June 2003, lot 82, to Antiquariat Neumann-Walter (Markkleeberg, Germany); manuscript disbound and gathering sold by Antiquariat Neumann-Walter; purchased by Penn from King Alfred's Notebook (Cayce, S.C.), 2011.

851 Peter Lombard, *Collectanea in omnes D. Pauli apostoli Epistolae*.

852 Frame-ruled in lead; prickings visible.

853 Also running titles ("S[e][c][u]n[ad Co[rinthios]"") in red and blue; here in red alone.


855 The Schoenberg Database of Manuscripts records provenance details for other surviving leaves from the original volume: Luke & John, 155 fols., 362 x 244 mm (SDBM ID #s 19214, 76833, 38546); Luke & John,
Free Library of Philadelphia, Ms. Lewis E 45, a copy of the Canonical Epistles and Apocalypse with the *Glossa Ordinaria*, copied in France, perhaps Paris, ca. 1240-60 also contains both marginal and interlinear glosses. Its pages (94 fols.; 296 x 199 mm) are sub-divided into 3 columns (usually gloss, text, gloss); of ca. 20 lines of text, with the ratio of gloss to text the usual 2:1 (see fols. 34v-35r; Figs. 2.13). Again, two strikingly different scripts are used to distinguish Scripture (the large text in the central column) from the gloss (the smaller text in the surrounding columns). Color is also used to match passages of Scripture with their glosses in this glossed Bible, and to help the reader to distinguish sections of gloss (in the margins, marked by tall *paragraphus* symbols in alternating red and blue), and to guide and facilitate the reader’s search for a particular book of the Bible via the use of the running headers in red and blue capitals (at the top of the page, here “~PETRI~ ~II~” and “IOHANNS~ ~I~”, marking the transition from ‘II Peter’ to ‘John I’). Marginal glosses are ‘hyper-linked’ with their biblical text in the central column using both *signes de renvoi* and lemmata (for example, on fol. 34v, the commentary in the lower right-hand margin – “sic[ut] & hui[u]s” - glosses the tenth line of biblical text, the superscript symbol placed above the “&”, with the biblical text repeated at the start of the section of gloss).

Moreover, the scribe also uses symbols to indicate when sections of marginal gloss continue in another column or on another page, and to mark the location at which the

---

25 fols., 225 x 130 mm (ID # 152221); Luke, 28 fols., 362 x 244 mm (ID # 38111); Luke, 12 fols., 363 x 244 mm (ID #7 7477); Luke, 24 fols., 363 x 246 mm (ID # 93187).

856 Plummet ruling and pricking visible.
text resumes. Thus on fol. 34v, the symbols resembling sideways slingshots at the bottom of columns $a$ and $c$ indicate that their respective sections of gloss resume at the top of columns $a$ and $c$ on the facing page (fol. 35r); i.e. “In qua” (fol. 34v) continues “oblit[us]” (fol. 35r) and “ap[ostil]o[rum]” (fol. 34v) continues “de fidei” (fol. 35r).\footnote{857}

\section*{ii University Scripts in the 12th and 13th centuries}

The ‘less formal’ types of ‘Gothic’ textura are particularly difficult to describe, since they include a greater range of variation than the ‘more ‘formal’ grades.\footnote{858} In general it encompasses texts that were written with more speed and less care than the formal, or with less thoroughness and consistency in observing the rules that scribes observed when writing the ‘formal’ grades of script. Copyists may not have attained, or even attempted, to achieve complete uniformity in the treatment of the feet of vertical strokes and in the angling of curves.\footnote{859} However sometimes, as in the case of 13th-century ‘pocket’ bibles, scribes’ blurring of the lines between grades of formality was partly the result of the letters being written on such a small scale that, as James J. John puts it, “the Gothic angles were inevitably slurred.”\footnote{860}

\footnote{857} The same strategy is employed to mark run-over glosses within columns within the space of a single page (rather than across multiple pages) in Durham Cathedral Library, Ms. A.III.4, a glossed book of I-IV Kings copied in the third quarter of the 12th century. For example, on fol. 4v the symbol resembling an o with a cross-stroke at the bottom of the left-hand column (col. $a$) indicates that the gloss continues at the indicated place in the right-hand column (col. $c$); thus “[p]e[re]seuerar" at the end of col. $a$ concludes “[ ]uerunt” in col. $c$. See Mynors, DCM (1939): no. 116 (71) & pl. 43 (reprod. fol. 4v); also De Hamel (1984): 25 and 37; cf. Anglo-Norman Durham 1093-1193, Eds. D. Rollason, M. Harvey & M. Prestwich (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1994): 464, pl.38 (reprod. initial fol. 4v.).


\footnote{859} James J. John, “Latin Paleography”, in Medieval Studies: An Introduction, Ed. James Powell, 2nd ed. (New York: Syracuse UP, 1992): 3-81; see esp. 32-33 & Fig. 1.15.

\footnote{860} James J. John, “Latin Paleography”, in Medieval Studies: An Introduction, Ed. James Powell, 2nd ed. (New York: Syracuse UP, 1992): 3-81; see esp. 32-33 & Fig. 1.15.
Lieftinck sub-divided these ‘early gothic’ book scripts into two types of writing, following Bischoff in distinguishing them through the terms *littera notula* and *littera textualis* and proposed three categories for the distinct kinds of *textualis*: *littera textualis formata*, *littera textualis*, and *littera textualis currens*. However when sailing in the treacherous waters of the less formal styles of ‘early Gothic’ writing, Lieftinck rather employed Bischoff’s distinguishing term “(*littera*) *notula*” (or ‘Gebrauchsschrift’) which Lieftinck characterized by its use and function. Thus the term *littera notula* constitutes not different *scripts* but rather different *styles* of writing, rendered stylistically ambiguous through their small size, and the circumstances of their use; i.e. such writings are not book hands, but rather hands which may be used to write in books.

Julian Brown’s system of nomenclature (largely based on Lieftinck’s) distinguished the different scripts and styles of writing used in the 13th century by their use, qualified further by applying distinctions of grade determined by the *ductus* of the scribe, according to Brown’s system, the neat book hands scribes used to painstakingly copy the

---


862 *littera textualis formata* (“pour la calligraphie”), *littera textualis* (“tout court pour le livre ordinaire de bonne facture”), and *littera textualis currens* (“pour le petit manuel, pour l’écriture des gloses également, s’il y a lieu”). G.J. Lieftinck, “Pour une nomenclature de l’écriture livresque de la période dite Gothique” (1954): 17; cf. Figs. 12-14 (15-16).


864 “Nous savons tous qu’on écrivait autrement dans le corps d’un livre, même dans les gloses, que dans les griffonnages destinés au rubricateur ou dans les petites listes auxiliaires, les notices de bibliothécaires, les marques de propriété, etc.” G.J. Lieftinck, “Pour une nomenclature de l’écriture livresque de la période dite Gothique” (1954): 17, cf. ibid.: Figs. 15-16 and discussion (17-18).

865 Lieftinck’s proposed system of terminology for categorizing and describing the ‘Gothic’ handwriting of the High to Late Middle Ages influenced all his paleographer descendents. In a neat turn of paleographical genealogy, T.J. Brown’s system of nomenclature, inherited from Lieftinck, was adopted by Brown’s pupil Michelle Brown, as outlined in her useful (and endurably popular) paleographical textbook *A Guide to Western Historical Scripts* (1990). M. Brown (1990): ‘Nomenclature’ within Brown’s *Introduction* (1-7, at 1-2) [1].

866 *libraria* and *documentaria*; to clarify terminological descriptions of those scripts which could apply both to book and documentary use; M. Brown (1990): 2.

867 *formata* indicating formal, careful *ductus* and less speed of execution - *media* indicating medium care and speed - and *currens* indicating less than average care and maximum speed; Brown variously combined these grading terms in order to allow for changes in the appearance of a hand and for border-line cases (e.g. *formata/media* denoting *formata* tending to *media* and *media/formata* indicating *media* tending to *formata*); see M. Brown (1990): 2.
texts of 13th-century ‘pocket’ bibles would be classified as *libraria media* or *libraria formata*, according to their ‘use’ and ‘grade’.868

During the course of the 12th century scribes copying new academic texts had adopted an intermediate size of handwriting for this category of text, which was between the small, often rapidly written version used by students and scholars, and the medium-sized handwriting used for most other texts.869 The small version had been used in the 11th century for adding glosses to Bible texts870 or by scholars and students for annotations and glosses in other texts.871 The more stable intermediate-sized version had been adopted in the last decades of the 12th century by scribes in France and England for copying the recognized gloss which accompanied the text in glossed books.872 Its characteristic letter shapes (especially round-backed d and the notae) as well as the space-saving devices (conjoint letters, biting, and the frequent use of abbreviated forms of words) enabled scribes to accommodate both gloss and text on the same page.

The handwriting of the gloss had to be executed to a standard which would be appropriate to accompany the large formal handwriting employed for the text. The

868 With regards to the variants of *textualis* (Brown’s *littera gothica*) used for glosses and for notes, Brown offered an even more nuanced categorization, arguing that these scripts, sometimes employing limited cursive features, are primarily distinguishable by their scale (*minuscula*) and function (*glossularis* for glosses, *notularis* for notes); combined, the small-sized writing used for glosses is termed *littera (minuscula) gothica glossularis*, and that for notes as *littera (minuscula) gothica notularis*. With both variants of *textualis* occasionally employing limited cursive features; the use of *notularis* was practically confined to the 13th century, after which it was replaced by cursive; M. Brown (1990): 80. Cf. on *littera glossularis* see *ibid.*: pl. 32 (90-1); on English cursive documentary script in the early 13th century [92-3, pl. 33] and in the second half of the 13th century [94-5, pl. 34]. Cf. Parkes (2008): 71-85; M.B. Parkes, *Their Hands Before Our Eyes* (2008): 103-5, and pl. 26 (British Library, Royal Ms. 3.D.VI, reprod. fol. 182v); Peter Comestor, *Historia scholastica* (“The Ashridge Peter Comestor’), England, London?, copied between 1283 and 1300; Jane Roberts, *Guide to Scripts used in English Writing up to 1500* (London: British Library, 2005) and Bernhard Bischoff on Gothic *textura* (*textualis*) in Bischoff (1979/90).


870 For examples of additions, glosses and annotations in margins see Keble College, Oxford, Ms. 22, fol. 6r, late 11th century (see Webber 1992: pl. 15); the St. Albans Psalter, ca. 1100-25 (see Pächt, Dodwell & Wormald 1960: pls. 40–1); Durham Cathedral Library, Ms. B.IV.24, last addition on fol. 5r, ca. 1100–50 (see Mynors, 1939: pl. 33a); and St. John’s College, Cambridge, Ms. A.22, after 1130 (see Robinson, *Cambridge: dated and datable* 1988: pl. 58).

871 This kind of small script appears most frequently in books of small format, or in separate booklets bound in collections that contain texts or commentaries associated with the schools. These copies were often written on poor-quality or unbleached parchment, and lack decoration (although some were provided with colored initials); see M.B. Parkes, *Scribes, Scripts and Readers* (1991): 71-89.

872 See De Hamel (1984): esp. 30 and pl. 10 (Bodleian Library, Oxford, Ms. Auct. D.2.8); R.A.B. Mynors, *Durham Cathedral Manuscripts* (1939): pls. 43, 47 (Gratian) and 48 (DCL, Ms. A.III.4, C.II.1, A.III.17); *CRMSS*: pl. 36 (BL, Royal Ms. 4 D.III).
standard and status acquired thus allowed and encouraged scribes who copied other texts in medium- and large-sized handwriting, to adopt some of the features characteristic of the intermediate-sized hands. For example, scribes producing deluxe copies introduced features from the large handwriting used for Bibles or the biblical text in glossed books (like the pointed arches of m and n) and characteristic letter forms and biting from the intermediate-sized handwriting used for the gloss. Apart from their size, the most obvious difference between these variations of the script was that scribes who produced large, deluxe copies avoided the frequent abbreviation of words, whereas those who produced copies in smaller handwriting developed further, even more drastic abbreviations of technical terms in academic texts.

In the 13th century, the increasing demand for copies of new, longer texts exerted pressure on commercial scribes, and many scribes adopted a more rapid ductus which tended to eliminate features of style, although some preserved the traditional features of the script. Commercial scribes replaced the medium-sized handwriting previously used for patristic and other texts with the intermediate-sized version, although they often reduced the size and the space between the lines of writing to accommodate longer texts in a single volume. The script became closely spaced and characterized by its size and

---

873 The small and large-sized hands employed in high-quality books had more features in common than in the previous century, especially the round-backed d, the nota for ‘et’, and the practice of biting; see M.B. Parkes “Handwriting in English books,” in CHBB II (2008): 6.4, col. b (Bodleian Library, Ms. Douce 180, p.71: Apocalypse with the commentary of Berengaudus, copied between 1254 and 1272).


compression. Scribes simplified letter shapes, constructing them with uneven strokes, and sometimes separating the component elements of individual letters, and also introduced copious abbreviations with drastically simplified spellings of contemporary terms.

Among the other ‘less formal’ versions of textura of the 13th century, the most important (and influential) were the litterae scholasticae used to copy academic texts for the various university communities, many produced by professional scribes. The so-called ‘12th-Century Renaissance’, that is to say the upsurge of scholastic learning at Paris, Bologna and Oxford and the rise of the universities and the multiplication of schools, scholars and treatises, produced a growing market for books, both academic and popular, which brought about the eclipse of the monasteries as the chief centers of book production. The emergence of professional non-monastic scriptores at this time “as a class” meant that scribes needed, as Boyle put it, “an expeditious and profitable yet legible method of writing as much as possible in the smallest possible area” in order to meet the rising demand for the written word.

Paleographers have distinguished between the litterae scholasticae or ‘university scripts’ of the 13th century through the use of terms of nomenclature that refer to the cities and countries within whose university environments these respective styles of writing developed. For example in Jean Destrez’s celebrated 1935 study of uses of the pecia system to copy and circulate ‘university’ texts in the 13th century, Destrez differentiates “la lettre parisienne” (‘Parisian script/style’), “bolonaise” (‘Bolognese’), “anglaise” (‘English’), and “napolitaine” (‘Neapolitan’). Although many paleographers remain skeptical as to the

878 M.B. Parkes, Their Hands Before Our Eyes (2008): 105. For example, see the rapid handwriting with shortened, curved ascenders and simplified - curved - form of a in Lincoln College, Oxford, Ms. Lat. 113 (sermons, late 13th century; repro. in J. Destrez, La Pecia 1935: pl. 28); cf. Worcester Cathedral Library, Ms. F.103 (Aquinas, Summa theologiae, secunda secundae, ca. 1400-25; repro. - with transcription and translation - in M.B. Parkes, Pause and Effect, 1992: pl. 27).
879 The increasing number of longer texts, as each generation of scholars commented on the work of their predecessors, led to the deterioration of this variety of the script. However the proportions of letter shapes, and a characteristic treatment of the minims whereby scribes completed the strokes by curving them into short diagonal serifs, influenced developments in the handwriting of cursive origin; see M.B. Parkes, Hands (2008): 105 and “Handwriting” (2008): 127 n.98.
880 Boyle, “Emergence”: 27-8
development of distinct ‘university scripts’ in certain university cities and centers - for example, Cencetti and others have seriously questioned the existence of a specific script proper to the university of Oxford (littera Oxoniensis)\textsuperscript{882} - the script developed at the university of Paris (littera Parisiensis) is widely regarded as a standard type in all handbooks.\textsuperscript{883} The name occurs in medieval documents and refers to a ‘simplified textura’.\textsuperscript{884} It is bold and abbreviated, as one would expect in scripts used for copying scholastic texts (Derolez classifies it as textualis libraria or currens, depending on the level of formality) and is characterized by some simplified letter forms, typically including the shapes of a and s, and the short length of common marks of abbreviation; all features resulting from the small size and rapidity of the writing.\textsuperscript{885}

### iii 13th-Century ‘Portable’ Bibles: Legibility and Writing as Image

Although the large, formal handwriting developed during the period 1200–1500 is often loosely referred to as ‘Gothic’ (a term which originated as a derogatory term among the early humanists),\textsuperscript{886} Malcolm Parkes argued that in fact, the term refers (or should refer) “not to a group of scripts, or even to a category of script, but to a prevailing attitude

---


\textsuperscript{885} In littera Parisiensis, the shape of a varies between textualis a and single-compartment a, while straight s was generally preferred at the ends of words as well as elsewhere. Derolez (2003): 100. Kirchner uses the term Gothica textualis (littera Parisiensis) to describe a copy of Thomas Aquinas’ In librum de causis copied in Paris ca. 1270-90 (now BnF, Paris, Ms. lat. 14706). BnF, Paris, Ms. lat. 14706 measures 306 x 215 [200 x 140] mm, its text in 2 columns of ? lines; see Joachim Kirchner, Scriptura Latina Libraria: a Saeculo Primo usque ad finem Medii Aevi (Monachi in Aedibus Rudolfi Oldenbourg, 1955): No. 46a (47-8); cf. also Nos. 45a-c & 46a-b (46-9 & pls.).

towards what constituted elegance in handwriting, and the features of style that produced it.\textsuperscript{887}

This attention to style was stimulated, from the mid-13\textsuperscript{th} century onwards, by developments in books produced for the top end of the market, particularly the growing demand from wealthy patrons for luxury copies of texts with ostentatious decoration (especially copies of the Psalter and Books of Hours).\textsuperscript{888} Such texts were increasingly accompanied by elaborate illuminated initials, illustrations and, in particular, more extensive border decoration.\textsuperscript{889}

As a result, scribes sought to reinforce the image of the handwriting by introducing elaborate detail to improve the balance between text and decoration. Since elements of style were based on movements of the pen, scribes could introduce them into the basic ductus of a script,\textsuperscript{890} thus when scribes enlarged their handwriting, they were able to emphasize the details in these graphic patterns as characteristic features of different styles.\textsuperscript{891} These developments led to the emergence, during the second half of the 13\textsuperscript{th} century, of two kinds of ‘Textura’, a script derived from the formal book hand of the previous century,\textsuperscript{892} varieties which were subsequently referred to as littera prescissa and littera quadrata.\textsuperscript{893} By the end of the 13\textsuperscript{th} century scribes who adopted Textus prescissa began to be influenced by Textus quadrata; and gradually textus quadrata replaced textus prescissa as the principal script for texts in luxury copies.\textsuperscript{894}

\textsuperscript{888} M.B. Parkes, Their Hands Before Our Eyes (2008): 103.
\textsuperscript{890} For example, scribes formed minim strokes with supplementary movements to produce distinctive, symmetrical patterns on the page; M.B. Parkes, Their Hands Before Our Eyes (2008): 103.
\textsuperscript{891} M.B. Parkes, Their Hands Before Our Eyes (2008): 103.
\textsuperscript{892} M.B. Parkes, Their Hands Before Our Eyes (2008): 103.
\textsuperscript{894} M.B. Parkes, Their Hands Before Our Eyes (2008): 105; for example, the ‘Lovell Lectionary’ BL, Harley 7026 [ca. 1408]; see K.L. Scott, LGM, Survey VI, 1996: no. 10 & pl. 60) and the ‘Chichele’ Breviary (Lambeth Palace Library, Ms. 69 [ca. 1408-16]; see K.L. Scott, LGM Survey VI, 1996: no. 30 & color pl. 5). By the mid 15\textsuperscript{th} century the script had been further developed, “becoming more artificial as letter shapes became inflexible and features of style were crystallized.” M.B. Parkes, Their Hands Before Our Eyes (2008): 104-5 [105]; cf. ibid pl. 28 (Bodleian Library, Oxford, Ms. Digby 227; reprodu. 126r).
It is this visual aspect of handwriting created by the density of the writing on the page which lies at the heart of the characterization of Gothic scripts offered by the late, great paleographer Leonard Boyle (d. 1999): “Generally the writing tends to be heavy, but there is always a harmony of angle with angle and curve with curve. “The use of the broad pen heightens the impression of weight and solidity, echoing to some extent the Gothic architecture of the period. … A page written in the full, disciplined Gothic looks very much like a woven pattern or textus, suggesting the name text hand to some scholars.”

Let us explore this idea of the aspect and visual impact of their written text on the page as image a little further.

iv The Graphic Impact of the Page in 13th-Century Portable Bibles

Before the scribe began writing, he had to make certain decisions which influenced what Malcolm Parkes called “the graphic impact of the handwriting on the page”: the module of the handwriting (i.e. the distance between the feet of the minim strokes on one line and the feet of those on the next) determined the height and size of the letters; while the relationship between the width of the nib and the height of the minim strokes determined the character of the traces [in other words, when the height of the minim was equivalent to twice that of the nib-width, the traces produced bold strokes; but when the minim height was equivalent to four nib-widths, the traces produced narrow strokes. These decisions would determine the density of the chiaroscuro patterns produced by the text on the page (i.e. “the overall visual impression on the pages generated by the contrast of the graphic patterns of letters against the background of the writing surface.”)

---

895 Boyle notes that a good example of this preoccupation with symmetry is “The almost invariable use of a Gothic r (a letter resembling the Arabic number 2) after the letter o instead of the straight Caroline r … for the 2 form of r, with its pleasant curves, blends more agreeably than the plain r with the bows of o, as in o2.” Boyle, Emergence: 30.
896 M.B. Parkes, “Handwriting in English books,” in CHBB II (2008): 112 and figs. 4.12, 6.1, 6.2. Further to the topic of ‘the graphic impact of handwriting on the page’, see Parkes’ study of ‘Handwriting as image’ in Their Hands Before Our Eyes (2008): 127-145, and for a superb excellent glossary for the terminology used to describe features of handwriting see ibid: 149-155.
897 M.B. Parkes (2008): 112 and149-155 [149-50]; for further discussion of the function and processes of handwriting, the problems of copying and examples, see ibid.: 57-69.
Thus although handwriting is primarily a medium for communicating a text, “the image of handwriting on the page could also embody a message of its own, even though that message is difficult for us to interpret.”

Parkes identified several factors upon which the projection of such an image depended: first, a scribe’s capacity to apply his (or her) penmanship to produce an image of appropriate quality; second, the coexistence of different scripts, or different kinds of formal handwriting, to provide scribes (or patrons) with graphic options; and third, a cultural political or social context that would enable contemporary readers to recognize the significance of the image.

In other words, when a particular script had been preferred for a certain text, or kind of text, and thus had acquired a special significance for readers, “the image of the handwriting could itself acquire an emblematic significance by association.”

By the 13th century the idea (or ‘standard’) of how the biblical text should be written, was dictated by a combination of what Parkes calls decorum (the ground of common consent between contemporary scribes and readers as to the qualities of handwriting required for different kinds of texts, and to the appropriate balance between style and fashion within the limits of prevailing fashion), equilibrium (the impression created by the overall balance between style and function in the visual impact of the scribe’s handwriting; this impression depends on various factors, including the coordination of traces, a balance between fluency and the requirements of a set hand within the stable rhythms of a scribe’s personal ductus, and upon the propriety of the handwriting according to prevailing attitudes to decorum) and graphic ideas (for example, a scribe’s choice of module, ratio of nib-width to minim height, variant forms borrowed from different scripts and, especially, the exploitation of particular elements or resources of style to embellish components of letter shapes in order to enhance an image of a scribe’s handwriting on the page).


A scribe’s choice of script (or scripts) was generally dictated by the kind of text to be copied, the speed of writing (i.e. how quickly the scribe needed – or wanted - to copy the text) and the desired – or required - effect of the text’s aspect for the reader. The choice of a script could be determined by its position within the hierarchy of scripts (the ranking by scribes of scripts for display purposes or according to their perception of the status of the text for which they were used - e.g. the contrast between a script used for Psalters or Books of Hours and that used for a commentary produced for the schools; scribes also perceived a hierarchy in the different varieties of a single script). 13th-century bibles were written in small versions of *display scripts* (formal scripts used for special books, although more frequently used to indicate major divisions of a text in a book) with *calligraphic* features (that is to say, the exploitation of the potential of penmanship to produce conspicuous features of style in response to a prevailing attitude towards what constituted elegance in handwriting).

Some accomplished scribes who copied books contributed to the development of the art of handwriting “by creating images with form and style to enhance the visual impact of the text on the page”; the treatment of detail is intrinsic to the creation of style and scribes exploited their penmanship to produce features of style that conformed to the prevailing criteria for elegance in handwriting. However, the shapes and distribution of these elements of style were determined by the limitations of the pen, and the finite number of its possible movements. Although scribes “coordinated these elements of style to achieve uniformity in their handwriting and adapted the scale of these movements to embellish components of letter forms in their own ways”, every scribe who exploited

---

902 Scribes often distinguished between a ‘primary’ display script for major headings, a ‘secondary’ display script for the opening words of a text, chapter or paragraph and a ‘tertiary’ display script for the beginnings of *sententiae* or periods (in prose); cf. M.B. Parkes, *Their Hands Before Our Eyes* (2008): passim, but esp. 149; cf. *ibid.*: 101-25, 127-145.

903 As opposed to *cursive handwriting* (rapid handwriting, protean by nature, in which letter shapes are recognizable but not variable because of the priority given to speed and ease of movement) characterized by the *cursive resolution* of the writing (a general tendency in rapid handwriting produced with a pen to reduce the number and complexity of the traces by accelerating the movements of the pen and lifting it from the writing surface as seldom as possible, thus modifying or transforming the letter forms), M.B. Parkes, *Their Hands Before Our Eyes* (2008): 149-152.


his penmanship when forming features of style\(^\text{907}\) did so within the guiding boundaries of needing to maintain the balance between style and writing’s primary practical function: to communicate.\(^\text{908}\)

The legibility of these bibles’ written text\(^\text{909}\) was determined by cues, or “graphic clues,” situated at, or near, the top of the minim- or ‘x’-height, which enabled the reader to identify and distinguish between letter forms.\(^\text{910}\) Hence scribes were able to exploit features at the extremities of the letters to assimilate them into “the patterns which constituted words” without detracting from the legibility of the text.\(^\text{911}\) Serifs (short strokes at the top of ascenders and at the base of minims) helped to prevent the reader’s eye from slipping accidentally from one line of writing to the next but also served to link letters within a word.\(^\text{912}\) How legible the biblical text was for a reader was influenced by several factors: the clarity with which a scribe had distinguished the cues for legibility\(^\text{913}\) and the module of his writing.\(^\text{914}\) This concern to emphasize words “as pattern-units”\(^\text{915}\) in order

\(^{907}\) For example when scribes developed new versions of existing scripts for copying books, such as the scripts based on cursive handwriting developed in England during the 14\(^{th}\) and 15\(^{th}\) centuries.

\(^{908}\) M.B. Parkes, Their Hands Before Our Eyes (2008): 145.


\(^{910}\) M.B. Parkes, Their Hands Before Our Eyes (2008): 110; and Pause and Effect (1992): 41-44, esp. 41; cf. ibid. for a broader discussion, esp. Ch. 2, ‘Changing Attitudes to the Written Word: Components in the Grammar of Legibility’ (20-9, pl. 8-12) and ‘Exegesis and the Interpretation of the Message of a Text’ (72-6, pl. 1).


\(^{912}\) Sometimes an ascender was traced with a double broken stroke producing a wedge-shaped feature in which the horizontal movement at the top of the ascender functioned as a serif. M.B. Parkes, Their Hands Before Our Eyes (2008): 154.

\(^{913}\) Those minimum distinctive features required to identify letter shapes, which are located at cue-height, i.e. at the same level as the top segment of the letter \(x\). (M.B. Parkes, Their Hands Before Our Eyes 2008: 149, 154). For example, the scribes distinguished the cues for legibility by covering the tops of the ascenders of \(b\), \(h\), \(k\) and \(l\) and the bottom of all letters below the upper segment of \(x\). At this level the reader distinguishes between different letter shapes formed with the same repetitive stroke: \(bp\), \(dq\), \(ceo\) and \(hkl\). The arches of \(m\) and \(n\), which distinguish them from \(i\) and \(u\) (for example, in the word ‘minimum’), and the essential elements which identify \(a\), \(g\), \(r\), \(t\) and \(x\) itself, are all located at the same level.

\(^{914}\) The distance between the base of the minim strokes on one line and the base of the minim strokes on the next line; some scribes wrote on a ruled line, but many wrote between the ruled lines, using them as a principal guide for the two levels of the handwriting. M.B. Parkes, Their Hands Before Our Eyes (2008): 149, 150, 153-4; cf. Pause and Effect (1992): 41-44, 301-7.

\(^{915}\) On the vocabulary for describing letters and the shape of word-units see M.B. Parkes, Their Hands Before Our Eyes (2008): Minim (153), Ascender (149), Descender (151), Minuscula (153), Ligature (152), Juncture (152), Approach stroke (149), Transitional strokes (155); also Nota (153), Common mark of abbreviation (150), ‘Litterae notabiliores’ (152-3); and Constant pen-angle (150), Major axis (153).
to speed the eye of the reader from one letter to the next within a word,
led scribes to explored the calligraphic features of scripts to contribute to the harmony created from the larger units – word, paragraph and page – whilst retaining the individuality of component letters.

The text’s legibility was also influenced by the writing’s density within the textblock as part of the visual aspect of the written text (i.e. the general impression on the page made by a specimen of handwriting at first sight). The density of the patterns within this text was determined by the combination of features, including the nib-width and its ratio to the minim height, the constant pen-angle, the color of the ink, the space within and between letters, the space between words, and the module of the handwriting).

Scribes preferred a narrow nib for small or rapid handwriting and a broader nib for a set hand (i.e. handwriting in which the scribe lifted the pen before tracing each stroke). The tiny writing of 13th century ‘pocket’ and ‘portable’ bibles was made possible as the result of more widespread use of writing with a pen with a very fine nib, obtainable as a result of using the feathers from different kinds of birds. Medieval scribes generally preferred goose quills, owing to their practical suitability, because, as the modern calligrapher (and ex-Benedictine monk) Ewan Clayton explains, goose feathers

---

916 This concern became a predominant factor in the development of scripts in the later Middle Ages and subsequently in the design of type faces. M.B. Parkes, *Pause and Effect* (1992): 41-44, esp. 41.
917 M.B. Parkes, *Pause and Effect* (1992): 41-44, esp. 41. This involved scribal attention to letters’ essential elements (those characteristics of a letter shape which enable a reader to distinguish one letter from another), their form (the configuration of traces required to construct a particular letter shape) and shape (that which embodies the characteristics, or essential elements which enable a reader to distinguish one letter from another in the alphabet of a particular script) and their configuration (the combination of traces required to construct the form of a letter). (M.B. Parkes, *Their Hands Before Our Eyes* 2008: 150, 152). A scribe’s distinction of these constitutive elements of the letters and words written text was effected through the movements of his pen (those required for tracing the configurations of letter forms, although in the set hands used for copying 13th-century portable bibles the whole movement was usually not recorded on the writing surface, since the scribe lifted his pen), comprising traces (the movement of the pen which produced a stroke on the writing surface) and strokes (a record on the writing surface created by a single trace). (M.B. Parkes, *Their Hands Before Our Eyes* 2008: 153-4).
“Are just the right size to easily fit in the hand.” Swan quills were also used for larger letters.

Smaller handwriting generally required a narrower nib, since the width of the pen’s nib determined the degree of contrast between pen strokes, thick or thin, according to the direction in which they were traced and thus had a bearing upon the scale of writing. Scribes requiring a fine-nibbed pen for extremely small writing, including the university scribes of the 13th century and those copying our ‘pocket’ bibles, often used quills from the feathers of small birds, such as crows or ravens, since their feathers had more slender shafts and barrels. This choice was based on the relative physical properties of thick- or thin-shafted quills, since, as Clayton explains, “The width of the barrel or shaft of the feather (called the ‘butt’ in the modern feather trade) determines how wide the nib can be.”

To produce a pen whose nib was narrow yet still strong and flexible, it is necessary to keep the ratio of the nib width to the width of the feather’s shaft/barrel as low as possible. Cutting a narrow nib on a thick-barreled quill produces a weak, ‘spindly’ nib, since the ratio of nib width to shaft width is too high (akin to cutting the tip of the feather to a ‘point’). However by cutting a fine, narrow nib on a slender-barreled quill, one may produce a pen whose fine nib is still strong, since the nib width is at a comparatively low

---

920 The five outer feathers of the wing (the flight feathers) were generally favored over the right, again for practical reasons, since the shape of these feathers mean that they curve more naturally into the fingers and knuckles of a right-handed scribe. Ewan Clayton, *The Golden Thread: The Story of Writing* (London: Atlantic Books, 2013): 69.


ratio to the width of the barrel, permitting the barrel to provide sufficient strengthening support to the ‘shoulders’ and ‘mouth’ of its nib.\textsuperscript{924}

Increasing experimentation in pen-use by 12\textsuperscript{th}-century scribes, who experimented with how the pen was held and its angle, generated innovative methods for subsequent practices of letter-formation and the speed of copying. Amongst these innovators were the scribes who wrote the glossed books of the Bible at this time as witnessed in their writing and their choice of scripts and the ways in which they shaped letters and formed words. In order to write the smaller glossing script of the commentary, scribes would probably have needed to change to a smaller pen, a wearisome necessity that must have tested the patience of even the most disciplined scribe, although perhaps less tedious than continually changing from black to red ink and back again.\textsuperscript{925}

However, Christopher de Hamel has suggested that “Part of the rather sharper quality of the glossing hands with less contrast between thick and thin strokes might have been due originally to some sort of experimentation in speeding up writing by using only one pen.”\textsuperscript{926} The scribe may have been able to avoid the use of several pens in writing an ordinary glossed manuscript by rolling the pen over in his fingers, since “A quill pen held the normal way up will produce a broad flexible stroke but if turned over on its back writes a small and more angular line since the pen is less responsive to variations of pressure.”\textsuperscript{927}

The width of the cut nib also seems to have been used by scribes as a measure when deciding an appropriate height for the letters, since the heights of minim strokes or ascenders frequently correspond to a specific number of nib-widths.\textsuperscript{928} This calculation of the ratio of nib-widths to minim height was particularly important for 13\textsuperscript{th}-century scribes copying ‘portable’ bibles since this ratio, which dictated the boldness of strokes, directly


influenced the density of the handwritten text within the space of the page and the overall *chiaroscuro effect* or ‘Light-and-shade’ effect of the written page (the overall visual impression on the page generated by the contrast of the graphic patterns of letters against the background of the writing surface) impression. A low ratio of nib-width to minim height produced thick strokes and a bold text, whereas a high ratio resulted in a ‘finer’ text comprised of thin strokes.

When the size of the scribe’s handwriting was as compressed as it was in 13th-century bibles of either ‘pocket’ or ‘portable’ format, ‘finely’-written handwriting (i.e. with a high ratio nib-width to minim height) seems preferable, as it generally produced a textblock of lower density. Furthermore, since the writing space within each line available to scribes of 13th-century ‘portable’ bibles was restricted, the opportunities for the scribe to employ resources of style were minimal, and thus scribes were compelled to resort to rely on manipulation of the serifs and thus it can be easier to recognize word separation and to decipher the shapes of letters within the profile of text in the ‘finer’ handwriting produced through a high ration of nib-width to minim height. However both ratios were used, and the scribes and readers of these bibles do not seem to have preferred one option over the other.

The denser their pages, the greater were the number of clear visual signposts necessary in order to ensure the legibility of the writing and to facilitate the navigation of the text within the codex. Of course punctuation also supplied crucial ‘determinants’ within the dense visual patterns of these bibles’ pages, making their compressed text easier to read. The fundamental conventions of the punctuation used in the 13th century had

---

930 The *profile* of handwritten text is the outline of its letters, and the contours of the strokes within it, created by the constant pen-angle and nib-width adopted by the scribe; M.B. Parkes, *Their Hands Before Our Eyes* (2008): 153.
932 M.B. Parkes, *Pause and Effect* (1992): 41-44, esp. 41. Overall, the best study of premodern punctuation (including discussion of abbreviation symbols) remains Malcolm B. Parkes, *Pause and Effect: An Introduction to the History of Punctuation in the West* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992): on components in the ‘Grammar of Legibility, see 20-9, pl. 8-12], cf. 72-6, pl. 1 (‘Exegesis and the Interpretation of the Message of a Text’); on notation employed for public worship and the liturgy, see 35-40, pl. 16-19, cf. 76-80, pl. 19 (‘Public Worship and Aural Responses to the Written Word’); see also the Glossary of Technical Terms and Punctuation Symbols (301-7); see also Paul Saenger, *Space Between Words: The Origins of Silent Reading* (Chicago: Stanford University Press, 1997): esp. 18-51 (on the nomenclature of word separation) and 52-82 (on complements to word separation by space).
been established a century earlier, when scribes had begun to exploit details of handwriting to emphasize word separation, ensuring that individual letter forms were read as parts of larger patterns – the word, the phrase and the sentence.933 As handwriting became more compressed during the 12th century, and the space between words decreased in size, the punctus became the most common mark of punctuation, used to indicate all kinds of pauses, to introduce quotations and to mark separation.934

The colored initials called litterae notabiliores (or ‘more noticeable letters’) were also crucial in helping readers to navigate the minute handwriting and dense textblocks of 13th-century ‘portable’ bibles.935 Litterae notabiliores initials at the beginnings of sections or paragraphs could also be decorated more substantially or flourished with pen strokes to make their identification easier and, by extension, to maximize their visual impact which dictated their navigational function within both the textual body of the Bible and their indexical function within the space of the sacra pagina.936

Through their combined use of these strategies of compression, the scribes effected a reduction of the length of the text itself, which in turn reduced the thickness of the bible codex and increased (or at least maintained) the bible’s portability, since the higher the compression of the text (i.e. the more the biblical text’s length was shortened), the lower amount of physical page-space required to copy out the entire Bible (i.e. the fewer the number of leaves its text would occupy).937 The effect of these compression strategies in combination within the written area on these bibles’ pages produced their

933 M.B. Parkes, *Pause and Effect* (1992): *passim*, but see esp. on the development on the general repertory of punctuation by the 12th century (41-49); cf. *ibid.* on the pre-history of punctuation in Antiquity (9-19); on the components of a ‘Grammar of Legibility’ in the early Middle Ages (20-29); on Caroline innovations (30-34); on the influence of the requirements of public worship ca. 9th-12th century (35-40); and on printing’s influence on the use of punctuation (50-61). 12th-century scribes not only left spaces between words but also reduced the spaces between letters within a word, and from the second half of the century they compressed the letter forms laterally. (Parkes 1992: 41; cf. 41-44).


935 As of the 12th century these symbols had been used with increasing frequency to indicate the beginnings of *sententiae*, but by the 13th century, when different alphabets had come to be used for *litterae notabiliores*, they were picked out with splashes of color when situated within the textblock. M.B. Parkes, *Pause and Effect* (1992): 42-44 and 301-7 [305-7]; cf. M.B. Parkes, *Their Hands Before Our Eyes* (2008): 152-3


characteristic textblock; uniform and consistently proportioned,\textsuperscript{938} compressed both vertically and horizontally, the words on each of the closely spaced lines seeming to stretch outwards, straining against the parameters of their confinement within each of their individual compressed units of words and lines within the bounding lines framing the clean, smooth edges each column.

In Diane J. Reilly’s characterization of 13\textsuperscript{th}-century ‘pocket’ bibles as “The smaller, portable, closely-written Bibles,”\textsuperscript{939} Reilly emphasizes, by foregrounding their textual arrangement on the page, that the visual impact created by these bibles’ presentation of the biblical text (in a highly-compressed, layout) must be considered equally distinctive and characteristic of 13\textsuperscript{th}-century ‘pocket’ bibles as their other defining characteristics of their format (as ‘smaller’ bibles) and its consequences for their use (as ‘portable’ bibles).

The extremeness of the chiascuro effect generated by the contrast of the text’s dense, compressed graphic patterns on these bibles’ pages within their respective units of columns and textblock is portrayed by a leaf from a ‘pocket’ bible copied ca. 1240, probably in France, now part of an Otto Ege Portfolio in the Special Collections Library at the University of Pennsylvania.\textsuperscript{940} As a result of prolonged contact in compressed conditions, the impression of the textblock was transferred from the leaf’s verso onto the inside of the mount/folder within which it is housed (see Fig. 2.14A). This impression of the textblock’s two columns is remarkably clear; the shape of each column is crisp and uniform, its edges are sharp, and within them, each column’s written space is a solid,

\textsuperscript{938} As Peter Stoicheff observes of their writing: “Some scripts are as small as one-sixteenth of an inch high, too small to be easily read with the unaided eye, suggesting the devotion was not in the act of reading but the act of the inscription into the parchment surface itself—literally making the word flesh. Digital enlargements of such scripts reveal an astonishing accuracy in the straightness of line, the height of script, and the shape and detail of individual letters.” Stoicheff, “Materials and Meanings” in The Cambridge Companion to the History of the Book, Ed. Leslie Housam (Cambridge; CUP, 2014): 73-89 [79 n.4].

\textsuperscript{939} Diane J. Reilly, “The Bible as Bellwether: Manuscript Bibles in the Context of Spiritual, Liturgical and Educational Reform, 1000-1200,” in Form and Function in the Late Medieval Bible, Eds. Eyal Poleg and Laura Light (Boston: Brill, 2013): 9-29 [29, my italics].

dense block. Here then we have demonstrable proof that the density and regularity of the
textblock in a 13th-century ‘pocket’ bible generates a distinct impression.

The leaf itself measures 192 x 129 [129 x 79] mm and is arranged in 2 columns of
56 lines (see Fig. 2.14A). The arrangement of text within the written space is highly
compressed, comprising 56 lines within a textblock 129 mm in height; lines are ca. 2 mm
in height and letters ca. 1 mm in height. The text is written in a tiny round hand of the
type now very familiar to us. The extremities of letters are distinguished with sharp hair
strokes which, like the ‘swish and flick’-style of strokes used to form the many
abbreviation symbols, result in a sharp, spiky aspect. Although the bodies of letters are
generally quite round (albeit hunched and considerably compressed both vertically and
horizontally), the overall impression created by the writing is of angular; letters are
irregularly-sized, with both minim-height and the height and angle of ascenders varying
from line to line, and even within lines themselves. Nor do the lines maintain a consistent
level - that is to say the text does not look to be written in ‘straight lines’ – for example see
recto, col. b line18 (Fig. 2.14B) or verso (Fig. 2.14A) col. a lines 47-56, i.e. the last 7 lines
are more tightly cramped together.

Similarly, UPenn Ms. Codex 236941 a Bible-Missal (218 x 148 [149 x 93] mm, 2
cols./50 lines; 465 fols.) copied in France, probably in Paris, ca. 1235-40 is written in a
very sharp, angular hand, with sharp horns and serifs formed with fine hair strokes,
slashes, ticks and sharp punctus marks (see fol. 395v; Fig. 2.15); for example the feet
which are consistently applied to the bottoms of minims are added by sharp upstrokes,
making them seem not so “rounded-off” as supplied with the pointed-toed shoes more
commonly associated with popular representations of medieval jesters. Again, the bodies
of letter forms are rounded, with use of two-compartment a (with occasionally single-
compartment form, but only when used as a suspension, e.g. ‘noscit[a]’ in col. b, line 28)
and two-stroke forms of ‘open’ c and also t (generally formed with two strokes, but
inconsistently featuring a ‘closed’ triangular ‘spire’). Both straight and round forms of r
are used, with s mostly in long form but with the occasional use of the round form
(usually at the ends of word, e.g. ‘co[n]fusiones’ in col. a, end of line 38; 3 lines above the

941 UPenn Ms. Codex 236 on Penn in Hand here.
tail of the ‘A’ initial). Round d is used throughout, its ascender almost always slanting sharply to the left, occasionally with a forward-hairstroke at top. The tops of the ascenders of I and b are clubbed, or occasionally wedge-shaped. Minim strokes are also of irregular, inconsistent height and both ascenders and ‘word size’ varies wildly, creating the impression of uneven lines wavering across each column (see col. a lines 35-50). This is not to say that this is untidy work by an unskilled scribe, quite the opposite, but these features are the result of a scribal ductus which could perhaps not readily be described as either ‘steady’ or ‘rhythmic’.

Free Library of Philadelphia, Ms. Lewis E 39 offers a truly marvelous example illustrating contemporary use of design techniques in 13th-century ‘pocket’ bibles to miniaturize the Bible, demonstrating both the compression of the Bible as book (in tinysize pandect format), and compression of the biblical text (highly-compressed within the unit of the - visually-dense – page). This Italian ‘pocket’ bible copied between 1240-60, probably in Venice, is a triumphant testament to the 13th-century compression technologies. 403 fols. (ff. xi + 390 + ii), measuring 175 x 115 [107 x 72] mm, its text written in 2 columns of 55 lines, with 16 historiated initials and both decorated and pen-flourished initials throughout.942 The bible’s scribe has accomplished a compression of the biblical text into material form that is truly astonishing. The bible is undeniably small (measuring 175 x 115-20 mm), although not tiny, nor is the number of folios it contains (403 fols.) extraordinarily high or low.943 What is really astounding is the book’s achievement of an extremely compressed layout without increasing the dimensions of the textblock in relation to the size of the page in order to give himself more writing space (which consequently would have reduced the quantity of margin space whilst compromising the aesthetics of the page). Instead our scribe managed to compress the biblical text within the space of the page by the ‘simple’ (!) expedient of increasing the number of lines he copied within the text block and compressing the size of his writing accordingly.

942 The bible contains 403 fols. (ff. xi + 390 + ii); ruled in hard point; written in rotunda; with capitals in red and blue, rubrication and both decorated and pen-flourished initials throughout. For further details see De Ricci (1935-40): II, 2027 (no. 10); also E. Wolf II, Descriptive Catalogue (1937): 47; cf. FLP online catalogue description here.

943 Although of FLP Ms. Lewis E 39’s 403 fols., the biblical text is written on only 364 of them (ff. 10r-374r).
Thus the scribe set out to write his text - arranged in the conventional two-column layout - on an extraordinarily high number of lines per page, cramming an astonishing 55 lines into a textblock only 107 mm high (and 72 mm wide). This meant that if our scribe wanted any hope of his finished text being at all legible to a reader (which was, after all, the point), then the size of his writing would have to be very small indeed (it is) and thus his letters exceptionally clear (they are), an extremely difficult challenge when attempting to form letters in such cramped conditions. He triumphed; each line measures just under 2 mm in height, his letters measure less than 1 mm throughout, and it was in this way that our crafty scribe managed to fit a huge amount of text into a very limited amount of page-space.

The text is written in a rounded bookhand (rotunda), its letters thick and chunky (i.e. with a low ratio of pen’s nib width to minim height), written on closely spaced lines (see Figs. 2.16C-D; fols. 159v, 150v). There is considerable vertical compression; the scribe uses only the single compartment form of a, round d and both long s and the ‘trailing’ round form of terminal s (see “Beatus” in Fig. 2.16C: col. a, line 2), with distinction of the cues for legibility including some clubbing at top of ascenders (although these usually marked, if at all, by ‘serif’ strokes), ticked ii and horned forms of g (see “genib[us]” in Fig. 2.16D: col. a, line ?) and e (see “Quare” in Fig. 2.16D: col. a, line 4).944 The writing is also considerably compressed horizontally via the usual methods of frequent use of a wide range of abbreviation symbols (including ‘7’-shaped “et”, e.g. in Fig. 2.16C: col. a, line 4 and Fig. 2.16D: col. a, lines 8, 9, 12 etc.), as well as both suspensions and contractions.

Furthermore, in FLP, Ms. Lewis E 39, the biblical text is surrounded by a forest of supplementary texts which are, miraculously, even more highly compressed! The Bible text is surrounded in two senses; the first is paratextual, in that on most of its pages the margins are filled with scholia and added notes. The second kind of ‘surrounding’ of the Bible text is sequential, in terms of the position of the Bible text within the contents of the codex; both Testaments are preceded and followed by extra texts, lists and additional

---

944 This form of e is unusual; the contemporary form of e is usually characterized by the angle and extension of its ‘tongue’ cross-stroke, but here the embellishment is not of the cross-stroke but rather at the top of the ‘closing stroke’ of the e, resembling the ‘horn’ characteristic of the contemporary g form.
materials. Every section of writing is a graphic island within an ocean of more text!

At the front of the volume were added a number of lists written in microscopic sized writing (including lists of Saints’ days and readings etc., and an alphabetical index of *incipits*; fols. 4r–6v, 6vb-8v, 8v-9v). The Bible text begins on fol. 10r (through fol. 374r) and is followed by the *IHN* (fols. 376r-99r), with a Concordance positioned between them (at fols. 374v-75v). Finally, another alphabetical index of *incipits* was later copied onto the book’s rear flyleaves (fols. vi-xii), in the hand of the annotator who added marginal notations throughout the bible, in his minute-sized handwriting.

Here, the extreme compression of the added annotations’ size almost defies belief. On fol. 10r (Fig. 2.16A-B) 16 lines of marginal notes within a block measuring 17 mm in height (running from lines 8-17 of the biblical text); likewise on fol. 149v (Fig. 2.16F) 35 lines of notes within a block measuring 41 mm in height (running from the biblical text’s lines 12-32), whereas on fol. 373v (Fig. 2.16E) the 59 lines of annotations run from lines 15-55 and extend below the base line of the textblock down into the lower margin (occupying a written space approximately equal to ca. a further 20 lines of the biblical text), occupying a written space 115 mm in height.

By contrast, the extreme minuteness of these annotations exemplifies just how neat and legible these bibles’ written text could be, despite the small, compressed size of their writing. Although the layout of the biblical text in this volume is undeniably highly compressed and visually dense (at 55 lines within a 107 mm-high textblock), when compared to the aspect and measurements of the almost impenetrable surrounding forest of marginal notes (Fig. 2.16F), which are generally written on lines spaced less than 1mm apart with a minim height of ca. 0.5-0.6 mm - in several instances they are compressed into 20 lines per inch – the biblical text can, in fact, be read without too much difficulty.

---

945 The texts included on fols. 4r-9v are as follows: fols. 4r-6e, Lists (fols. 4r-4v, readings for lists of days and months; fols. 5r-6va, ?, subdivided with brackets; fols. 6r-6va, an alphabetical list); fols. 6vb-8v, Lists of Saints’ days and readings etc., with red initials (including, on fol. 7r, Pentecost, St. Stephen, St. John; fol. 7v, Mary M. and St. Peter; fols. 8r-8v, “Ad…”, Prayers for…; fol. 8v, “Lepresos” “Peregrenos” etc.); fols. 8v-9r, an alphabetical index of incipits [lexicographical? People?]}
Fols. 1r-3v of FLP, Ms. Lewis E 39 are three leaves from a 14th-century liturgical manuscript, left over from a previous binding.
946 “Incipit prologus sancti ieronimi ad paulinum de omnibus divine hystorie libris Bible…”; *Inc.*: “Frater Ambrosius michi munuscula perferens detulit…” (fol. 10r) / *Expl.*: “Philo, vir dissertissimus Iudaeorum . . . unde accidit ut ead em uocabula, quae apud illos non similiter scripta sunt, nobis videantur inter pretationem variare.” (fol. 399r).
How legible a medieval reader might have found writing as tiny as that of these marginal notes is anyone’s guess. Their density within the space of the margins does make a difference; when the margins are quite empty and contain only a few blocks of notes (Fig. 2.16H) their text is rather more approachable, but when they fill the margins (Figs. 2.16E-G), they are certainly an intimidating sight.

Coda: The consequences of these strategies for the legibility and uses of these bibles

The tiny size in which the biblical text was copied in these bibles, in addition to the high visual density of their pages, raises the question of practicality; did the size of the handwriting used in copying the text in these bibles influence their function in terms of who could use them, how and where or preclude certain uses?

Other scholars have been struck by this conundrum. Richard Pfaff mentions it frequently when discussing bible-missals, very small breviaries and missals, coining a new term for these books: “eye-strain volumes”. Laura Light suggests that part of the answer may be found in the importance of memory; priests using these books probably knew many of the Mass prayers by heart, and the missal’s text was therefore primarily a reminder and a supplement to his memory. Mary and Richard Rouse have argued that the greatest strength of these new bibles, their ease of navigation, may also be seen as their greatest weakness, characterizing these codices as “the kind of book that can only be searched, for it cannot be read.”

Difficulty in reading such texts may have been associated with the development of reading glasses. Spectacles had been invented well before the end of the ‘peak’ period of these bibles’ production; documents preserved in Venice make it plain that eyeglasses...
were made there in 1301, and quite possibly a year earlier,\textsuperscript{951} although references to their invention are witnessed in 1286,\textsuperscript{952} and twenty years before that, when Roger Bacon had recommended the use of a lens to help old people afflicted with weak eyesight in his \textit{Opus Majus} (1266).\textsuperscript{953} However, nonprescription lenses could cause problems, as witnessed in an episode punctuating the saga that attended the writing out of Margery Kempe’s spiritual autobiography, when the friend of Margery’s first scribe who in a desperate attempt to optimize his chances of deciphering his predecessor’s abysmal handwriting, “sett a peyr of spectacles on hys nose,” but alas, “than wast wel wers than it was befor.”\textsuperscript{954} This would certainly make sense, for even today, attempting a reading of some of the scripts in these bibles provides the keenest motivation to utilize any possible magnification devices at one’s disposal (preceded by the headaches).

If reading these bibles’ texts could be hard on the eyes, so too must their writing have placed considerable strain on the eyes of the scribes who wrote them. Book-production was an extremely labor-intensive activity, but the act of writing itself must have been particularly arduous. The long hours scribes spent working in cold scriptoria or poorly-lit workspaces (as often seems to have been the case) surely exhausted their bodies and minds but the ill-effects must have proved particularly ruinous to their eyesight. Given the extreme miniaturization of some of the scripts (barely) visible in portable bibles, one can readily imagine a scenario such as that suggested by Peter Stoicheff, in which young scribes possessing a myopia ideally suited for the difficult purpose of repeatedly producing minute script, fell victim to the elevated physical strains and stresses of such intensive work at a proportionally accelerated speed and lost their ability – likely their

\textsuperscript{951} Even before spectacles were invented, a guild of crystal workers had been formed in Venice, which had been the main center of die glass industry since ca. 1000 AD; John Dreyfus, “The Invention of Spectacles and the Advent of Printing,” \textit{The Library}, 6\textsuperscript{th} ser., 10.2 (1988): 93-106 [96].


\textsuperscript{953} Here Bacon was influenced by the ideas on the magnifying properties of lenses expounded by the Arabic optician known as Alhazen (d.1036); see \textit{The ‘Opus Majus’ of Roger Bacon}, Ed. J.H. Bridges. 3 vols (Oxford, 1897-1900): II, 152-58.

sight altogether – “much as today’s high-performing athletes have relatively brief spans of prowess.”\textsuperscript{955} As John Shinners quite rightly points out, “We are apt to forget what a curse even the most minor defects of vision were to a medieval reader,”\textsuperscript{956} and problems of poor eyesight were compounded by books that were badly written or whose text was written in script too small to be easily read\textsuperscript{957} or which had become faded with age\textsuperscript{958} with poorly-lit reading spaces placing further strain on the eyes and patience of the medieval reader, who was after all, at the mercy of the seasons and the weather for natural light.\textsuperscript{959}

Ultimately this riddle of the function that these bibles’ biblical text and supplementary texts encouraged and the limitation of how they could be used by the illegibility of these very texts certainly gives us cause to reevaluate our understanding of the relationship between the production and use of these bibles. Let us now turn to do so.


\textsuperscript{957} Visitation records for the parishes of Tavistock and Stowford in that year chronicle criticism of the script of the breviary located in each parish as being “nimis tenuis” (too small, Tavistock), or as “nimis tenuis et difficils ad legendum” (too small and hard to read, Stowford). Coulton, “Visitation of Totnes”: 120 [at Tavistock and Stowford].

\textsuperscript{958} In the early 14\textsuperscript{th} century Exeter’s official visitors recited a regular litany of defects that underscore these books’ heavy use and age: they were “vetus” (old), “male” or “non cooperta” (poorly covered), “corrosum” (worn), with “male ligatum” (sprung bindings) and “obscuram” (faded script); one service-book’s letters were rubbed away in many places, “propter usum magnum.” See Coulton, “Visitation of Totnes”: passim, Reg. Grandisson: 570-9, 606-11 and The Register of Walter de Stapledon, Bishop of Exeter, 1307-26, ed. F.C. Hingeston-Randolph (London & Exeter, 1892): 109, 111, 130, 133, 185, 194 etc. (“libri matinutinales antiqui, corrosi, et litera in pluribus deleta propter usum magnum”: Coulton, “Visitation of Totnes”: 121).

\textsuperscript{959} This last factor may have had less of a detrimental impact on bible-users in bright Paris or sunny Bologna, but one’s chances of receiving much sunlight on a cloudy day in Durham or a gloomy Oxford afternoon in February were probably as high as they are today; almost zero.
Chapter Three

The Portable Bible in the Medieval World

It is often said that three factors in particular shaped the development of the intellectual life of the 13th century: the rapid growth of the universities, the predominant influence of the mendicant orders, and the impact of Aristotle on Western thought. To these three, the Rouses add a fourth macro factor, what they term a change in “the attitude of the age towards its written heritage – practical, utilitarian, active rather than passive.” In the course of the 13th century a flood of texts appeared that belonged to a new a genre: that of “works designed to be used, rather than read,” and intended to “help one to use, rather than to read, the texts to which they were devoted.” They included works such as the alphabetical collections of biblical distinctiones, the great verbal concordances to the Scripture, alphabetical subject indexes and location lists of books. The appearance of these new texts – or in some cases, the production of updated versions of older texts - was sudden, their circulation and their dissemination were swift, their effect was dramatic and their legacy was long. While there is much to say about this phenomenon more generally, here my focus is of course on bibles.


The combination of the new ordering of the biblical text - the ‘Paris’ Bible model - with the new portable format – the ‘pocket’ size – resulted in the immediate and widespread popularity of such volumes. Contemporary proof can be found in many forms, but perhaps the most telling is the speed and scale with which users of such volumes began to customize their bibles.

The lasting influence of the form and content of the bibles produced in the 13th century is certainly the result of the innovative combination of material layout and paratextual interpretational aids dictated by 12th-century Scholasticism and its requirements for efficient and effective information retrieval.\footnote{See M.A. & R.H. Rouse, \textit{Authentic Witnesses}, Chapters VI & VII.} Such tools, used for improved access and organization of the biblical text, both reflect a variety of uses for these bibles, and, most crucially, actively depend upon the existence of the Bible as a well-organized, searchable text, complete in one volume. It was upon these 12th-13th century developments in research and reference tools and technologies that the innovations in Scriptural technology represented by the mature Paris Bible codices were built, and within which their influence was rooted.

The Scriptural canon was more easily and more accurately searchable within these single pandect copies of the Bible’s text as a result of the contemporary establishment and widespread adoption of the ‘new’ ‘standardized’ ordering of the canon, and the division of books into chapters followed 12th-century methods. Furthermore, that canon was rendered more simply and more swiftly navigable within the material body of that single codex through the use of decorated initials, paragraph marks, images, decorations and marginal symbols, together with these bibles’ additional incorporation of a whole host of 13th century navigational aids and indexical strategies, including running headers, subject headers, indices, tables of contents, lists of \textit{incipits} and concordances.\footnote{Foliation and pagination perform a similar function, but these systems are not introduced until a later date as, with this rich existing systems of indexical and navigational aids available to the reader they were not yet necessary.} The combination of these factors made for a pocket-sized reference copy of the entire Scriptures that one could consult easily anywhere, at any time. It is not so much that these bibles make The Bible ‘user-friendly’ for the individual for the first time,
but rather that they made The Bible suitable for use by individual users. The resulting implications for a reader’s access to and use of the Scriptures were considerable.

1 The 13th-century portable bible as reference book

Prior to the 12th century, the medieval reader’s experience of reading the Bible was not a one-book activity, but rather a practice requiring many books. Scriptural reading could be a complicated, disjointed process involving referencing and collating multiple texts as part of the reading experience. Plurality is inherent in the very name given to the material form of the written Scriptures – ‘Bible,’ from the Greek and Latin words ‘biblia,’ signifying the authorized, collected canonical text-books of the Old and New Testament Scriptures. These Scriptures, a shifting canon with no single fixed order until the 13th century, were written in multiple different codices of differing sizes, formats and lengths according to their various functions: study, worship, preaching, or for an individual’s reading of The Bible’s text.

From the 5th century onwards, the role of the codex as a searchable, indexable cultural technology inviting varied, discontinuous readerly usage had been central to the development of Christianity, the medieval history of which speaks firmly of a religion of the book.\textsuperscript{966} The medieval study and interpretation of the written Scriptures was contingent on the reader’s skilful negotiation of the material format in which that text was inscribed.\textsuperscript{967} The material form in which the Scriptural text was written could limit or facilitate the reader’s most efficient and effective use of that text, inhibiting or privileging the reader’s access to the divine inscribed in material form.

However, reading the Scriptures could be a risky business. The need for a medieval reader to use multiple reference tools simultaneously during the act of reading The Bible was based upon the medieval view of interpreting the Scriptures as an activity plagued by the constant danger of misinterpretation, requiring guidance in the reader’s


pursuit of the divine. Authoritative guidance had always been deemed an essential accompaniment to any reading of the Scriptures. Throughout the Middle Ages, the topos of the Bible-as-forest, which characterized the reader’s navigational route through the confusing forest of biblical exegesis as a dangerous venture, enjoyed wide currency. It was held that it was not simply the Scripture that formed a dark forest in which a reader could lose himself, but the textual universe that surrounded it. Augustine, in his *De Doctrina Christiana*, quoting from Tyconius’ tract *On Rules*, referred to the need for guidance through the “immense forest of prophecy”. Likewise, in his *Breviloquium*, Bonaventure addressed the interpretive challenges to readers, portraying the interpretative passage of the readers through the scriptural text as a difficult, violent struggle.

However, by the 13th century, the overwhelming quantity of glosses and paratextual interpretive systems that had been designed to clarify the obscurities of the scriptures, were in danger of coming to have the opposite effect, as Bonaventure noted.

---


969 “Sunt enim quaedam regulae mysticae, quae uniuersae legis recessus obtinent et ueritates thesaurus aliquidus uisibiles [uisibiles] faciunt. Quaram si ratio regularum sine inuidia, ut communicamus, accepta fuerit, clausa quaque patient et obscura dilucidabuntur, ut quis prophetiae immensam siluam perambulans his regulis quodammodo lucis tramitus deductus ab errore defendatur.” (‘For there are certain mystic rules which reveal what is hidden in the whole Law and make visible the treasures of truth which are invisible to some. If the sense of these rules is accepted without envy as we have explained it, whatever is closed will be opened, and whatever is obscure will be illuminated, so that he who walks through the immense forest of prophecy led by these rules as if by pathways of lights will be defended from error.’) Cited by Lawrence Warner, “The Dark Wood and the Dark Word in Dante’s *Commedia*”. *Comparative Literature Studies* 32:4 (1995): 449-78 [454].

970 “Quod per sacrarum Scripturarum silvam quis secure incidendo et exponendo incedat, opus est, ut prius noverit ipsius sacrae Scripturarum veritatem per verba explicita.” (‘If a man is to make his way securely in the forest of the Scripture, cutting through it and opening it out, it is necessary that he first have a knowledge of Scriptural truth in its explicit statements.’) St. Bonaventure, *Breviloquium* Prologue 6.1, *Doctoris Seraphici S. Bonaventurae opera omnia*, vol. 5 (Quaracchi: Collegium S. Bonaventurae, 1891); trans. from *The Breviloquium*, *The Works of Bonaventure*, vol. 2, trans. José de Vinck (Paterson, NJ: St. Anthony Guild Press, 1963).

971 Et quia haec doctrina tam in scriptis Sanctorum quam etiam doctorum sic diffuse tradita est, u tab accenditibus ad Scripturam sacram audiendam non posit per longa tempora videri nec audiri – propter quod etiam novi theology frequenter ipsam Scripturam sacram exhorrent tanquam incertam et indordinatam et tanquam quondam silvam opacam.” (These truths are so widely diffused throughout the works of the saints and doctors that they could not all be read or heard by Scriptural students even in a long time. Beginners in the study of theology, in fact, often dread the Scripture itself, feeling it be as confusing, orderless, and unchartered as some impenetrable forest.’) St. Bonaventure, *Breviloquium* Prologue 6.5, *Doctoris Seraphici S. Bonaventurae opera omnia*, vol. 5 (Quaracchi: Collegium S. Bonaventurae, 1891); quoted by Lawrence Warner, “The Dark Wood and the Dark Word in Dante’s *Commedia*”: 457 [n.23]; trans. from *The
By this time, ideas regarding what constituted ‘The Bible,’ along with questions of how, where and when one would and should read certain Scriptural texts were changing, and the contents and uses of certain kinds of religious books reflected these changes. In the late 12th to early 13th centuries, the continuous *ruminatio* of the monks was displaced by the discontinuous ‘scholastic mode’ of *lectio divina* practiced by schoolmen, arguably effecting an institutionalization of discontinuous reading practices.\(^{972}\)

These modes of reading the Scriptures were very different from those hitherto practiced by religious, who had read The Scriptures slowly and continuously, chapter by chapter. Instead, the scholars of the 12th and 13th centuries were reading in a different way entirely, using the biblical text in different formats for different purposes, navigating larger quantities of texts, cross-referencing between authorities, commentaries and glosses within a larger range of Scriptural material itself in the space of the classroom. These new modes of using the Bible required new ways of arranging the biblical text on the page, and more accurate and efficient paratextual indexing systems and navigational tools for realizing and facilitating these new uses of The Bible’s texts.

The evolution of scholarly apparatus in the second half of the 12th century was a direct response to the changes underway in an increasingly urbanized society whose population was increasingly mobile. These newly-created instruments reflect the learned’s perception in these changes of the emergence of a fertile breeding ground for heresy, while the forms that these tools took reflect their function as strategic weapons devised to defend the Faith from the rising threat of this new evil. Two factors were particularly influential; namely the growth of the schools and the needs of formalized instruction, together with a growing emphasis on the pastoral ministry of preaching, which prompted the emergence of the new form of the sermon.\(^{977}\) These scholarly reading strategies of the


12th century may be characterized, argue Richard and Mary Rouse, “By the effort to gather, organize and harmonize the legacy of the Christian past as it pertained to jurisprudence, theological doctrine, and Scripture.”

These readerly requirements of the 12th century resulted in the development of complicated artificial finding devices through the 13th century, marking a watershed in readers’ usage of navigational systems. However before the prioritization of ‘searchability’ of written knowledge, especially of the Scriptures, came the idea of ‘putting into order’. Previously, scholars like Hugh of St. Victor (ca. 1096-1141), had emphasized the importance of logically ordering one’s methods of studying, in order that one may use one’s recall as a finding device. On the manner and order of reading, Hugh warned, in his Didascalicon, that, “Whoever does not keep an order and a method in the reading of so great a collection of books wanders as it were into the very thick of the forest and loses the path of the direct route; he is, as it is said, ‘always learning yet never reaching knowledge’” (V.5). Thus, rather than “thumbing the pages of books to hunt for rules and reasons” (‘folia librorum non quaererunt,’ III.3), Hugh encouraged his readers “To gather brief and dependable abstracts” while they read, “To be stored in the little chest of memory” (III.11). This was best accomplished, advised Hugh, by fixing in their


minds the graphic features of the page – the whereabouts of colored initials, the shapes created by the patterns of letters on the page – in order to register the positions of *sententiae* on the page as cues to the location of information in the text, the better to commit their knowledge to memory and to ensue one’s ability to relocate their text in the future.\(^983\)

By the mid-12th century, the method of reading was coming to dictate the ordering and presentation of reading materials; as Malcolm Parkes puts it, “To think [had] become a craft.”\(^984\) The application of scholastic method demanded closer scrutiny of the arguments and the new organization of material (according to topics) produced the need for more ostensible guides to facilitate reference. Scholars’ requirements of their source texts resulted in the production of more sophisticated systems for organizing information, as well as more accurate finding devices which made [biblical] text more swiftly and easily navigable, and thus made these readings possible. A complex litany of reference tools and indexing systems came to be used more frequently including subject indexes and chapter lists.\(^985\) These developments involved capitalizing on the material technology of the codex, which invited rapid and efficient discontinuous reading, provided the reader made skillful use of an accurate and efficient system to map these routes.

Thus the guidance systems for directing Scriptural reading developed into two kinds of organizational schemes: navigational aids (permitting ease and accuracy of textual use) and the presentation of works of gloss or commentary (guiding interpretation of Scriptural meaning).\(^986\) The whole process of indicating text, commentary and sources was incorporated into the design of the page, organizing the inherited *auctoritates* in such a

---


\(^984\) M.B. Parkes, “*Ordinatio* and *Compilatio*” (1979/91): 37.


way as to make it not only accessible alongside the text to be studied on the same page—
with the text in the center and the paratext surrounding it in the space of the margins—but accessible in terms of new ways of thinking. The resulting systematization of the practice of indicating citations’ sources in the margin became the ancestor of the modern scholarly apparatus of footnotes.

As the demand for ease of reference increased, two kinds of apparatus evolved in order to facilitate scholars’ study of a text and the location of information within it. The first “provided a form of hypertext, material essential for the understanding of a text itself, which followed the order of the text—the ordo narrationis;” while the second kind of apparatus “provided independent access to information, or subordinate topics within a text.”

Layout began to be used to greater effect as a finding device in the schools of the 12th century, the great interpretational tools of this period, including Peter Lombard’s Sentences, Gratian’s Decretum, Peter Aberlard’s Sic et non, were all, in effect, finding devices, and they all employed finding devices, such as prefatory lists - and/or tables - of chapter headings to facilitate scholars’ identification of the passage they were looking for within the work. Readers were then better able to actually locate that text thanks innovative features to the layout of the page, which acted as study aids, including techniques such as running headlines, rubricated chapter titles, alternating red and blue initials and gradation in size of initials, paragraph marks, cross-references and citation of authors

---


989 Three particularly noteworthy attempts were formulated at this time to provide artificial devices to supplement one’s memory (“not so much to aid the memory as to perform tasks for which the memory was unsuited”); these were Papias’ dictionary, the Elementarium doctrinae erudimentum (mid 11th century), Cardinal Deusdedit’s technique for searching his collection of canonical texts (1083-7) and the twelve marginal symbols devised for indexing Gilbert of Poitier’s Commentary on the Psalms (first half of the 12th century). See M.B. Parkes, “Folia librorum quaerere” (1995): 24 (cf. on apparatus which follows the ordo narrationis, see 24-31, pls. I-III and on apparatus which provided independent access to subordinate material in a text, see 31-41, pls. IV-VIII); and M.A. & R.H. Rouse, “Statim invenire: Schools, Preachers, and New Attitudes to the Page” (1991): 192-96.

quoted, features which had all become standard by about 1220. The same period saw the emergence of the great products of the 12th-century schools for biblical study; the glossa ordinaria, in existence by about 1150, and the 12th-century glossed books of the Bible, whose pages united the Scriptural text with works of gloss and commentary in a clear, useful layout.

In reference tools such as these, and especially in copies of the works of 13th-century writers, the ordinatio of the work was more clearly defined, a change that Parkes hailed as “The structure of reasoning came to be reflected in the physical appearance of books.” However, as is so often the case, the clearer these new organizers of knowledge desired their text to seem, through definition, identification and organization, the more complicated some of their apparatus and devices became, and the more overgrown could their pages come to appear. As Parkes put it, the more “Academic discussion bent on more precise definition focused on the ostensible arrangement of a work and formulated a concept of ordinatio,” with the laudable intention of “providing a theoretical foundation for attempts to meet the readers’ practical needs,” the greater grew the “ostensible ‘packaging of the text.’”

The turning point in the history of the presentation of the text came in the 13th century when the rediscovered Aristotelian logic influenced the adoption of principles which demanded a more precise method of dissecting and defining human knowledge. As a result, 13th-century scholars increasingly viewed different fields of study as

---

autonomous branches of knowledge, each with its own appropriate mode of procedure, and insisted upon organization and method in the various procedures.\footnote{996}

Contemporary 13\textsuperscript{th}-century discussions about the structure of knowledge and the subordination of the sciences to the study of theology further emphasize the changes from the early 12\textsuperscript{th}-century attitude, as witnessed by Hugh of St. Victor.\footnote{997} Bonaventura’s view emphasizes the shift that has taken place since the early 12\textsuperscript{th} century. He takes a comparable view of the hierarchy of studies, but he specifies the studies he is referring to; “he is more definitivus”.\footnote{998} Whereas Hugh’s use of the terms “recte ordinata” emphasizes the ordering of studies within the structure of knowledge, Bonaventura’s use of the terms “ordinate procedere et exerceri” emphasizes the need to recognize the principles of order inherent in each branch of knowledge and to follow the appropriate procedure, which Bonaventura clarifies as being dictated by the nature of the subject to be studied: “Ordo diversimode traditur a diversis, sed oportet ordinate procedere ne de primo faciant posterius.”\footnote{999}

\footnote{996}{This attitude was exemplified in the \textit{Summa} attributed to Alexander of Hales (written ?): “Modus definitivus debet esse, divisus, collectivus, et talis modus debet esse in humanis scientiis, quia apprehensio veritatis secundum humanum rationem explicatur per divisiones, definitiones, et raciocinationes.” \textit{Summa theologiae}, attr. Alexander of Hales (Quaracchi ed., 1924), Tractatus introductorius, quaestio I, art. 1, cap. 4, ad secundum; quoted by M.B. Parkes, “\textit{Ordinatio and Compilatio}” (1979/91): 50-51.}


\footnote{998}{M.B. Parkes, “\textit{Ordinatio and Compilatio}” (1979/91): 50.}

By the 13th century the *glossa ordinaria* came to be supplemented (eventually replaced?) by the development of *postillae*, commentaries that encompassed the whole of a biblical book. Early *postillae*, such as those of the Dominican Hugh of St. Cher (ca. 1200-63),1000 were based on scholarship that had taken place since the completion of the *glossa*. This new work required a different layout on the page - the term *postillae* may itself derive from its layout, the name probably originating from the Latin “*post illa [verbus textus]*”, that is, ‘*after those [words of text]*’ - as the ratio of commentary to text was so high; thus the commentary was now written not in the margins or between the lines of biblical text, but as blocks of text that followed the scriptural text being commented upon.

2 The 13th-century portable bible as an independent searchable reference tool; a ‘One-Book Scriptural Reference Library’

It was in the 13th century that the first tools that served as an interpretational apparatus to the Scriptures were created in searchable order, both rational and alphabetical.1001 These research tools included alphabetical collections of *distinctiones* and *concordances* to the Scriptures, in addition to alphabetical subject indexes to the writings of Aristotle and the Church Fathers and location lists of books such as the Franciscans’ *Tabula septem custodiarum*, a guide to incidental passages in patristic writings which could be used for the interpretation of biblical texts, and their *Registrum anglicae de libris doctorum et auctorum veterum*, the remarkable bibliographical union catalog produced in the 1330s, essentially a guide to patristic texts in English libraries.1002

---


1002 The *Registrum anglicae* is a truly remarkable work; indexing 185 libraries and listing c.1400 titles attributed to 99 ancient, patristic and early medieval authors, the work functions as a finding aid, a catalogue of works, a location list, and yet we have no firm clues as to why it was made. Along with its close Franciscan-made relation text, the *Tabula septem custodiarum*, the two works document changing attitudes to inherited authority, changes in the organization of knowledge and the evolving needs of students and masters, reflecting 13th-century views on the proper and permissible organization of learning and how information
The creation of such tools was the result of multiple factors including the rapid growth of the universities, the predominant influence of the mendicant orders and the growth of the professions. However, Richard and Mary Rouse have argued that it was ultimately the emergence of the thematic sermon that motivated the development of these new tools, together with the need to meet the new requirements of preachers in combination with a growing interest in ‘whole texts’ within the universities.\footnote{On a particularly fascinating preacher’s tool which offered quick and easy access to auctoritates for sermons, see the Manipulus florum of Thomas of Ireland, compiled in 1306 using the books of the library of The Sorbonne: for discussion see M.A. \\& R.H. Rouse, \textit{Preachers, Florilegia and Sermons: Studies on the ‘Manipulus florum’ of Thomas of Ireland} (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1979).} Whereas the apparatus produced in the 12\textsuperscript{th} century had been designed to assimilate, compile and organize information (inherited written authority) in systematic form, the guiding impulse that generated the research tools of the 13\textsuperscript{th} century was rather characterized by a desire to search written authority afresh, and to locate, access and, retrieve information. These tools employed artificial order as a finding device, in contrast to reliance on layout, most of them created in response to the need for sermon material for preachers. Many were arranged in alphabetical order to facilitate searching.\footnote{See M.B. Parkes, “The Influence of the Concepts of Ordinatio and Compilatio on the Development of the Book,” in \textit{Medieval Learning and Literature: Essays Presented to R.W. Hunt}, Eds. J.J.G. Alexander \\& M.T. Gibson (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976): 115-40, repr. in Parkes’ \textit{Scribes, Scripta and Readers: Studies in the Communication, Presentation and Dissemination of Medieval Texts} (London: Hambledon Press, 1991): 35-69 \cite{36} and M.A. \\& R.H. Rouse, “Statim inventio: Schools, Preachers, and New Attitudes to the Page,” in their \textit{Authentic Witnesses: Approaches to Medieval Texts and Manuscripts} (Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 1991): 201-20.} Thus they are the visible and tangible manifestations of a new mode of thought which distinguishes the 13\textsuperscript{th} century from preceding centuries and whose common goal was to facilitate access to desired information.\footnote{M.A. \\& R.H. Rouse, “The Development of Research Tools” (1991): 221-2, 239. On distinctiones, see M.A. \\& R.H. Rouse, “Biblical Distinctiones in the thirteenth century”, \textit{Archives d’histoire doctrinale et littéraire du moyen âge} 41 (1975), 27-37.}

These reference tools emerged simultaneously during the course of the 13\textsuperscript{th} century, bearing what Richard and Mary Rouse have termed “a certain family resemblance”; namely that they were all made to be used and intended to help the reader to use the texts to which they are the keys.\footnote{M.A. \\& R.H. Rouse, “The Development of Research Tools” (1991): 239.} These tools “embody the concept of utility,
of plain practical usefulness,” both conceived and used for practical purposes,\textsuperscript{1007} and this in itself represents a radical transformation from 12\textsuperscript{th}-century attitudes to written authority.\textsuperscript{1008} In the following paragraphs, I will briefly discuss each of the crucial new tools of the 13\textsuperscript{th} century - Biblical distinctions, Biblical concordances, and alphabetical subject indexes - in order to underscore the ways in which they revolutionized the reading and interpretation of the Scriptures.

I Biblical distinctions

The most popular of these new tools was probably that of the collections of biblical distinctiones, lists of key words from the Scriptures that distinguished (hence distinctionio) the various meanings of each word, listing three or more allegorical and moral applications with the relevant biblical verse, all stated in highly compressed language.\textsuperscript{1009} Emergent in the late 12\textsuperscript{th}-century, collections of biblical distinctiones were the first tools to employ artificial order as a finding device, making them the most direct ancestor to the later alphabetical and searchable tools of the 13\textsuperscript{th} century.

These collections of distinctions were an instant success and continued to be produced with ever-increasing enthusiasm from the end of the 12\textsuperscript{th} century through most of the 13\textsuperscript{th} century.\textsuperscript{1014} Their immediate popularity demonstrates that they met a need, and their continued production attests to a significant and long-lived demand. It was once thought that this demand originated in the medieval classroom, and that these tools’


\textsuperscript{1008} Indeed, as the Rouses note, “The notion that the text of the bible, or the works of the Fathers of the Church, should be useful would have been strange, and likely repugnant, to monastic thought.” M.A. & R.H. Rouse, “The Development of Research Tools” (1991): 240.


\textsuperscript{1014} At least five major collections were produced in the final decade of the 12\textsuperscript{th} century alone - Peter the Chanter’s Summa Abel, the Pantheologus of Peter of Cornwall, the collection of Alan of Lile and the distinctions on the Psalms of Peter of Poitiers and Prepositinus – containing up to 1,500 biblical terms and distinguishing as many as 6 or 8 meanings for each; see M.A. & R.H. Rouse in “Statim invenire: Schools, Preachers, and New Attitudes to the Page,” in their Authentic Witnesses: Approaches to Medieval Texts and Manuscripts (Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 1991): ‘Biblical Distinction Collections’, 204-9 [205].
purpose was primarily exegetical for use in teaching or composition by theologians.\textsuperscript{1015} However the true source of demand for such ready supplies of distinctions seems rather to lie in the needs of those engaged in composing sermons, specifically preachers, whose need for a convenient selection of distinctions from which to choose was met by the creation of these handy new tools.\textsuperscript{1016} By the end of the 13\textsuperscript{th} century, for instance, the Dominicans in Paris devised a system of divided each chapter into alphabetical partitions, ranging from ‘a’ through ‘g’ for longer chapters and ‘a’ through ‘d’ for shorter chapters. Thus “xii a” would point to the first quarter of chapter 12, “xii b” to the second quarter, and so on.\textsuperscript{1017} This system corresponded to the references in the Dominicans’ concordances and distinctiones.\textsuperscript{1018} These were specialized lexicographical tools – in effect, exegetical tools adapted specifically for sermon preparation - which designed to allow scholars either to quickly find a Bible verse that could be used as a proof text or illustration or to find an appropriate story to illustrate a theological or moral point, or elaborate on the meaning of a particular word in the Bible text.\textsuperscript{1019}

The origin of the use of these distinctiones collections in the practice of sermon-composition seems to be closely linked with the emergence of the scholastic, or so-called thematic sermon, whose form had become broadly standardized by the 14\textsuperscript{th} century.\textsuperscript{1020} It was the needs of those engaged in composing thematic sermons that motivated the

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{1017} The division into verses as we know them today was not introduced until the 16\textsuperscript{th} century, by the Paris printer Étienne Robert in 1534. Van Liere (2014): 44-5.
  \item \textsuperscript{1018} See Van Liere (2014): 230-2.
  \item \textsuperscript{1019} Van Liere (2014): 230.
\end{itemize}
creation of the first tools in searchable order, rational and alphabetical, while the development of new techniques in the layout of the page were responses to the needs of those teaching from the page.\textsuperscript{1021}

II Biblical concordances

While these distinction collections were created in response to the needs of preachers, the new concordances that emerged at the same time were rooted rather in biblical scholarship.\textsuperscript{1022} Concordances facilitated the quick lookup of biblical passages, by placing the key words in alphabetical order, and giving the chapter (and later, the verse) for each occurrence for speed and ease of access to the biblical textual and the retrieval of citations.\textsuperscript{1023} Two kinds of concordance developed simultaneously: in verbal concordances words were listed alphabetically, accompanied by references to the biblical passages in which the particular words occurred; while in topic or subject concordances relevant passages were listed under subject headings. The verbal concordances were the more popular of the two kinds of concordance, and enjoyed a much wider circulation.

The first verbal concordances were authored by the Dominicans of Saint-Jacques in Paris (hence their name, the Concordantiae sancti Jacobi), probably in the mid- to late 1230s. It is usually assigned to Hugh of St. Cher, active at St. Jacques 1230-5, who was traditionally said to have been assisted in his labors by 500 fellow Dominicans.\textsuperscript{1024} However these first Concordantiae from St. Jacques were not widely popular for the simple


\textsuperscript{1022} At least to begin with; later concordances also came to be used for sermon composition and other preacherly requirements (see below).


\textsuperscript{1024} Although it may have been completed after his departure from the house; the earliest surviving datable copy was produced sometime between 1239-47; R.H. & M.A. Rouse, “The Verbal Concordance to the Scriptures,” Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum, 44 (1974): 5-30 [8] In the preface to his Correctio Biblie, Hugh writes that he has collated various Latin versions, biblical commentaries and as well as the Hebrew manuscripts. Hugh’s Correctio Biblie survives in more than a dozen manuscripts. See ?? The preface has been edited by Gilbert Dahan, “La critique textuelle dans les correctoires de la Bible du XIIIe siècle,” in Langages et philosophie: hommage à Jean Jolivet, Ed. A. de Libera, A. Elamrani-Jamal, A. Galonnier (Paris 1997): 365-92 [386-7]. On Hugh’s approach to the text of the Bible drawing criticism from William de la Mare, author of another correctorium, see Denifle, “Die Handschriften,” (1888): 263-311, 471-601 [296, n. 5].
reason that they were of limited use, providing preachers seeking relevant biblical passages for their sermons, with a reference tool that was little more than a skeletal model; although these concordances cited the biblical passages where particular words could be found, they provided no actual quotations and thus offered users no guidance as to the content of the passages listed, which was what preachers in particular needed. Around the middle of the 13th-century, a revised version - the *Concordantiae Anglicanae*, or ‘English Concordance’- was produced by an English Dominican, Richard Stavensby, probably working in collaboration with others at St. Jacques, which included complete quotations of the listed passages.\textsuperscript{1025}

However this revised version was soon superseded by the production, before 1286, of a third version, probably produced at St. Jacques, which reduced the lengthy and unwieldy quotations supplied in the *Concordantiae Anglicanae* to their essence, greatly condensing the size of the work, and thus enhancing its usability, as witnessed in its immediate and long-lasting popularity.\textsuperscript{1026} This third concordance to the Scriptures divided The Bible into seven parts, numbered a-g, so that references in the concordances could be located more readily. In some bibles of this time the letters a-g or a-d were entered into the margins, to facilitate access of access to the passage/letter cited in the concordance. However, these letters were not always entered into copies of the Bible itself; if they had not been entered, the user of the concordance had to mentally subdivide into 7 or 4 sections the chapter cited by the concordance as containing that passage he was seeking.

**III Alphabetical Subject Indexes / Originalia & Tabulae**

Finally, we turn to alphabetical indexes. The new interest in organization and procedure within an individual work – the need to study an argument from beginning to end – stimulated a return to the *originalia*, the works of the *auctores in toto* motivated by the

desire to see the *auctoritates*, the individual *sententiae*, in their full context. In material terms, this impulse lead to the compilation of as much information as possible united in a single compendious volume. Thus new copies were made, fat volumes embracing as many of the writings of a single *auctor* as possible, and constructed from independent ‘booklets’ or units, each of which contained a complete long work or a group of shorter works. Scribes achieved the necessary compression of a large work into a ‘booklet’ through the use of the same compression strategies as those used in the contemporaneous production of ‘pocket’ bibles; by using very small handwriting in combination with the copious use of abbreviations. This growing concern with the importance of the ‘whole work’ and the emphasis on the use of ‘whole texts’ amongst scholars and preachers at the universities in the 13th century required the creation of new tools with which to search the *originalia*. Indexes were ideal solutions to these needs, and many such indexes were soon being compiled with tremendous energy and enthusiasm, borrowing the devices of alphabetical or rational order created for the 12th-century preaching tools and utilizing the divisions into chapters as their reference system. Alphabetic order offered a neutral, flexible way of presenting material, since it allowed freedom to the user to transfer material or ideas to other contexts.

---


1029 M.B. Parkes, “*Ordinatio* and *Compilatio*” (1979/91): 54-5.


The use of alphabetical order for organizing and making knowledge retrievable is significant in attesting to the emergence at this time of a new attitude to written tradition. The acceptance of alphabetization as a method for ordering information was neither immediate nor widespread, requiring as it did a break with the established method of ordering ideas - namely according to rational order, or, for theologians, the order of topics as defined by the order of the Scriptures – but the increasing use of alphabetization represents a contemporary recognition of the fact that each user of a work brought to it his own preconceived rational order, which might differ from those of other users. In other words, “Alphabetization was not simply a handy new device; it was also the manifestation of a different way of thinking.”

For those readers who wished to search for material to use in the contexts of different arguments, the tabula was the most important of the new forms of apparatus, providing a new means of access to subordinate topics within the existing ordinatio of a work, which were extracted, defined and arranged by lemmata (key words) in alphabetical order based on a convention derived from lexicography. The range of tabula was wide: there were standard tabulae (like the alphabetical indices prepared by Robert Kilwardby on the Fathers and the Sentences and those prepared by individuals for their own use. 13th-century scholars produced tabulae permitting independent access to texts in accordance with new ways of thinking, and used them to make earlier texts accessible in terms familiar to the 13th-century reader. For example, Robert Grosseteste produced a set of tituli to the Ethics of Aristotle and Robert Kilwardby produced a series of synopses

of works of the fathers variously called intenciones, capitula or conclusiones. These works kept to the order of the existing ordinatio but their authors divided each chapter into smaller sections and analyzed and summarized their respective contents.

This perception of an overabundance of additional reference texts fuelled the production of even more aids to remedy this problem, fostering the diffusion and development of various aids to learning or ‘reference genres’, and also affected the way medieval scholars worked, from reading and taking notes to composing books of their own. Many of today’s methods for managing an abundance of texts via “selecting, sorting and storing, carried out in various combinations and with various motives and technologies” originated in the 13th century, from the strategies at work in florilegia to branching diagrams or the alphabetical index.

3 The Use of Portable Bibles by The Mendicant Friars

Tied into the uncertainty regarding the use of portable bibles in the 13th century, persists a lack of a straightforward answer as regards their readership and ownership. Whose was the demand that necessitated the production of this massive supply of bibles? The reduction in size of the Bible during the 13th century reflects the rise in personal rather than corporate ownership of these books which seem almost all to have been for private study. Unlike their giant multi-volume predecessors, the smaller size, more compact format and higher degree of portability of these 13th-century bibles caused them to open up a wealth of possibilities not only for how the Bible and its text could be read.

1038 See Ann M. Blair, Too Much to Know: Managing Scholarly Information before the Modern Age (New Haven & London; Yale University Press, 2010): passim, but esp. 11-61 and 173-229.
1039 Branching diagrams offered a conceptual division of a topic or presented an outline of how one might subdivide, or order a text (and thus could be very useful for the purposes of teaching or preaching) but could also serve as finding devices for the contents of a work, text or section of information. For further discussion see Ann M. Blair, Too Much to Know: Managing Scholarly Information before the Modern Age (New Haven & London; Yale University Press, 2010): 144-52 and John Murdoch, Antiquity and the Middle Ages. Album of Science (New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1984).
1040 See Blair, Too Much to Know (2010): 137-44.
1041 For example, only two of the 13th-century bibles selected for inclusion in Nigel Morgan’s survey of Early Gothic manuscripts contain evidence of use for reading in the refectory (CUL Ms. Ee.2.23 and Bodleian Library, Oxford, Ms. lat. Bibl. e.7); N.J. Morgan, Survey IV.1 (1982): nos 65 (CUL Ms. Ee.2.23) and no. 69 (Bodleian Library, Oxford, Ms. lat. Bibl. e.7).
and searched, but where; in what kinds of circumstance, where it could be consulted and
how it could be experienced (read in solitude or in company) in doors or out, supervised
by others or read uninhibited by supervision.

These bibles produced throughout Europe in the 13th century were embraced and
used by many segments of society. Portable bibles were used by members of the
universities (such as masters, scholars, fellows and so on) and by those associated with
them. They were also found in the hands of other religious, including members of
both the major and minor orders of the secular clergy, members of monastic
communities (including monks, abbots and priors) and members of other religious houses.
However their users included a wider audience that now encompassed members of the
laity, from local nobility, royal officials, clerks and administrators of estates to other civil
servants and urban professionals (particularly London tradesmen); in short, people who
had never owned books before and for many of whom the portable bible would have
been their first introduction to the book. Scholars, including Richard and Mary Rouse
and Lori Anne Ferrell, have emphasized the radical consequences implemented by these
books for access to the Bible in lay hands, while Margaret Deanesly’s research on bible
ownership witnessed in late medieval wills - in her 1920 study of the English Bible in the
14th through early-16th centuries - also emphasizes the growing number of lay owners of

1042 Although Light notes that “The use of the Paris Bible by students and masters in the theology faculty [of
the university of Paris] needs to be treated carefully. …Nonetheless, we need to remember that the same
students and masters who studied the Bible and its accompanying gloss were also using the Bible in
preaching and disputations (it also seems probable that students who could not afford to own a multivolume
set of the complete Bible with the gloss did own one-volume unglossed Bibles.” (Light 2011: 239). Such a
portrait of bible-purchase and ownership by students thus positions these bibles as less-expensive
alternatives; for further discussion of the impact of these bibles’ cost and purchase prices on their possible
use and owners see Chapter 4.
1043 Including archbishops – and Archbishops of Canterbury - and bishops / and other, slightly less senior,
members of the secular clergy; particularly members of the cathedral clergy, such as deans, archdeacons
and canons, as well as beneficed priests and stipendiary clergy
1044 Including chaplains, parsons, vicars, rectors and clerks; see David Knowles, The Monastic Order in
England: A History of Its Development from the Times of St. Dunstan to the Fourth Lateran Council, 943-1216 (1940, 2nd
1046 Richard and Mary Rouse argue that these bibles represent the Bible’s descent “from the communal
altar to become the private property of the priest, a personal possession of the friar” (M.A. & R.H. Rouse,
Authentic Witnesses 1991: 214) while Lori Anne Ferrell argues that “These new smaller-scale, practical Bibles
were...not only the harbingers but also the primary symbols of a changing, increasingly intimate
relationship between the Bible and ordinary people” (Lori Anne Ferrell, The Bible and the People 2008: 38).
Latin Bibles during this period, revealing a significant numbers of bibles found in the possession of lay persons.\textsuperscript{1047} \textsuperscript{1048}

However, it is increasingly clear that the inspiration, format, and extraordinary success of the 13\textsuperscript{th}-century portable bible were due to the patronage of the Dominican and Franciscan orders of mendicant friars, both of whom exemplify the church’s focus on preaching and pastoral care. It was Josephine Case Schnurman who, in 1960, first made the case for fraternal use of these bibles,\textsuperscript{1049} deviating from previous scholarly opinion that had emphasized either a wholly university-based audience (Martin, Berger and Quentin et al.),\textsuperscript{1050} or a “wandering scholar” model (Loewe).\textsuperscript{1051} Over the last thirty years, scholars such as Laura Light,\textsuperscript{1052} Christopher de Hamel, and Chiara Ruzzier\textsuperscript{1053} have extended and nuanced the case for friars, arguing that the portable form and pandect format of the 13\textsuperscript{th}-century bible make them the first bibles that catered to the needs of the individual, a user group that, as Light comments, both includes and extends beyond the university, “ranging from the students and masters of the new and rapidly growing universities, to

\textsuperscript{1047} Indeed lay users constituted the largest group of the testators Deanesly found who bequeathed bibles within Deanesley’s classification of premodern bible-owners into the general categories of bishops or cathedral clergy, those connected with the universities, the minor clergy (including rector, vicars and chaplains) and laypersons. Comprising 24 of the total 69 testators, compared to 23 bishops or cathedral clergy, 16 rectors, vicars or chaplains (i.e. minor clergy) and only 6 connected with the universities. Deanesley comments that the recorded cases of possession of Vulgates “were rare as compared with those who possessed service books only,” adding that of the 7578 wills she examined before 1526, “338 wills bequeathed service books, and 110 Vulgates”: Margaret Deanesley, \textit{The Lollard Bible} (1920): 332, cf. Appendix I (391-98). These discoveries notwithstanding, Deanesley asserted that “the Vulgate was not a common book in late medieval England,” based on having found references to Vulgate Bibles in “only” 118 of the total 7578 English wills made before 1384-1526 she examined, and having found evidence of “only” 69 testators who bequeathed bibles. These 118 references to Vulgates Deanesly discovered were located in the following sources: 49 references in printed collections of wills made before 1526; 20 in collections of wills printed in archaeological collections, episcopal registers, historical monographs etc.; and 41 in single printed wills, MS. single wills and references to bequests in chroniclers.; Margaret Deanesley, \textit{The Lollard Bible and Other Medieval Biblical Versions} (Cambridge: CUP, 1920): 203, 329, and for tabulations of the results of her research see Appendix I (391-98).

\textsuperscript{1048} Comprising 24 of the total 69 testators, compared to 23 bishops or cathedral clergy, 16 rectors, vicars or chaplains (i.e. minor clergy) and only 6 connected with the universities. Deanesley comments that the recorded cases of possession of Vulgates “were rare as compared with those who possessed service books only,” adding that of the 7578 wills she examined before 1526, “338 wills bequeathed service books, and 110 Vulgates”: Margaret Deanesley, \textit{The Lollard Bible} (1920): 332, cf. Appendix I (391-98).

\textsuperscript{1049} Schnurman (1960)

\textsuperscript{1050} Cf. J.P.P Martin (1888, 1889, 1890), H. Denifle (1888), S. Berger (1893, 1902), Henri Quentin et al. (1922, 1926)

\textsuperscript{1051} Raphael Loewe, 1969.


\textsuperscript{1053} Ruzzier, 2011, 2013
the bishops and priests of a church that was emphasising its pastoral role as never before, to the wandering preachers of the Franciscan and Dominican orders.”

De Hamel goes further, arguing that use by itinerant friars must be considered the crucial factor in how and why these bibles achieved such recognition and popularity so rapidly. He highlights the friars’ agency in physically establishing their centrality in medieval society and culture through their physically taking these bibles out into the world, thus literally popularizing portable bibles, making them visible in places and in ways in which the laity had never encountered them before. While I agree with these assessments, I believe there is still more to be said about the symbiotic relationship that existed between the mendicant orders and the portable pandect bible, and it is into this larger conversation that I hope to enter here.

If it is clear that the mendicant orders have a special relationship to the new 13th-century bibles, the question of why this is remains less than obvious. One way that we can begin to account for this unique relationship is via the dual identity friars occupied as both preachers and scholars. In exploring this dual identity, I will deal with the interrelated questions of why these bibles were particularly useful books for friars, what they needed them for, and how they used them.

The foundation of the orders of mendicant friars in the 13th century produced evangelical personnel for the purpose of preaching by word and example. This activity was based upon close study of the Bible and the written doctrines of the Church, and the convents situated at the universities became centers of study. The foundation and rapid spread of the Franciscan and Dominican orders in the first quarter of the 13th century “marked a new departure in the religious life of Europe.”

1054 (Light 2012), 380.


1057 Though, as D’Avray notes, there were ephemeral forerunners in the 12th century; D.L. D’Avray, “Portable *vademecum* books” (1980): 61.
followed suit two years later.\textsuperscript{1058} In England, the friaries of Oxford were amongst the first to be set up: the Franciscan house was established in 1224-5 and the Dominicans’ by 1226.\textsuperscript{1059} The Dominicans in particular played a centrally formative role in biblical scholarship of the 13\textsuperscript{th} century. St. Dominic (1170-1221) had founded the order with the primary aim of teaching and confirming fundamental truths in order to resist heresy and to educate intellectuals in orthodox religion. Biblical scholarship was therefore at the heart of their teaching at St.-Jacques in Paris, and men like Hugh of St. Cher and Thomas Aquinas himself, who both lectured there, were among the greatest biblical scholars of any age.

By the second quarter of the 13\textsuperscript{th} century, thanks to the emergence of an organized book trade catering to the academic needs in Paris, Oxford and other major university centers such as Bologna, bibles could, for the first time in the Middle Ages, actually be bought in considerable numbers. As Christopher de Hamel reminds us, while friars were by no means the only customers for portable bibles, “they must have been the principal means for disseminating everything that the Paris Bible represented.”\textsuperscript{1060} Indeed, through this trade, the friars soon acquired well-stocked libraries which sustained scholarly activity directed towards making inherited material available in condensed or more easily accessible form to the preacher in the field.\textsuperscript{1061} By 1236, for example, the Dominicans had their own list of corrections to the Biblical text.\textsuperscript{1062} Therefore, the evangelical purpose of these new orders was not only served by the new book trade, but actively helped to shape it through the development of new scholarly apparatus. The search for originalia, the production of new copies, and the collection of these ideas into new readily-accessible compendia were all essential to the friars’ task, which required

\textsuperscript{1058} For a list of Franciscan Custodies and Houses in the Province of England see A.G. Little, \textit{Studies in Franciscan History} (Manchester: Manchester UP, 1917): 235-8.
\textsuperscript{1060} As de Hamel also points out, “There is a certain irony that the Orders which renounced all worldly possessions probably furnished a good part of the regular income of many secular workshops.” (De Hamel, \textit{The Book} 2001: 135).
\textsuperscript{1062} See Beryl Smalley, \textit{The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages} (1974): 274.
close attention be paid to the further development of the tools and processes of "auctoritates". In this the Oxford friars were particularly active, devising various kinds of aids to facilitate reference to patristic authorities, such as indexes and concordances that kept to the order of the existing "ordinatio" while dividing each chapter into smaller sections for summary and analysis.

But of course in addition to these scholarly or pseudo-scholarly pursuits, friars were first and foremost itinerant preachers. Friars disseminated ideas, techniques, and manuscripts as they took to the road or moved from one house to the next, and indeed, travelling was built into the structure of the friars’ organization and pastoral activity, significantly influencing the kinds of books they needed and how they used them – including the new portable pandect bibles. Richard Rypon, sub-prior of Durham Cathedral priory and prior of Finchale 1397-1405, provides a portrait of the late medieval preacher’s essential library in the collection of sermons he compiled in the last quarter of the 14th century. Rypon first emphasizes that in order for a priest to preach, the essential qualification was, of course, a thorough knowledge of the Scriptures, however this must be supplemented by familiarity with “The Book of Sacraments, the Lectionary, the Antiphoner, the Baptisterium, the Complotus, the Canones Poenitentiales and Homilies throughout the year for Sundays and Festivals”, to be achieved through extensive study. Rypon concludes with the thunderous warning that if the priest’s, or

---

1063 In this context, notes Parkes, “The definition of ordinatio led to the development of the notion of compilatio both as a form of writing and as a means of making material easily accessible.” M.B. Parkes, “Ordinatio and Compilatio” (1979/91): 68.


1066 “Curati are required to have a knowledge of Holy Scripture with which they are to have a knowledge of Holy Scripture with which they may preach to the people the word of God.”

1067 These books to which Rypon here refers the would-be preacher-priest are “The books which it is necessary for a priest to know” as prescribed by Canon Law (quoting Gratian, Dist. 38); cited in G.R. Owst, Preaching in Medieval England (1926): 28-29 (cf. 28 nn.1, 4 & 29 nn.1-3).
curate’s knowledge of any single one of these is lacking, “Hardly is he worthy of the name of priest.”\textsuperscript{1068} However, although this list of recommended reading was undeniably sound advice for the non-traveling preacher-priest, it was hardly practical for friars, whose way of life was characterized by mobility in imitation of the \textit{vita apostolica}.\textsuperscript{1069}

Rather, the kinds of books that an itinerant friar would have been able to take with him to use on his travels were most likely, for obvious reasons, portable \textit{vade mecum} volumes whose small format and diverse contents were necessarily dictated by their function for their users. A friar may have supplied himself with preachers’ aids such as an \textit{exempla} collection,\textsuperscript{1070} a Bible concordance or a volume of \textit{distinctions}, perhaps alphabetized,\textsuperscript{1071} or supplemented by examples of model sermons,\textsuperscript{1072} and a book of stories about the saints. 13\textsuperscript{th}-century preachers also compiled and used handbooks containing a tailor-made range of sermon aids and/or selections from texts required for sermon composition.\textsuperscript{1073} An excellent example of this kind of compendious volume produced by preachers for preachers is Bodleian Library, Ms. Laud Misc. 511 (220 x 150 mm, 204 fols.), a portable but comprehensive preacher’s handbook compiled by an English Dominican in the second half of the 13\textsuperscript{th} century\textsuperscript{1074} which includes not only


\textsuperscript{1071} E.g. Bodleian Library, Ms. Bodley 23, the alphabetical \textit{distinctiones} of Nicholas de Gorran, O.P.; produced in England 1300-50 (168 x 127 mm, 289 fols.); cf. F. Madan & H.H.E. Craster, \textit{Summary Catalogue II.1} (1922): no. 1866 (89).


\textsuperscript{1074} On this manuscript, see in particular the excellent study by Mary Elizabeth O’Carroll, \textit{A Thirteenth-Century Preacher’s Handbook: Studies in MS Laud Misc. 511} (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1997): for codicological information on the volume, see 75-116, and the catalogue of the manuscript’s
sermons in various patterns (long, short, summary, distinction style, popular and clerical) but also a collection of exempla and of patristic authorities and a selection of extra material for preaching on specialized topics. Friars might also have taken with them a confessional handbook, or a treatise on the virtues and vices, which would have enabled them to help a penitent examine his conscience, and “served as a sort of anatomy of sin for reference purposes”; and works of spirituality. Apart from books to help him with confessions and preaching, a friar would need a breviary in order to say his daily office – some orders actually required their priests to carry portable breviaries – and of course a ‘pocket’-sized copy of the Bible.

Given the itinerant nature of the friar’s daily life, the emergence of the portable pandect bible in a large-scale book market was truly serendipitous. Multi-volume lectern bibles were of no use during a sermon: a preacher needed a copy he could carry, and the

---

1075 The process of the volume’s production seems to have been as varied as its contents; the texts are arranged in 2 column(s), each of 39-45 lines, measuring 179-165 x ca. 48 mm apiece (lines numbered in Arabic numbers in fives), and the contents were written in four different book hands, which O’Carroll distinguishes as Hands A-D as follows: Hand A, fols. 5-50v; Hand B, fols. 51-118v, 121-128v, 131-180v [and fols. 1-4v]; Hand C, fols. 119-120v, 129-130v; Hand D, fols. 181-204v, or, in order of the book’s contents: [fols. 1-4v: Hand B]; fols. 5-50v, Hand A; fols. 51-118v, Hand B; fols. 119-120v, Hand C; fols. 121-128v, Hand B; fols. 129-130v, Hand C; fols. 131-180v, Hand B; fols. 181-204v, Hand D; see O’Carroll, A Thirteenth-Century Preacher’s Handbook (1997): 78-80.

1076 e.g. Bodleian Library, Ms. Selden Supra 48, including Raymundes de Pennaforte, Suma de casibus poenitentiae; 156 x 117 mm, 1225-50; see F. Madan & H.H.E. Craster, Summary Catalogue II.1 (1922): no. 3436 (634)

1077 e.g. Bodleian Library, Ms. Bodley 35, after Guillelmus Peraldus; produced in England 1275-1300 (168 x 140 mm, 101 fols., in 2 cols.); cf. F. Madan & H.H.E. Craster, Summary Catalogue II.1 (1922): no. 1884 (97)

1078 In his contribution to the exhibition and catalogue for The Bodleian’s 1980 Exhibition in Memory of Richard William Hunt, D.L. D’Avray lists seven books as representative examples of the kinds of portable vademecum books used by (and useful for) Franciscan and Dominican friars: a copy of Distinctiones and model sermons, ca. 1300-50 (Bodleian Library, Ms. Bodley 4); Nicholas de Gorran, O.P., Alphabetical Distinctiones, early 14th century (Bodleian Library, Ms. Bodley 23); Treatise on the virtues and vices, after Guillelmus Peraldus, late 13th century (Bodleian Library, Ms. Bodley 35); a confessional handbook: Raymundes de Pennaforte, Suma de casibus poenitentiae, ca. 1225-50 (Bodleian Library, Ms. Selden Supra 48); a Dominican pocket Bible, ca. 1250-1300 (Bodleian Library, Ms. Auct. D.5.9); a Franciscan Breviary, probably ca. 1225-50 (Bodleian Library, Ms. Canon. Liturg. 171, fols. 137-276); and a Franciscan Psalter, Missal and Breviary combined, mid-13th century (Bodleian Library, Ms. Lat. liturg. f.34). See D.L. D’Avray, “Portable Vademecum books containing Franciscan and Dominican texts,” in A.C. de la Mare & B.C. Barker-Benfield, Manuscripts at Oxford, An Exhibition in Memory of Richard William Hunt. Exhibition catalogue (Oxford: Bodleian Library 1980): 60-64, Figs. 39-40.

new bible was the ideal size to fit into the preacher’s satchel or pocket. Thus the friars used the new pandect bibles because they were small and light, and therefore portable, and comprehensive in their contents, and therefore useful. In short, we can understand these bibles as a kind of portable reference library – and one widely available on the market. As de Hamel reminds us, “when the friars discovered the merits of the ‘Paris’ Bible, they must have been attracted not only by the fact that it was potentially portable, definitive and searchable, but also by its commercial availability” for “by the mid-13th century there were Dominican and Franciscan convents in every major town in Europe [and] if rules were adhered to, each preaching friar needed a bible, and so copies would have been required in their thousands.” Indeed, mendicant users and itinerant preachers have been identified so closely with this kind of bible that in addition to their common attribution as ‘Students’ Bibles’, scholars have frequently referred to these books as ‘Preachers’ Bibles’. Such characterization is witnessed in Otto Ege’s portrait of the late medieval production and users of these bibles wherein he argues that “[m]iniature manuscript Bibles were produced in great numbers to meet the demands of the wandering friars and the expanding universities.” Despite the broad strokes of Ege’s portrait, his characterization of the “wandering” friar is useful nevertheless, and mirrors

---

1080 De Hamel (1994): 123.
1081 De Hamel, *The Book* (2001): 134-5. The Franciscan constitutions of 1338 decreed that each of their students in Paris should be assigned a bible up to the value of 200 livres, or should be given the equivalent sum to buy one. (De Hamel, *The Book* 2001: 135).
1082 De Hamel, *The Book* (2001): 134-5. The Franciscan constitutions of 1338 decreed that each of their students in Paris should be assigned a bible up to the value of 200 livres, or should be given the equivalent sum to buy one. (De Hamel, *The Book* 2001: 135).
1083 Ege vivid portrait seems to suggest a medieval society teeming with legions of demanding friars meandering aimlessly around Europe, each with their own bible, although according to Ege, despite the ready supply of such bibles (their having been churned out at a breathtaking speed) they were apparently illegible and it was only with the arrival of the 14th century that bibles appeared that one could actually *read*, an arrival that must have come as a great relief to all concerned.
contemporary medieval attitudes toward and representations of the mendicant orders’ use of portable pandect bibles.

The Franciscans played a great part as missionaries, and their written accounts of their travels to distant countries were eagerly copied and read; tales of Franciscans’ journeys on missions to the Far East were particularly popular. On the opening page of a copy of one such text, William de Rubrucc’s ‘Itinerarium ad partes orientales’, previously in the library of the Abbey of Bury St. Edmunds, and now Corpus Christi College, Cambridge Ms. 66A, fols. 67r-110r, Friar William and a companion are portrayed within an historiated ‘E’ initial (fol. 67r; Fig. 3.1), first presenting their book to King Louis IX of France, in the top half of the initial, and then, in the lower portion, we see these intrepid friars ‘in action’ on the road, equipped with book-satchels on their shoulders and staves. These satchels also feature in a passage from Matthew Paris’ Historia Anglorum, Chronica minor, in which he describes the friars’ dress, and their public appearances:

diebus Dominicis et festivis de suis habitaculis exeuntes, praedicaverunt in ecclesiis prochialibus et locis aliis, ubi populi congregabantur … libros continue suos, videlicet Bibliotecas, in forulis a collo dependentes bajulantes.

Such representations of itinerant preachers and their book satchels let us know that friars were strongly associated with the portable pandect bible, but what can we say about how

1086 Incipit, “Excellentissimo domino et christianissimo Lodovico dei gracia Regi francorum illustri Frater W. de Rubruc”; Explicit, “plures interpretes et copiosas expensas etc.”. The initial is on on fol. 67r; for discussion of this image, see A.G. Little, “Illuminated Manuscripts,” in Franciscan History and Legend in English Mediaeval Art, Ed. A.G. Little (Manchester: Manchester UP, 1937): 35-77 [47-8 & pl. 21a]. See also the depiction of Fr. Roger Conway in an historiated ‘E’ initial on fol. 77r (see ibid: 49 & pl. 21b). The library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge contains two further copies of the text, in CCCC Ms. 181 (fols. 321-400) and Ms. 407 (fols. 37r-68v).
1087 “In victu et vestitu maximum humilitatis exemplum praerentem; nudis pedibus incedentes, funiculis cincti, tunicis griseis, talaribus et peciatis, insuto capucio, utentes.” (‘They gave a wonderful example of humility, going barefoot in their long, ample, grey, hooded habits, patched and girded with a cord’)
these books were actually used in the act of preaching? What performative role, if any, did they play?

In general, the role that books played in the act of preaching is uncertain. While books played an essential reference role in the preacher’s preparation, it seems that they were not always physically present when he delivered his sermons. Some preachers of popular sermons occasionally used notes or even books, but this seems to have been considered unusual, and most experienced preachers delivered their sermons without recourse to crib-sheets. This is suggested in Salimbene’s report that Pope Innocent III’s (reg. 1198-d.1216) practice of preaching with a book open before him was deemed unusual by his chaplains, and when they asked why a man as experienced a preacher as he needed to do so, he replied “I do it for your benefit, as an example to you, because you are ignorant and yet you are ashamed to learn.”1089 There are, however, exceptions to the rule and some preachers certainly made use of props whilst delivering their sermons. Salimbene recounts how a certain Brother Gerard of Modena would pause mid-sermon, cover his head with his hood, and keep the people waiting in suspense.1090 Another account describes a 15th-century Franciscan preacher using props to achieve a more dramatic effect; he would hide a human skull under his robe which he would suddenly reveal and brandish at his audience to remind them of the brevity of human life.1091 Although this preacher hardly seems to have been a fellow of infinite jest, his expertise in making and leaving an impression are undeniable.

Despite its seeming strangeness, the standard 13th- and 14th-century English iconography of Christ or Saint Paul preaching almost always depicts the speaker holding a closed book,1092 and images of contemporary preachers or friars follow the same
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pattern. In addition to his written accounts of the friars in his *Chronica minor* mentioned above, Matthew Paris recorded two portraits of a characteristic Franciscan friar in his *Chronica maiora* (now CCCC Ms. 16.II). In one of these portraits the standing friar is depicted cradling a vermillion-tinted book which is held closed with a clasp (fol. 30r; Fig. 3.2A). In his portrait of a friar on fol. 71r (Fig. 3.2B), Paris’ caption identifies his subject as “F[rate]r Will[elmus] nac[i]one anglic[us] soci[us] s[an]c[t]i francisci”. This striking image of the English friar is repeated in an almost identical sketch - in Paris’ later style - on fol. 30r. Brother William is shown with bare feet and a knotted rope suspended from his waist, corresponding to Matthew’s own description of the friars’ appearance (“ipsi Minores nudi pedes et viliter tunicati cincti funiculis”) and reflecting the strict standard of dress observed in England, as well as the fact that the Minors as a rule went barefoot even in the depths of winter. Similarly, the recto of a single leaf inserted into a mid-13th century *Florilegium* (now CUL Ms. Gg.6.42), bears a framed drawing - tinted in pale brown and pink with touches of vermillion – showing St. Francis bearing the stigmata, standing next to another friar. Like Matthew Paris’ Brother William, both are barefoot, cowled, with cords around their waists and carrying books. On the verso is another framed drawing of two more standing friars, shod, wearing hooded cloaks and walking with staffs. Dated ca. 1240-50, the drawings are sufficiently

---


close to Paris to suggest a direct connection.\textsuperscript{1008} Given these images, it seems likely that, as de Hamel suggests, “a travelling friar, preaching outside a church or at a market cross in rural England, would have held his Bible or other book as a symbol of authority and spiritual credibility.”\textsuperscript{1009} If this was indeed the case, then in so doing, such friars would have offered their medieval audience an extremely rare glimpse of a book - one of only few instances in which a 13\textsuperscript{th}- or 14\textsuperscript{th}-century layperson would have seen a book\textsuperscript{1100} - even if only the bible’s binding was visible.

If their actual function in the preaching performance is less than clear, we can however say with certainty that the mendicant orders were prolific users of the new portable pandect bible. Numerous 13\textsuperscript{th}-century bibles survive with evidence of possession and use by Franciscan and Dominican friars.\textsuperscript{1101} Of the forty-five ‘pocket’ bibles with either inscriptions or liturgical evidence in Case-Schnurman’s study, twenty-six had mendicant provenances (seventeen with Dominican associations and nine Franciscan) compared to seven with monastic and four with secular-clerical provenances.\textsuperscript{1102} In contrast, ‘lectern’ bibles containing indications of having been in mendicant possession are scarce.\textsuperscript{1103} Case-Schnurman attributes this statistic to the lack of liturgical matter in these larger bibles, arguing that friars would have wanted as much material as possible in

\textsuperscript{1008} See A.G. Little, \textit{Franciscan History and Legend in English Medieval Art} (Manchester, 1937): 41, 64, pl. 7; Nigel Morgan, Survey III (1984): no. 84 (130) and Figs. 280-1.


\textsuperscript{1100} “In practice, very few medieval people ever came face to face with the pages of manuscripts. Their ownership was restricted to a very small fraction of the population, disproportionately well-documented, and most men and women of medieval England probably passed their lives without ever reading or even touching a book.” De Hamel, “Books and society” in \textit{CHBB} II (2008): 3-21 [3]. On ‘the scene’ of medieval preaching, including preaching ‘at the cross’ (and ‘in procession’) see G.R. Ovst, \textit{Preaching in Medieval England} (1926): 144-221, esp. 195-221.


\textsuperscript{1102} The prominence of mendicants within Case-Schnurman’s archive of bibles with discernable provenances gets even higher considering that the provenance of her final eight examples had either friars or monasteries, Schnurman (1960): 197-8.

\textsuperscript{1103} Schnurman (1960): 197-8.
their small bibles - including Calendars and other tables – for they certainly could not have carried a library with them on their travels. By contrast, the fact that very many of these larger bibles display marks of institutional ownership helps to explain why so few contain liturgical materials; in an institutional context such additions would have been unnecessary, given that these texts would have been easily accessed separately in other books in the church or monastic library.

Fraternal provenance can be discerned in these bibles either from *ex-libris* inscriptions or can be deduced from their liturgical additions, such as calendars or tables, which have the added benefit of helping to date the use and/or production of the book. For example, calendars added to two pocket bibles, both made for Dominicans, allow us to estimate the dates of these books’ production. British Library, Ms. Arundel 303 (138 x 93 mm, 484 fols.), a tiny English bible that was probably copied in Oxford, can be dated by its calendar (fols. 3v-4v) as having been copied between 1228 and 1234, for the calendar, which is of English Dominican use, includes St. Francis (canonized in 1228) but not St. Dominic (canonized in 1234). Similar provenance may be seen in the case of Bodleian Library, Ms. Auct. D.5.9 (130 x 92 mm, 693 fols.), a ‘pocket’ bible copied in England at during the second half of the 13th century. D’Avray refers to this example as “a masterpiece of compression” and “typical of a whole class of Dominican pocket Bibles” via the inclusion of a Dominican list of Epistle and Gospel readings appended
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1107 (130 x 92 mm, 693 fols. in 2 cols./40 lines) Discussed in D.L. D’Avray, “Portable Vademecum books” (1980): 63-4 & Fig. 40; and Schnurman (1960): 197-8; also referenced in M.B. Parkes, “Handwriting in English books,” in *CHBB II* (2008): 126 n.92. Indications of the bible’s early provenance include: an early 14th-century inscription of Dominus Robertus Swerby, magister, and Willelmus Hawes of the Cantilupe chantry at Lincoln cathedral (executors of canon Naseby’s will) on fol. 3r; signatures (?) of William Turner, Dean of Wells (d. 1568) and his wife Jane (fol. 4v); given by Sir Walter Cope to Thomas James, 1600, who presented it to the Bodleian Library between 1605 and 1611. In a 16th-century binding of green velvet, rebacked; see entries in F. Madan, *Summary Catalogue II.1* (1897): no. 3050 (577) and Pacht & Alexander, III no. 474 (44).
after the *IHN*, including the feasts of Christmas-tide, the common of saints, votive masses and masses for the dead.\footnote{In Bodleian Library, Ms. Auct. D.5.9 the New Testament begins on fol. 504r; the *IHN* occupies fols. 635r-84v; a list of the books of the Bible and their order was added on fol. 3v. The bible is bound in a 16th-century English binding of green velvet with gilt edges (strings cut off) and contains two fragments of a 14th-century theological manuscript as pastedowns.}

\section*{4 Uses of Portable Bibles by these New Users}

One of the most fundamental questions raised by the appearance of the Bible in this new portable format -- and its survival in thousands of copies -- concerns their function: why did the world of the 13th century need portable bibles? Why were so many of these bibles made, for what purpose and for whose use?\footnote{These questions are also raised in Light (1987): 275 and Light (2011B): 169.} These bibles witness innovative practices of bible use by ‘new’ bible users unprecedented before the 13th century. These ‘new’ kinds of bible use and innovative ways of using the biblical text were commonly realized by supplementing the bible’s core text with additional reference tools, which were often recent developments themselves, and strategies that capitalized on these bibles’ form and format, as complete yet compact copies of the entire biblical text in a single, portable volume. Because these copies were equipped to function as independent reference ‘Scriptural Library’ tools they encouraged ‘new’ and innovative kinds of bible-use, and and were particularly receptive to being equipped for study purposes (used as study tools in the classroom and for independent study), for preaching (as preachers’ tools); and for liturgical use.

The format and contents of the 13th-century portable bible were shaped by utilitarian needs: it constituted a Bible no longer valued primarily as a symbol, but rather as a useful book, designed both for reading and, for the first time in the Middle Ages, for reference.\footnote{Light (1987): 276. See Schnurman’s study which, to date, remains the only study to concentrate exclusively on 13th-century pocket bibles, although, as Light notes, Schnurman’s study, while raising a number of interesting questions, “is of necessarily limited value” since the study was based largely on the evidence afforded by descriptions in catalogues. (Light 1987: 276 n.7). In the interests of fairness, it should be pointed out that it is not entirely fair to characterize Schnurmann’s entire study as based primarily upon secondary sources (although these were primarily catalogue descriptions), but it is fair to say that the majority of her Appendix catalogue of examples were sourced from such sources.} In many 13th-century bibles, the biblical text was accompanied by an extensive set of extra-biblical texts, often appended decades after the bible was first
produced. As a group, these added texts narrate a variety of uses for these bibles offering an invaluable resource to enrich our knowledge of the changing use and presentation of the Vulgate from the 13th century onwards, while each of these added texts and indexical tools has independent intrinsic interest, since their circulation in manuscripts of the Bible can also help us understand how the Bible was used in the late Middle Ages.\footnote{Light (2011B): 169.}

To date, Laura Light is the only scholar to have studied this subject in detail.\footnote{Laura Light, “Non-biblical Texts in Thirteenth-Century Bibles,” Special Issue of Viator in Honor of Richard and Mary Rouse 2011 Medieval Manuscripts, Their Users and Makers, Special Associate Editor Christopher Baswell (Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols, 2011): 169-83, hereafter referred to as “Light (2011B)”.} Of the 215 bibles in Light’s sample group, around one third (73 of the total 215) included supplementary texts,\footnote{Light draws her conclusions from her study of 215 Bibles found today in collections in Paris (the BnF, the Mazarine Library and the Bibl. de l’Arsenal), London (the British Library), Oxford (the Bodleian Library), and the United States See Light (2011B): Light (2011B): 172-3 [172].} the dates of the extra texts’ addition to these bibles varying; many were contemporary with, or were added fairly soon after, the bible’s production, but some were 14th- or 15th-century additions.\footnote{Light (2011B): 172.} Furthermore, Light found that the bibles containing an extra-biblical text often included more than one, which raises interesting questions such as which texts circulated together, how particular combinations might be explained and whether patterns might be discerned demonstrating correlations between the addition of particular extrabiblical texts to portable bibles and particular countries, dates or communities.\footnote{Such study is surely, as Light believes, “a necessary next step in building a more nuanced understanding of the use of the Bible in the later Middle Ages.” Light (2011B): 182-3.}

However it is important to note that the different kinds of bible-use that these added tools and devices made possible all depended upon the existence of the Bible as a well-organized, searchable text, complete in one volume.\footnote{Light (2011B): 170.} Their users capitalized on these books’ innovative union of the complete biblical text in portable form with a range of indexical and navigational tools and finding devices, either at the time of the books’ creation or in the following centuries, and surviving portable bibles bear material testimony to the utility of these bibles as predicated on and dictated by their innovative presentation of the Bible as book.
Equally significant for our understanding of how the late medieval bible was used are the questions raised in asking why these extrabiblical texts were added to complete copies of the complete Bible in the first place, thus complicating our view of these bibles as useful books. Should we read these additions as signs of these bibles functioning as useful reference vehicles whose usefulness was simply being supplemented or emphasized by the incorporation of such extra-biblical texts? Or does their addition imply that these bibles were of limited use unless their users necessarily supplemented their bible text with additional materials to make them more useful (or perhaps to make them useful at all)?

In 1416, William de Waltham, canon of York, and fellow of King’s Hall, Cambridge, left his bible to another canon of York, one “Magister Petrus Irforth” for the rest of Irforth’s life, and after his death, to pass to Beverley Church (“in eccl. Beati Johannis Beverlaci imperpetuum remanere”). However the details of William’s bequest included instructions for his executors specifying that before passing the bible on to Irforth, they were to have extrabiblical texts (the IHN and the Psalter) added to the bible so that it would be made useful to those who he intended to have the use of it: “Volo quod magister Petrus Irforth habeat bibliam meam, et volo quod interpretationes et psalterium executores mei scribe faciant in eadem; quam quidem bibliam, post decessum praedicti magistri Petri, volo in eccl. Beati Johannis Beverlaci imperpetuum remanere.” William’s will (dated 2 September 1416, prob. 15 October the same year) is printed in full in Testamenta Eboracensia III, Ed. James Raines. Surtees Society 45 (Durham: Andrews & Co., 1865): 55-59, with extracts repr. in Cavanaugh (1980): 908; see also North Country Wills...1383 to 1558, Ed. J.W. Clay. Surtees Society 116 (Durham: Andrews & Co., 1908): 11-13 and Alfred Gibbons, Early Lincoln Wills...1280-1547 (Lincoln, 1888): 142-3.

William also left Peter his copy of “Pharetram Bonaventurae” on the same conditions (“ad totam vitam suam, et post ejus decessum remaneat in praedicta ecclesia [Beati Johannis Beverlaci]”) plus 20 marcs in cash (“xx marcas”) (TE3: 58, NLW: 12).
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1118 Peter Irforth was also a canon of York and archdeacon of Stow and was the confessor of John, Duke of Bedford; see TE3: 58-9, 58n.; and NLW: 12-13 (in which Irforth is referred to as ‘Hirford’).
1119 William de Watham was a scholar of King’s Hall in 1377, and a fellow from ca. 1378 to 1388; for a brief biography of William and further details of his ecclesiastical appointments, see BRUC: 614-15.
1120 “Volo quod magister Petrus Irforth habeat biblia meam, et volo quod interpretationes et psalterium executores mei scribe faciant in eadem.” In other words, William clearly believed that in order for his bible to be useful to specific users in a particular environment (a canon-scholar and a parish church), the bible required these texts; William obviously thought that without these extra texts, a bible would be of limited use, or of no use at all.
In the discussion of these extrabiblical texts found in many portable bibles that follows, I consider these additions grouped within the broad categories of texts for the study of the Bible or for the classroom, texts for preaching, and texts related to the liturgy. However it is important to emphasize that while the presence of these additional texts in 13th-century portable bibles certainly demonstrates that 13th-century bibles were used in a variety of different ways - including for liturgical use, for preaching, and as study tools in the classroom - to equate the addition of particular extra-biblical texts to bibles with specific kinds and ‘rigid’ categories of use is as unhelpful and misleading as it is anachronistic.

That said, it is equally counterproductive to draw too broad or unqualified a distinction between the people to whom we may attribute certain kinds of bible use and the spaces within which we may locate them. This is particularly important for our treatment of the interrelated medieval activities of preaching and teaching, for a particularly close connection existed between, as the Rouses put it, “classroom lectern and pulpit, between theology lecture and sermon, between university preparation and parish application.” The masters who taught also preached and produced preaching tools, while their students were being prepared to spend much of their time engaged in preaching. Furthermore, many of the extrabiblical texts that one might classify as ‘Texts...
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1122 In so doing I broadly follow Light’s approach (Light 2011B). My main reason for doing so despite the potential pitfalls that attend such a methodology (which Light herself notes; Light 2011B: ?) is that such classifications offer the most suitable framework within which to most productively address the questions of how these bibles and the texts added to them were likely used. Nevertheless, the question of how best to organize a study of the extrabiblical texts found in these portable bibles is, to say the least, a challenge. Does one privilege the bibles and categorize them according to their sizes, dates, countries of origin, or by user, known or deduced from bibles’ provenance? Or does one focus instead upon the extrabiblical texts themselves, categorizing the texts by title, or by the date of their addition or the kind of use of the bible that the supplied text would likely have made possible? All such options seem to rely too heavily and too often on conjecture and moreover would necessarily be so repetitious as to make it nigh impossible to follow the thread of one’s argument.

1123 Although Light’s evidence certainly demonstrates that 13th-century Bibles were used liturgically, for preaching, and in the classroom, we must temper our delight with caution, remembering that not all 13th-century bibles include additional texts; if ca. one third of Light’s sample group of 13th-century bibles include these extra texts, roughly two-thirds, or 141 manuscripts, did not. Light (2011B): 182.

1124 Although we may note that all three activities (study, preaching and worship) share a fundamental liturgical foundation (as Light notes; 2011B: 173, 182-3); cf. D’Avray, The Preaching of the Friars (1985): 191.

for Preachers’, such as the collections of *distinctiones*, the concordances and other tools in searchable order, which originated in response to the needs of those engaged in composing sermons, incorporated many of the new techniques in the layout of the page which developed in response to the needs of those teaching from the page. Therefore, as we proceed we must never lose sight of the fact that these kinds of divisions between bible-users and types of bible-use may suggest artificial distinctions today where none existed in the Middle Ages.

**I For Study: The Use of Portable Bibles as Study Tools**

Additional texts and tools intended to aid these bibles’ use in the classroom - a traditional subject of scholarly debate - and/or for independent Bible-study, were frequently added to copies of 13th-century portable pandect bibles. Of this group, summaries of the Bible are the most frequently encountered, the most basic type of summary text being lists of the books of the Bible, usually with the number of chapters, sometimes with general comments about the groups of books within the canon. These lists provide evidence of medieval users’ effort to master the contents of the Bible and their ‘correct’ order.

Let us begin with British Library, Ms. Harley 1748 (230 x 160 mm, 346 fols.), a bible written in England ca. 1225-50. A number of texts and notes were added to this bible at various points between the 13th and 15th centuries, and although these
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1127 See Light (2011B): 180-182.,

1128 (230 x 160 [160 x 110] mm), its text arranged in two columns of 57 lines written below the top line. De Hamel suggests a date of ca. 1230 (De Hamel 2001: 121-22, pl. 85), and Light suggests either second quarter of or mid-13th century (Light 2013: 211). The bible is decorated throughout with numerous large puzzle initials in red and blue with pen-flourishing in both colors, plus numerous initials in blue or red with pen-flourishing in the alternate color and simple initials in red or blue. For descriptions and discussions of BL, Ms. Harley 1748, see A *Catalogue of the Harleian Manuscripts in the British Museum*, 4 vols (London: Eyre and Strahan, 1808-12): II, no. 1748; De Hamel (2001): 121-22, pl. 85; Paul Saenger, “Biblical Citation” (2005): 93 n.76.

1129 These added texts and notes are particularly numerous on fols. 1-12v and 340-46.
included texts added to equip the bible for liturgical use (most significantly, a Missal text, on fols. 170v-172v), the majority of these paratextual additions rather indicate a pressing and persistent concern with the organization and navigation of the Bible text by its users. The additions to British Library, Ms. Harley 1748 reveal the attempts by its owners and users to help themselves to better comprehend the ‘new’ ordering and sequence of the Bible’s text – introduced, as we have seen, in the early 13th century via the ‘Paris’ blueprint - in order to ensure that they could use this bible ‘correctly.’ They were not alone in this; it was a task with which, as de Hamel puts it, contemporary scribes and bible-users “struggled despairingly.”

In particular, two added lists testify to the efforts of the late medieval bible-users to master the Bible’s contents and their ‘correct’ order: the first comprising two added capitula lists, listing the chapters of the books of the Bible (on fols. 1r-2r and fol. 343v); and the other listing the order of the books of the Bible (fol. 2r). These lists were supplemented by other reference tools and guides for ‘correct,’ ‘up-to-date’ and efficient use of this Scriptural text, including the beginning of an alphabetical subject-index (from ‘Aa’-‘As’) with extensive but now barely legible notes in crayon or lead (on fols. 3-4v and fols. 339v-343), a metrical summary of the contents of the books of the Bible provided in a Summarium biblie text at the front of the bible (fols. 5r-12r) and a concordance of the Gospels added at the back (fols. 344-5).

Furthermore, many of the notes in the margins of the main text narrate further attempts to make the text of BL, Ms. Harley 1748 (which had been written according to what its contemporary annotator calls the ‘old Paris order’) conform to the ‘new’ ‘Paris’ order. To this end the chapters in Genesis were divided into six sections by Arabic numerals in margin (Fig. 3.3A), and a-g references were also added in other books. One note comments that the Psalms should precede the Books of Solomon, “according to the
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1130 The Missal text includes collects and canon of the Mass (with red and blue initials), and was added between II Maccabees and Proverbs. Another similar example is Brighton, Public Library, Ms. 1; see N.R. Ker, MMBL I (1969): 173.
1131 An interesting note was also added (15th century?) to the lower margin of fol. 338r, which reads: “This is the best parchment that [...] now [...] upon.”
1132 De Hamel (2001): 121, n. accompanying fig. 84; cf. ibid: 119-123, figs. 84-5.
new order of the books of the Bible” (on fol. 260v; Fig. 3.3B), while other marginal annotation variously note that Maccabees should have followed Malachi as the last book of the Old Testament, or that “according to the new order” the Epistles of Paul should follow the Gospels and that Acts should be positioned between the Catholic Epistles and the Apocalypse (on fol. 305r).

The function of these lists in contemporary bibles and the determining criteria for their inclusion were dictated not by a bible’s size, or even necessarily format, but rather by the version of the biblical text that the bible contained and the order of its contents. Thus although these lists were commonly added to small bibles, they are not unique to 13th-century bibles of minute size. A very large and richly decorated 13th-century bible that was similarly equipped is Trinity College, Cambridge, Ms. B.10.1 (375 x 255 mm, 462 fols.). As part of a program of revisions to ‘update’ this bible in the 14th century, a table was added at the front of the book (now fols. iir-va; Fig. 3.4A), listing the biblical books in this bible and the number of chapters in each book (for example, formulated as “Liber genesis continet capit’u’la I.”). In this table, which is arranged in two columns of 50 lines and written in a formal script, the name of each book is highlighted in red and blue capitals, alternating line by line.

At face value, this seems to be a simple Table of Contents positioned in the most helpful place for such an addition: on the book’s first pages. Nevertheless, the contents of this prefatory table are not limited solely to the textual contents of the Bible, but also includes two further sets of supplementary extrabiblical texts added to the volume at the...
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1134 A magnificent Genesis initial extending the length of the page (fol. 3r) and expanding into ornament at top and bottom. For a more detailed description of the bible’s decoration and illumination (including a list of the quatrefoils’ subjects) see M.R. James, The Western Manuscripts in the Library of Trinity College, Cambridge. A Descriptive Catalogue (Cambridge, CUP, 1900): I, no. 212 [279-83 [280-1]].


1136 Its text opens with a rubricated incipit, which reads: “Ista tabula testatur & certificat / legentem quot libri continent[ur] / in ista biblia seu volumine isto / et Quo ordine disponinintur & quot / capitula continet qui libet liber / ut cicius per scrutinium lectoris / in noticiam eiustem reuocentur.”
same time (and most likely by the same person), comprising selections from Isidore’s *Etymologies* (fols. 399r-410v) and the *IHN* (fols. 411r-62r), added back-to-back at the end of the volume, directly following the last line of the Apocalypse text (Figs. 3.4A-B). However despite their extrabiblical status, both additions were included in the tabulated list of the book’s contents (Fig. 3.4C). The recording of the books of the Bible ends halfway down the second column of fol. iir (“Apocalipsis capitul[i] ~(etc)~xxii.”) but continues, without interruption, on the next line: “Postinodum uero quedam compo/sitio etimologiarum veteris testa/menti secund/um ysodo[rum]” and so on, followed immediately by a ten-line concluding section. Thus we find in this table a symbolic privileging of the aesthetics over the theological suggesting that at least for one reader or scribe, the ways in which the order and organization of information (here the contents of this bible) from within a discrete unit (the whole bible book) was arranged and presented visually on the page (in the table) seems to have been of greater importance than the sacred prestige of that information he was collating and arranging, and to which, by so doing, he was facilitating access.

The struggle with the ‘new’, ‘correct’ ordering of the contents and associated attempts to ensure the accurate location of specific passages, sometimes for use on specific occasions, that we witness in these bibles was not limited to the 13th century but continued through following centuries. The significance of this problem and the duration
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1137 The text selections from Isidore’s *Etymologies* added on fols. 399r-410v follow on directly after the end of the Bible text (fols. 1r-398r); they include the follow extractss: fol. 399, “Incipt quedam composicio etimologiarum secundum ysidorum veteris testamenti” (“Vetus testamentum ideo dictur quia ueniente nouo - futuro regno et iudicio.”), “De scriptoribus”; fol. 399r, “Veteris testamenti secundum hebreorum tradicionem - remota sunt.”; fol. 400v, “De Bibliotheca” (“Bibliotheca autem a greco nomine” – alexandrie inuenta sunt.”); fol. 400v, “De interpretibus” (“Hic etiam ab eleazaro - indiculo comprehenderunt.”); fol. 401r, “Quedam explanaciones septimi libri etimologiarum sec. ysidorum Beatissimus leremon - persona intelligitur non natura.”; fol. 404v, “De Angelis”; fol. 405v, (“De primis hominibus”); fol. 407r, (“De patriarchis”); fol. 407v, (“De prophetis”); fol. 408v, (“De apostolis”); fol. 409v, (“De feminis”); fol. 409v, (“De clericis”); fol. 410v, (“De monachis”) ends with “Proselitus.”


for which it endured are both reflected in the high proportion of surviving 13th-century bibles which include similar lists, ranging in quality from the very sloppy notations on a flyleaf to more formal lists (similar to that added to Trinity College, Cambridge, Ms. B.10.1) and range in date from contemporary additions through the 15th century.1140

UPenn Ms. Codex 1053 is a pocket bible in two volumes produced around the mid-13th-century, probably in England (149 x 102 mm).1142 At the end of the second volume, directly following the conclusion of the IHN are two folios of pericope readings (fol. 129r-v; Fig. 3.5A) and eight folios of highly abbreviated capitula lists (II, fols. 129r-138v; Fig. 3.5B), arranged in 3 columns of 46-49 lines and written in a slightly larger, less formal hand than that of the Bible text and IHN. These capitula lists cover most of the Old Testament.

The positioning of these lists (added at the back of Vol. II) is instructive. It seems likely that they were so-placed in order to permit easier, more comfortable and quicker cross-referencing. In other words, by adding reference lists relating to the texts of the Old Testament (in the first volume) at the back of Vol. II, the user was able to leaf through the Old Testament while simultaneously being able to refer to the capitula lists in the second volume open on the desk before him. Whether it was this motive that influenced the positioning of the lists, it was surely a handy result, since it would have spared the reader

1140 Surviving examples include three in London, all in The British Library (in BL, Ms. Egerton 2867 [on fol. ?]; BL, Ms. Harley 2828 [an added list of biblical books with corresponding folio number in arabic numerals - 14th century? - on fol. 1v]; British Library, Ms. Harley 1287 [list of the books of the Bible in a later 13th-century hand added on fol. 1r]), three in Oxford (two in The Bodleian Library, Oxford Ms. Laud lat.13 [the order of biblical books is listed on fol. viiv, with corrections and a Table of Contents added on fol. viiiv at a later date]; Bodleian Library, Ms. Auct. D.4.10 [on fol. 599r]; and in All Soul's College, Oxford Ms. 2 [list of books of the Bible, each with the number of chapters it contains, added on fol. iv,r during the second half of 15th century, plus three other lists of books of the Bible added on fol. iv,v [also ca. 1450-1500]; the second and third in the hand of those on fol. iv,r, this time grouping them as ‘Libri historiales’, ‘Libri sapientales’, etc.; the third list, written by the same scribe, records 41 books and lists the number of chapters in each; below it are “vide plus de ita [sic] materia ex altera parte huius folij” and “vac” – it was deleted and replaced by an extended version in the same hand on fol. iv,r which records 71 books and the number of chapters in each]), four in Cambridge (In CCC Ms. 246 [contains two: fol. iir + Front pastedown; emphasizing the division between the Old and New Testaments]; Trinity College Cambridge, Ms. O.8.15, or James 1390 [on fol. 300c]; CUL Ms. Dd.8.12 [on fol. ?]; CUL, Ms. Ec.2.23 [on the inside front cover]; cf. also in York Minster Library, Ms. XVI.N.6 [on fol. ?] and two in North American libraries [in NYPL Ms. MA 7 [on fol. 3r] and in Beinecke RBML, Yale Ms. 1141 [on fol. ?]).

1141 UPenn Ms. Codex 1053 is fully digitized; images and bibliographic description available on Penn’s online catalogue of manuscripts, Penn in Hand, here.

1142 Thus the Old Testament fills the entirety of Vol. I (360 fols.; NT, fols. 1-359); and the New Testament occupies the majority of Vol. II (140 fols.; NT, fols. 1-94r), followed by the IHN (fols. 95-128) with highly abbreviated capitula lists added at the back of the book (fols. 129r-138v).
the time-consuming necessity required of readers whose Bible was in a single-volume format with reference lists added at the back or front, viz. that they were compelled to be continuously turning back and forth between reference lists and text within the same volume, hardly the most arduous task in the world, but perhaps frustrating if one was pressed for time or one’s patience was short, and presumably inflicting a higher degree of wear and tear on the volume through handling if a careless or over-zealous reader were to rummage through the volume’s pages with insufficient care too often.

Verse mnemonics of the names of the biblical books in both Latin and in the vernacular were products of the same concern. In the 13th and 14th centuries two sets of mnemonic verses were added to the flyleaves of York Minster Library Ms. XVI.N.6, a Bible copied in England in the middle of the 13th century, is an example of a one-volume 13th-century that looks in size and format exactly like a Paris Bible (203 x 143 [135 x 86] mm, 333 fols., 2 cols./60 lines), but is in fact a copy of a 9th-century text, rather than a representative of the ‘Paris’ family.

These mnemonic verses (on fols. iiv and viv), provide the order of books of the Bible in abbreviated list form. The six lines added on fol. iiv, written by a 13th-century hand, offer an abbreviated list of the books of the Bible and their order in this volume (Fig. 3.6A). The mnemonic verses added on fol. viv in the 14th century are a repetition of those on fol. iiv with the descriptive ‘heading’ of “V[er]sus de ordin[?]s / libro[rum]

1143 Bible text (fols. 1-316v) in the usual order, without II Ezra after Nehemiah, and with the Prayer of Solomon after Ecclesiasticus. Psalms are numbered. I Kings begins a new leaf (fol. 66), but not a new quire; Tobit, fol. 122, and Proverbs, fol. 156, begin new quires, 10 and 14. The prologues are 29 of the common set of 64 plus 19 others. The Bible’s inclusion of the IHN is recorded in a 14th-century inscription added at the foot of fol. iiv (Fig. 3.6B): “Libellus iste continet plenam bibliam cum interpretacionibus hebraicarum dictiunm de biblia.” In the rubricated opening of the IHN (fols. 318-333v), its authorship is attributed to Remigius of Auxerre: “Hie sunt interpretaciones hebraicorum nominum per ordinem alphabeti dispositorum et primo incipiencium per a. Aar (sic) apprehendens … Zusim consiliantes eos uel consihatores eorum. Expliciunt interpretaciones hebraicorum nominum per ordinem alphabeti dispositorum a remigio digeste.” (Stegmüller, no. 7709).


1145 The third addition, a table of epistles and gospels readings added on fols. ivv-vi (13th century), is discussed below.
A contemporary hand in a smaller, less formal script has also extensively - and densely - annotated these verses between and around the 6 lines of text with the names of the books and number of chapters each ‘entry’ contains. Another 14th-century hand also annotated the verses on fol. iiiiv, noting that ‘proper’ position of Machabees should be after Prophets (“Mentit[ur] de lib[ro] machab[us] q[ui]a e[st] / in ordine post p[ro]ph[et]as”; Fig. 3.6E) while a different 14th-century annotator inserted a memorandum in the blank space after Nehemiah recording the omission of III Ezra from this bible and questions its canonicity (fol. 121v; Fig. 3.6F).

While the portable bibles of the 13th century demonstrate a widespread attempt to adopt and to understand the ‘new’, up-to-date system for ordering and subdividing the Bible, some still found it important, useful or expedient to maintain a connection to the old system of Scriptural division and order, even if this was simply a matter of being thorough or of covering all one’s bases. For example, although Eusebius’ canon tables and the marginal concordances in the Gospels fell out of common use in the early 13th century when they were made redundant by the concordance, they were still occasionally referenced in the 13th century. Roger Bacon made use of these reference points to

---

1148 The two sets of added verses diverge at the end of the second line - “hester machabeorum” (fol. iii.v), “hester iob quoque dauid” (fol. viv) - and the beginning of the third line - “Iob dauid et Salomon, ysayas” (fol. iivi), “Et Salomon sapiens ysaías” (fol. viv).

1149 For example, above the entry for “Regu[m]” in the first line, the annotator has noted the number of chapters in each of the four books of Kings by drawing two vertical lines extending into the space above the top line (to create a distinct ‘column’) and added “4 lib: / 1 ca[pa]. (ca[pitul]a) 31 / 2 ca[pa]. 24. / 3 ca[pa]. 22. / 4 ca[pa]. 24.,” and to the right, “2o libri / 1 ca[p]. 24. / 2 ca[p]. 362.”

1150 The annotator comments that Jerome judged this book (III Ezra) to be part of the Apocrypha and that neither X nor the Concordance make any mention of it (“nec Magister Historiarum, nec concordance”): “M[emo]ran[d]um quia tres alij libri / Et Salomon sapiens / Eusebius: / nec ip[s]os esse apocrifos / Et ne[c]e Magiset[m] FACTOR[UM] / nec concordanc[em].” The same hand noted the absence of Jerome’s prologue to Ezra, on fol. 115v (Stegmüller, no. 330). Further examples of verse mnemonic texts added in portable 13th-century bibles are CCCC Ms. 246 (on fol. 400v) and CUL, Ms. Ee.2.23 (inside front cover); for further discussion of both see below.

1151 M.A. & R.H. Rouse, “Statim invenire...” (1991): 214-15. These Eusebian canon tables – so-named after Eusebius, bishop of Caesarea (ca. 260-340) who first compiled them in the 4th century - were one of the most important early aids to studying the Scriptures, for organizing the biblical text and for facilitating its navigation. They were the antecedent of all medieval marginal concordances; indeed the tables had been included in Gospel books, and later bibles, since antiquity. (see discussion above).
criticize the current text of the Vulgate,\textsuperscript{1152} and the traces of the Eusebian numbers are still found in certain mid-13\textsuperscript{th} century English portable bibles, such as St. John’s College, Cambridge, Ms. K.15.\textsuperscript{1153} However the canons themselves ultimately survived only in modified form in specialized theological texts such as Zacharius of Besançon’s \textit{Harmony of the Gospels},\textsuperscript{1154} and as appendices to English portable Bibles, in which references were converted either to book and chapter or to book, chapter and letter.\textsuperscript{1155}

An early reader of a small copy of the complete New Testament with prologues, now UPenn Ms. Codex 1560, copied in England, probably between 1235 and 1270 (196 x 132 [140 x 92] mm, 2 cols./63 lines, 61 fols.)\textsuperscript{1156} added a 200-line Metrical digest and concordance of the Gospels of Matthew, Mark, and Luke at the end of this slender volume directly after the conclusion of Revelation (fol. 60v-61v; Fig. 3.7A).\textsuperscript{1157}

The first five lines of the digest (following an introductory four-line section\textsuperscript{1158}) comprise a mnemonic device for the ten Eusebian canons in the form of verses marked with ten rubricated letters:\textsuperscript{1159}

\begin{center}
\texttt{Q[ua]t\textit{er} e\textit{ptus} p\textit{r\textit{ims} t\textit{raits}} b\textit{us} alt\textit{er} \textit{op}imus}
\end{center}


\textsuperscript{1153} Paul Saenger “Biblical Citation” (2005): 94. On St. John’s College, Cambridge, Ms. K.15/228 (13\textsuperscript{th}-century, probably France; Franciscan?; 507 fols., 197 x 140 mm, 2 cols./51 lines; Bible text fols. 1-?, IHN fols. ?, Table of Epistles and Gospels fol. 503r), see M.R. James, \textit{A Descriptive Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Library of St. John’s College, Cambridge} (Cambridge: CUP, 1913): 261-2; and see St. John’s College library website (\texttt{here}) for description and links to six digital images of the bible (reprod. fols. 4r, 224r, 373v, 385r, 392v and 405r). Also see Eusebian Canon Tables in Bodleian Library, Ms. Douce 113, fol. 319r-v.

\textsuperscript{1154} On Zacharius of Besançon see Saenger (1999): 36.

\textsuperscript{1155} Although some codices of Nicholas of Lyra’s \textit{Postilla} also contained revised canon tables that referred to the new chapters (e.g. Bibl. Mazarine, Paris, Ms. 159, fols. 82v-97v); Paul Saenger, “Biblical Citation” (2005): 94 & n.83.

\textsuperscript{1156} UPenn RBML Ms. Codex 1560 (“Novu[m] testamentu[m] dom[ini] n[ostri] Jesu Christi”) is complete except for text missing at the end of John (after 19:23) and the beginning of Romans (before 2:10); the lectionary text prefaces the New Testament text (fol. 1v-60v), which features extensive (although brief) marginal notes throughout, mostly indicating cross-references but also including some corrections; cf. entry for Ms. Codex 1560 on \texttt{Penn in Hand} (\texttt{here}).

\textsuperscript{1157} The Metrical digest in UPenn RBML Ms. Codex 1560 (fol. 60v-61v) is written on every other line to leave room for letters and numbers above each line; frame-rulled in faint ink; triple vertical bounding-lines left of left column and quadruple vertical bounding-lines left of right column, creating narrow columns for chapter numbers, paragraph marks, and the first letter of each line.


The digest is written in 2 columns of 33-41 lines (inc. A Generat b magos vocat...) and is marked repeatedly throughout with the same ten rubricated letters to indicate each phrase’s status in the Eusebian canonical tables (gesturing to the Eusebian canon tables of earlier proto-‘Paris’ Bibles) and with numbers to indicate the chapters of parallel passages in other gospels.

A second indexical tool was also added on the volume’s first page (fol. 1r); a highly compressed lectionary listing citations and minimal *incipits* in four columns within the space of a single page. At a later date another user of this Testament (in the 16th-century?) supplied the text with a title at the head of the page (“Novum[m] Testamentum[m] / Dom[ini] n[ostri] Jesu / Christi”) and also added an extremely compressed list of the New Testament’s books (“Ordo Librorum”) in the blank space between the second and third columns in the center of the page (see Fig. 3.7B).

Together, the addition of these extrabiblical indexical tools at both front and back of UPenn Ms. Codex 1560 illustrate the 13th-century desire to provide the means necessary to improve access to the contents of a volume containing the biblical text, whether as single Testaments, or as complete pandects, and demonstrate the similarity between the ways in which the Bible was being used in part or as a ‘whole text’. Furthermore, the later (early modern?) additions to the prefatory lectionary show that the 13th-century anxiety surrounding the order of the books of the Bible was by no means a concern that was limited to the 1200s and that had been ‘outgrown’ by the 14th century; this kind of indexical list was demonstrably used and found useful for readers over the following centuries who were still struggling with the ordering and divisional schema for the Scriptures.

---

1161 The manuscript breaks off abruptly at Luke 20, with the end of Luke and all of the Gospel of John missing at the end of the summary.
A more formal summary text is the *Summarium bibliae* or *biblicum*, often attributed (although probably incorrectly) to Alexander of Villa Dei (d. ca.1250), the author of an extremely popular versified grammatical treatise, the *Doctrinale puerorum*. In this text the whole Bible is summarized (metrically), with one word per chapter; the key word is amplified by a few additional words, usually copied, in a smaller script, above the line, although as Light notes, some copies include only one key word, thus rendering the text almost incomprehensible.

The *Summarium* was the second of two extrabiblical reference texts added towards the rear of a large French bible copied in 1244 (probably in Paris), now Wadham College, Oxford, Ms. 1 (A.5.2) (330 x 180 mm, 450 fols.), its text preceded and complimented by set of verses (“Versus decem libros Biblirorum exhibentes”). Likewise CUL, Ms. Kk.5.10, another ‘lectern’ bible of a similar date, although of English origin, and

---


1166 The *Summarium* text begins “*Summarium Bibliorum* versibus xxxii. Hexametris comprehensum” and the “Versus decem” text begins “Sextaginta quarter tres pandit biblia libros’. Both texts were added between the end of the biblical text and the beginning of the *IHN* (at fol. 434).
belonging to Durham Cathedral Priory (345 x 238 mm, 361 fols.) was also supplied with a similar selection of reference texts, including an imperfect copy of Alexander Nequam’s *Summa* and an *Abbreviatio interpretationum* at the end of the volume (fols. 323-68v, 314r-22v), with a copy of *Aptationes Veteris ac Novi Testamenti*, attributed to Adam de Dora preceding the Bible text (fols. 1r-8v; Figs. 3.8A-B).

Another text designed to serve a similar function was added to an illuminated English ‘saddle-bag’ bible copied in the second quarter of the 13th century (now Bodleian Library, Oxford, Ms. Auct. D.4.10; 206 x 141 mm, 597 fols.) and locatable in the library of Reading Abbey a century later, where it may still have been when the Gospel Harmony was added in the early 15th century (fol. i, Fig. 3.9A). Its text is copied in three columns, so that one begins reading in the first column with all the words for the 50 chapters of Genesis, each on its own line, numbered in Arabic numerals, with the

---


1168 The *Summarium* was also added to Huntington Library, Ms. HM 26061 (fol. 2v-3r) and Light records four other 13th-century bibles containing the text (Light 2011B: 181).

1169 An *ex libris* inscription on the final page of the bible records that the book belonged to Reading Abbey in the second quarter of the 14th century: “…est liber sancte Marie Rading’ de quo qui fraudem fecerit anathema” (fol. 600v). Alas, Bodleian Library, Ms. Auct. D.4.10 contains no indications to indicate its provenance between the 14th and 17th centuries. We know that in the early 15th century the Gospel Harmony was added and the list recording the order of the Bible’s books and number of their chapters was added in the 16th century, but neither addition offers any indication as where and by whom they were added. However ownership inscriptions reveal that in the 17th century the bible was passed down between three members of the Okeham family (Richard to Nicholas to Harbert) and thence to Ralph Ironside (either 1559-1629, or his second son 1605-83, or the latter’s nephew d. ca. 1667; the bible presumably changed hands in this order since these men signed their names successively on the same page of the bible, fol. 59r: “Ricardus Okeham, Nicholas Okeham, Harbert Okeham, Ralph Ironside”). It then passed to Ralph’s relative Gilbert Ironside who gave the bible to the Bodleian Library in 1678. Gilbert Ironside was Warden of Wadham College, Oxford at the time of this donation (an office he held from 1665 to 1689), as mentioned in the inscription on the bible’s second flyleaf (fol. ii) recording his donation of the bible to the Bodleian: “Hoc bibliorum Latinorum MS. exemplar bibliothecae publicae dono dedit vir admodum reverendus dominus Gilbertus Ironside S.T.D. collegii Wadhamensis custos dignissimus, anno domini 1678.” Ironside was subsequently bishop of Bristol (1689) and bishop of Hereford (1691).

explanatory gloss written in smaller script above. Mastering the content of this text would provide a student with a skeletal but complete knowledge of the contents of the bible; “to what extent it is linked to more extensive memorization of the actual text is an intriguing question.”

That this bible was being used for biblical study during its life at Reading is further witnessed in the rich and highly unusual selection of extrabiblical materials with which this bible was supplemented between the 13th and 15th centuries. Particularly suggestive is the bible’s inclusion of not one but two concordances, one being a real concordance (fol. 502v-541; Fig. 3.9C), which is arranged under vices, virtues, and the ecclesiastical hierarchy, while the other is a Gospel concordance (fol. 595r-96v; Fig. 3.9D) whose entries were written in two columns, with an additional slender column ruled to the left of each for the dicolored ‘D’ capitals of the “De”/“De” at the beginning of each successive entry.

Learning the basic narrative of the Bible remained an important part of biblical study throughout the Middle Ages, as demonstrated by the popularity of Peter Comestor’s Historia scholastica, a biblical paraphrase or condensed history from the narratives of the whole Bible, compiled from the Scriptures, the Church Fathers and various classical sources. The Compendium in Genealogia Christi by Peter of Poitiers (chancellor of the university of Paris 1193-1205), served a similar didactic function, comprising genealogical tables with brief entries on Christ’s ancestors, biblical personages

1172 On study in the monastery at Reading and the particular importance of the study of the Bible, see Alan Coates, English Medieval Books (1999); see 67-80 (cf. for a broader discussion of books at Reading Abbey from ca. 1200 to the dissolution, 61-80).
1173 The bible’s contents are ordered as follows: Gospel Harmony (fol. i); Bible text (fol. 1-501v); real concordance (fol. 502v-541); the IHV (fol. 543-85v, without title); De sensibus scripturae (fol. 586); Peter of Poitiers, Compendium historiae genealogiae Christi (fol. 586v-97v); “Rubrice quatuor evangeliorum vel concordancie secundum ordinem gestorum salvatoris” (fol. 595); a table of the number of chapters in each book of the Bible (fol. 599). See Light (2011B): 182; and Stella Panayotova, “Peter of Poitiers’s Compendium in Genealogia Christi” (2001): 331, 335 nn. 33-6, 340-1. For further details see F. Madan, H.H.E. Craster & N.Denholm-Young, Summary Catalogue II.2 (1937): no. 3563 (682-3); Pächt & Alexander III: no. 445 (41 & pl. XL); English Benedictine libraries CBMLC 4 (1996): B73 (448-51 [449]).
1174 This ruling scheme is more clearly visible on fol. 596vb-597r, which were ruled in this pattern in preparation for writing but were not filled in.
and contemporary rulers. The Compendium provided an indispensable tool for the study of the Bible and when associated with bibles, biblical concordances, and versified bibles, such as Peter Riga’s Aurora, the Compendium would have played the role of a teaching and reference tool in accordance with its author’s intentions.

A typical example of the Compendium historiae to be found in these bibles was added at the end of Richard Holdsworth’s bible, CUL, Ms. Dd.8.12 (fols. 461r-67r; Figs. 3.10A-B), a large lectern bible copied in England ca. 1230 (380 x 250 [240-50 x 145] mm; 467 fols.), whose biblical text was also supplemented with a copy of Alexander de Villa Dei’s Summa Biblie (fol. 3-8) and includes diagrams of Noah’s ark (fol. 461r), mansions in the desert (fol. 462r) and ‘habitatio regis et sacerdotum’ (fol. 465r).

However Peter of Poitiers’ Compendium historiae is also to be found copied into small bibles. Bodleian Library, Ms. Auct. D.4.10 also included a copy of Peter’s Compendium historiae amongst its extrabiblical apparatus (on fols. 586v-97v), prefaced by a 14-line text attributed to Peter Riga which was added in a neat hand in the blank space in the second column of its first page (fol. 586vb; Fig. 3.9B). The text was also added to Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, Ms. 437 (190 x 135 mm, 300 fols.) in which the

---


1177 Surviving copies of the Compendium are often found accompanying the Bible or the Historia Scholastica, which, as Stella Panayotova has stated, explains why it often remains unrecorded: “In a large volume containing a long, authoritative text, the Compendium is easily overlooked – especially when unillustrated.” Stella Panayotova, “Peter of Poitiers’s Compendium in Genealogia Christi: The Early English Copies,” in Belief and Culture in the Middle Ages: Studies Presented to Henry Mayr-Harting, Eds. Richard Gameson & Henrietta Leyser (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001): 327-341 & pls. 20-4 [327, 335].

1178 Contains the biblical text (fols. 9r-440v) and the INN (fols. 441r-60v). Also includes texts added on front flyleaves (including Middle English receipts). This bible is one of the manuscripts owned by RH, Master of Emmanuel College (d.1649), whose books passed to the CUL in 1664; see N. Morgan, Survey IV.1 (1982): no. 44; Western Illuminated Manuscripts: A Catalogue of the Collection in the Cambridge University Library, Eds. Paul Binski & Patrick Zutshi (Cambridge: CUP, 2011): no. 95 [87, pl. XXXII].

1179 inc. fol. 586v: “compendium testamenti veteris et partim noui a magistro Petro comestore digestum. Considerans historie sacre prolixitatatem…”

Compendium precedes the biblical text (at fols. 1r-6v; Fig. 3.11), although alas, the requisite compression of the text in this copy was perhaps achieved at the expense of quality.

However, although the presence of the Compendium in such a pocket bible - providing a resource for studying the narrative of Biblical history - would seem to suggest that this bible’s primary function was for study, CCCC Ms. 437 also includes ten folios’ worthy of themata for sermons (fols. 284r-94v), directly after the end of the IHN (expl. fol. 283r; fol. 283v blank), starting on a new folio, and followed by two sets of lists - a list of topics in the Gospels (“De diuinitate uerbi et genealogia ihesu”, fols. 295rb-96ra) and a list of Epistle and Gospel readings for the Temporale (fol. 296ra-v) – added together on an extra six-folio gathering inserted at the very back of the bible. At the very least, the presence of these extrabiblical study texts, liturgical texts and preachers’ texts together within the same portable bible provides evidence demonstrating how permeable we must consider the boundaries between the pulpit and the lecture theater/classroom to have been.

Another very small bible now in the Parker Library at Corpus Christi College, Cambridge (CCCC Ms. 246; 156 x 102 mm, 400 fols.) provides further evidence that the acts of preaching and the pursuit of Scripture knowledge were not mutually exclusive.

\[\text{CCC Ms. 437 contains the biblical text (fols. 7r-276v) followed by the IHN (fols. 278r-83r). Cf. on CCCC Ms. 437: M.R. James CCCC catalogue (1912): II, 345; see also description available online at Corpus Christi College’s Parker Library on the web resource here.}\]

\[\text{Stella Panayotova scathingly denounces it as “One of the most heavily abbreviated and least attractive copies of the Compendium, links between annuletts being drawn without a ruler and names being connected to the corresponding passages by black, tremulous lines.” (Panayotova 2001: 334). Another 13th-century ‘pocket’ bible which includes the Compendium historiae in genealogia Christi is an English copy, now Trinity College, Dublin, Ms. 41 (fols. 477-85), which measures 165 x 113 [108 x 70] mm and contains 485 fols., normally in 2 cols. usually of 44 lines. See Marvin L. Colker, Trinity College Library Dublin: Descriptive Catalogue of the Medieval and Renaissance Latin Manuscripts. 2 vols. (Aldershot, Hants.: Scolar Press for TCD, 1991): I, 69-73 [71].}\]

\[\text{The first reads “Dom. I in aduentu domini,” followed by “Cum appropinquaret... Nota quod hoc euangelium deseruit duobus diebus”; the last (unfinished?) is for “Dom. xxvi post pent.” on “Est puer unus hic.”}\]


\[\text{See M.R. James CCCC catalogue (1912): I, 544-5; see also description for CCCC Ms. 246 available online at Corpus Christi College’s Parker Library on the web resource here.}\]
A number of scholarly tools principally used for the study and interpretation of the biblical text were added to this ‘pocket’ bible (which contains minimal decoration; it features colored initials but none are historiated). A set of mnemonic verses on the Gospels, similar to that in UPenn Ms. Codex 1560 already discussed (see above) were added on the bible’s very last page, sub-divided into 3 columns: col. a Matthew; col. b Mark, Luke; col. c John (fol. 400v; Fig. 3.12A).

Another addition at the rear of the bible was a series of ‘Rules for preaching’ (fol. 399r), squeezed onto a blank page between the end of the IHN and the concluding verses. The same page contains the signature of “Ry. Massy” (16th century?) who also added his name to fol. iiiir (“Constat Richardo Masseo”),1186 which suggests a premodern provenance of this bible in the university community at either Cambridge or Oxford.1187 Further scholarly aids added include not one but two lists of the books of the Bible and their order, the first added on a flyleaf at the front of the book (fol. vv) and a second list of the Biblical books added inside the front cover (now obscured by rebinding). The beginning of a table of chapters for Genesis through IV Kings was also added at the back (on fol. 399v). However it is particularly intriguing to discover a number of diagrams present amongst the supplementary materials added on the front three flyleaves preceding the biblical text (fols. iv-vi). These include a series of full-page diagrams of the golden candlestick (fol. ivr), of the Tabernacle (fol. vir), and a rough mappa mundi (fol. ivv; Fig. 1186 This ‘Richard Massy’ may be one of two men of that name at Oxford: ‘Richard Massy’ of Cheshire, pleb. (Brasenose College, matric. 14 Feb. 1538-9, aged 13) or ‘Richard Massie’ [Middleton], of Rosthorne, Cheshire, gent. (Brasenose College, matric. 26 March 1697, aged 15 [subsequently one of the keepers of the Ashmolean and F.S.A., d. 1743]) or one of three at Cambridge - ‘Richard Massey’ [matric. pens, from Christ’s, Nov. 1549], ‘Richard Massie’ [matric. pens, from St John’s, Easter, 1584, B.A. 1587-8, M.A. 1591] or ‘Richard Massy’ [matric. sizar from Pembroke, c. 1593]. (Foster, AO III [1891]: 984-5 & Venn, AC I.3 (1924): 158).

1187 Further evidence of this bible’s medieval provenance in the university community is provided in the bible’s containing a series of cauto notes: on a flyleaf at the front of the bible, a cauto note, partly erased: “Caucio m. ler (or ‘ber’)... exposita in cista. / W... embris. / Anno dni mno ccccxv lxxix (1479) et habet duo supple/menta antonii in metaphisica (??) 2o fo / ilia que et ... stat[uta?] 2o fo. (?) quod et iacet / pro xlvis viijd”; an earlier entry on fol. ivr, “precium iiij marc.” (fol. iir); further erased cautiones on flyleaves at end of bible (fols. viii-viiii) including, on fol. viir, “Caucio doctoris iacobi standiche” (the other notes illegible). This ‘James Standish’ may be the Oxford scholar who graduated from Corpus Christi College, BA on 14 Jan. 1583-4 or perhaps ‘John Standish’ of Cambridge [matric. sizar from Peterhouse, Easter, 1650]; (Foster, AO IV [1892]: 1407 & Venn, AC I.4 [1927]: 145). Another inscription (15th- or 16th-century) is signed ‘Thomas Sneyd’. “Thomas Sneyd” may be ‘Thomas Sneade’ of New Inn Hall, Oxford (matric. 31 March 1637, aged 16, BA 12 Nov. 1640); see Joseph Foster, Alumni Oxonienses 1500-1714 [IV] (1892): 1386 and M.R. James, The Sources of Archbishop Parker’s Collection of MSS at Corpus Christi College, Cambridge (London: George Bell & Sons for the Cambridge Antiquarian Society, 1899): 47.
3.12B), all three accompanied by a multitude of microscopic notes (e.g. fol. vr), some of them in branching diagrams (e.g. fol. viv). Although it is uncommon to find such drawings in portable bibles (particularly diagrams of full-page size), further surviving examples are not numerous.

II For Preaching: Portable Bibles as Preachers’ Tools

The link between the new one-volume portable 13th-century pandect bibles and the renewed contemporary focus on preaching as a fundamental part of the life of the church has been discussed variously and at length (including in the following chapter, with particular reference to the friars). In order to illustrate the suitability of portable pandect bibles as useful tools for 13th century preachers, it is necessary to briefly review the centrality of preachers and of preaching itself within medieval society together with the different kinds and contents of sermons preached.

If most medieval Christians knew the Bible not by reading but by hearing it (during the celebration of Mass and through personal prayer), most people knew the stories of the Bible through hearing them preached. Preaching was one of the most widespread, frequent and well-attended activities of the medieval church, particularly during the later Middle Ages, and the archive of surviving medieval sermons is huge.

Sermons were delivered by members of both the secular and regular clergy, and from across the hierarchy of seniority in both, from popes, bishops and parish priests to

1188 Bodleian Library, Ms. Auct. D.5.14, another late 13th-century English pocket bible (165 x 121 mm, 579 fols.) also contains a rough mappa mundi (fol. iv) added perhaps in the early 15th-century and it too includes a memoria technica text, this version for the books of the Bible (fol. 578v) added about a century previously, in the early 14th-century. See Summary Catalogue II.1 (1897): no. 1849 (83); Pacht & Alexander III: no. 476 & pl. XLVII.

1189 Four bibles in the British Library include diagrams of a similar kind: BL, Ms. Burney 3 or ‘The Bible of Robert of Battle (275 x 205 mm; the entirety of its first folio [fol. 1r] is filled with a three-tier diagram of a building drawn with pen and ink), BL, Ms. Harley 1034 (diagram of Noah’s ark added in lower margin of fol. 5v), BL, Ms. Harley 1287 (185 x 115 mm; a horizontal tree diagram on the theme of ‘anima’ on fol. 416v, added by a 13th-century hand), and BL, Ms. Harley 2822 (260 x 175 mm; a series of short texts and inscriptions) together with 6-point and 8-point stars and diagrams showing the order and grouping of biblical books; added 14th-15th centuries on fols. 332r-v).


monks and mendicants. A sermon’s contents could be based on a passage from the Bible, a phrase from the liturgy, a hymn or an episode from the lives of the saints, depending on the audience to whom it was addressed, and sermons were preached to a wide variety of audiences in the later Middle Ages. According to the theory of the artes praedicandi, sermons fall into several categories: university sermons (or sermones ad scolares); sermons to the clergy (ad clerus); to the laity (ad populum); and to specific groups in society (ad status). This variety within the genre itself is reflected in the variety of Latin terms by which sermons were known, including sermones, homiliae, tractationes, collationes or expositiones.

Most sermons were preached in churches, delivered from the pulpit (‘pulpitum’) by bishops and parish priests during the service of worship. These included sermons preached throughout the year on Sundays (sermones per annum or de tempore) whose theme was usually based on the reading for that Sunday, and sermons preached on saints’ feast days (sermones de sanctis), which usually expounded the virtues that were embodied in the life of the particular saint whose feast was celebrated.

---


1193 See David Wallace’s chapter on the Council of Constance in the new Europe: A Literary History collection shows how deliberations in council (over the future of the papacy) were always conducted by riffing off Scriptural verses; “It was an art form, though one that irritated greatly if done poorly.”


1197 Pulpits were often of stone, although some were wooden, some of them decorated with carvings depicting biblical scenes. Many medieval examples of this kind of church furniture are still visible in English village churches; cf. J.C. Cox & A. Harvey, English Church Furniture (London: Methuen & Co. 1907): 144-156 (including a list of pre-Reformation pulpits, 148-150) & illustrations on 145, 146, 147, 157; cf. C. Wordsworth & H. Littlehales, The Old Service-Books of the English Church (London: Methuen & Co., 1904): 204, 208

Some sermons were specifically preached for learned audiences. At the medieval universities preaching was one of the regular scholarly activities and attendance was required of students. University sermons were preached on the occasion of the opening of the academic year and on Sundays and feast days throughout the academic year.\textsuperscript{1199} These academic sermons were usually based on the theological or philosophical interrogation of biblical texts. For example, the later medieval sermons (sometimes called the ‘scholastic sermons’) were based on either a text from the Bible (\textit{thema}), sometimes complemented by a second, closely related text (\textit{prothema}), but in the rest of the sermon the preacher was free to touch on a wide variety of other Bible passages.\textsuperscript{1200}

Sermons were also preached by monks to their fellow monks after dinner during the time set aside for reflection and learning. These ‘monastic’ sermons were also, as one might suppose, more exegetical in character, providing expository explanations of the Bible text.\textsuperscript{1201} However, “In the 13\textsuperscript{th} century, current ‘sermones ad claustrales’ or ‘ad religiosos’, of English origin are exceedingly rare,” and for the 14\textsuperscript{th} century “they are practically non-existent.”\textsuperscript{1202}

However some sermons could be preached outside churches, either by clergy, for example on special occasions, or by wandering preachers including itinerant friars, to mixed audiences including members of the clergy and the laity.\textsuperscript{1203} This kind of popular sermon could be based on Christian vices and virtues, aimed at the instruction or edification of their audience, they could be stirring discourses, sometimes delivered from a raised platform (‘scaffaldus’), delivered with the intention of inspiring listeners to

\begin{footnotes}
\item[1199] Cf. proceedings of the IMSS Symposium 1979
\item[1202] “In England, indeed, there had been a tradition of monastic preaching at least as old as the Venerable Bede. So in the century of Bernard, Stephen Harding and Richard of St. Victor, the last two themselves British by birth, there were other English preachers who made a similar reputation in their own native land (e.g. Ailfred of Rievaulx, Geoffrey of Mailross, Gilbert of Hoyland etc.); see G.R. Owst, \textit{Preaching in Medieval England} (1926): 49-95 [49 & n.2].
\end{footnotes}
conversion and and penitence. Other sermons delivered by wandering preachers were
designed to raise great religious enthusiasm among large crowds.1204

The great turning point in the history of popular preaching was catalyzed through
the rise of schools and universities in the 12th century. Between 1150-1250 preaching
became one of the central goals of medieval education, effecting considerable changes in
the form and contents of medieval sermons, the context in which they were preached and
the manner in which they were committed to writing, while the contemporary expansion
of literacy resulted in an increase in demand for written sermons.

However this development was certainly intensified by the rise, in the early 13th
century, of the two new religious orders, the Franciscans (founded 1209) and the
Dominicans (founded 1215), who defined the following of Christ as the life of a wandering
preacher dedicated to evangelical poverty.1205 Both orders made preaching to the laity
their main vocation and trained their members to be effective preachers and to assist the
secular clergy in their duty of instructing the laity, although since the friars usually took
the view that the clergy were providing the laity with hopelessly ineffective spiritual
guidance and guardianship, they often took this task over themselves. Unsurprisingly, the
clergy were not best pleased by the perceived distain of the mendicants, and this led to
longstanding tension between the two groups.1206

13th-century sermons abounded with scriptural citations, and portable 13th-
century pandect bibles were perfectly designed to search for appropriate citations.1207
Indeed, the text, codex and layout of these bibles were all specifically designed to facilitate
navigation and searching: running-titles at the top of each page made it easier and faster
to locate a particular book of the Bible within the codex; distinctive decoration and

1206 On the relations between the friars to monks and parish priests see A.G. Little, Studies in Franciscan
History (1917); 92-122; and R.N. Swanson, “The ‘Mendicant Problem’ in the Later Middle Ages,” in The
Barrie Dobson. The Ecclesiastical History Society (Woodbridge, Suffolk, UK/ Rochester, NY, USA: The
1207 The essential work on preaching and sermon-composition in the later Middle Ages remains R.H. &
M.A. Rouse, Preachers, Florilegia and Sermons: Studies on the ‘Manipulus Florum’ of Thomas of Ireland
(Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1979): 3-90 [on 13th-century sermon aids see 3-42 [on preaching
tools, see 7-26; on techniques, 26-36; on theory, 36-43] and on the evolution of sermon-form in the 13th-
century, see 65-90; see also Alan J. Fletcher on compilations for preaching in Alan J. Fletcher & Anne
rubrication marking the beginnings of prologues and biblical books facilitated the location of a passage within that book; and the passage could then be more swiftly identified within the space of a few pages, since the text itself was divided according to clearly-marked, numbered chapters, also visually distinguished with colored initials.¹²⁰⁸

Preachers could further augment the manifold benefits offered by the layout and organization of the biblical text in portable 13th-century pandect bibles through adding a selection of the new reference works created to aid the practice of sermon-composition, and a number of such texts for preachers are common additions to these bibles, including: lists of Epistle and Gospel readings; lists of collected suitable themes for sermons, arranged according to the liturgical year; and Real and Verbal (or Topical) Concordances.¹²⁰⁹

i Lists of Epistle and Gospel Readings

Lists of Epistle and Gospel readings for the Mass are commonly found in 13th-century bibles,¹²¹⁰ especially those used by preachers, since such lists could serve a double function for such users: in addition to these lists’ liturgical function, they also provided the preacher with handy repertories of sermon themes.¹²¹¹ Lists of epistle and gospel pericopes for the liturgical year (or capitularies)¹²¹² - organized according to the liturgical year, with the feasts of the temporale (or the Proper of Time), the sanctorale (or Proper of Saints), and the common of saints - are one of the most common extra-biblical text in 13th-century bibles; indeed, only lists of the books of the Bible are found more frequently.¹²¹³


¹²¹⁰ The majority of these newly-developing sermon-composition aids were lengthy texts, including collections of distinctions, or of exempla and the verbal concordance to the Bible; the texts for preachers which were added to 13th-century bibles were, for obvious reasons, either shorter texts from this group, abbreviated versions or selections from them. See below for discussion of the liturgical function of these lists.


¹²¹² Examples of 13th-century bibles with capitularies, or lists of biblical pericopes include Huntington Library, San Marino, Ms. HM 51 (includes introits, Epistle and Gospel readings for the diocese of Thérouanne; fols. ir-xir, added in the 14th century), BnF, Ms. lat 216 (now includes a fragment of the Canon, lists of Epistle and Gospel readings and prayers for the Offertorium) and Bibl. Mun., Poitiers, Ms. 12 (includes Collects, secrets and postcommunion prayers; fols. 535r-36r); Light (2013): 190 n.16.

¹²¹³ Their widespread circulation is demonstrated in Light’s 2011B sample of 215 bibles, thirty-three of
Although these bibles tell us little about the origin of lists of this sort, since the examples are not concentrated in bibles from any one geographical center,1214 the readings specified in these lists can be valuable clues to the provenance of a particular bible.1215 Because these lists of readings for the Mass are a continuation of two liturgical texts found from very early dates in the Middle Ages, lists of Gospel readings, most commonly found in Gospel Books, and lists of readings from the Epistles, which are much less common, it is easy to overlook their importance.1216

The popularization of lists that include both Gospel and Epistle readings is a 13th-century innovation,1217 surely a direct result of the production of bibles that were portable, but more importantly, were also in pandect form, for such lists, including readings from both the Gospels and the Epistles, depended upon bibles that were

which include a list of liturgical lections (Light 2011B: 173). Josephine Case Schnurman’s earlier study (1960) also illustrated this point; of the 423 late medieval bibles listed in her Appendix catalogue (all measuring less than 200 mm in height), ninety-one include lists of Epistle and Gospel readings; see Josephine Case Schnurman, “Studies in the Medieval Book Trade from the Late Twelfth to the Middle of the Fourteenth Century with Special Reference to the Copying of the Bible” (B.Litt. Thesis, St. Hilda’s College, Oxford 1960): Appendix 1 (i–lxx).

1214 The earliest example in Light’s 2011 study is found in a northern French bible from around 1200–25 (now BnF, Paris, Ms. Lat. 16267) which is exceptionally small for a bible of this date, measuring only 160 x 110 [120 x 70] mm. Its chapters and the corresponding capitula lists are unique, and each double page opening is numbered with a roman numeral. The table of Epistle and Gospel readings lists each reading by its opening words and folio number. As illustrated in De Hamel (2001): 118, pl. 83; its capitula lists are printed in Biblia sacra iuxta latinam vulgatam versionem ad codicum fidem ... cura et studio monachorum abbatiae pontificiae Sancti Hieronymi in urbe O.S.B. edita, Ed. Henri Quentin et al., 18 vols (Rome 1926–94): ???. British Library, Royal Ms. I.C.1 (copied in Paris in the 1220s with illuminations assigned to the Alexander atelier) also includes a slightly later list of readings for the Mass, at fols. 228–230 (between Maccabees and the Gospels). (noted in Light 2011B: 174 n.19).


1217 Theodor Klauser’s classic study of Gospel lections listed 179 manuscripts of lists that included both Epistle and Gospel readings for the Mass, with single examples from the 8th, 9th, 10th and 12th centuries, but with eighty-three manuscripts from the 13th, fifty-three from the 14th, forty from the 15th and one from the 16th centuries. See Theodor Klauser, Das Römische Capitulare Evangeliorum. Texte und Untersuchungen zu seiner Ältesten Geschichte, Liturgiegeschichtliche Quellen und Forschungen 28 (Münster, 1935): LXXI–LXXXI (referenced in Light 2011B: 174, n.26).
complete in one volume, and divided into a system of chapters, and thus could hardly be more convenient for readers perplexed as to how to link the reading in the list with the corresponding biblical passage.\footnote{1218 The lists studied here all use chapters very similar to those in the modern Bible, traditionally attributed to Stephen Langton; their origin may predate Langton, but it is likely he was instrumental in popularizing them (see Paul Saenger 2008). Since the Gospels were divided from a very early date according to the Eusebian sections used in the Canon Tables, earlier Gospel lists commonly used these as their system of reference; lists of Epistles identify the reading by its opening words (and perhaps this explains the comparative rarity of these lists (noted in Light 2011B: 174-5, n.27).} However, although these lists are the most common liturgical addition to late medieval bibles,\footnote{1219 They survive “In many more copies than bibles with complete missals” (Light 2013: 206) } the question of how these texts were actually \textit{used} has not been resolved. Sermon themes were often chosen from the Mass readings of the day, and these lists certainly may have been used by preachers composing sermons. Another possibility, as Paul Saenger has suggested, is that bibles with capitularies enabled people to follow the readings in their own copies during Mass.\footnote{1220 Paul Saenger, “The Impact of the Early Printed Page on the Reading of the Bible,” in \textit{The Bible as Book. The First Printed Editions}, Eds. Paul Saenger & Kimberly van Kampen (London: British Library, 1999): 31-51 [35], discussing Newberry Library, Chicago, Ms. 19, a very small Franciscan bible with a list of pericopes for the Mass. Even despite the lack of direct evidence to support it, Saenger’s theory is an interesting one nevertheless, especially in light of the importance of the daily Mass readings in the vernacular in the later Middle Ages, and the prevalence of capitularies in English Wycliffite Bibles; for discussion of these lists in Wycliffite Bibles see the articles by Peikola, Hoogleviet, and Corbellini in \textit{Form and Function} (2013).} Let us first concentrate our attention on a selection of examples of Franciscan tables of liturgical readings in 13th-century English bibles.

Newberry Library, Chicago, Ms. 19 (139 x 93 mm, 585 fols.) is a tiny bible which was copied in Paris during the second half of the 13th century,\footnote{1221 Newberry Ms. 19 (Franciscan Bible); France, Paris ca. 1250 (139 x 93 [91 x 64] mm, 2 cols./47 lines; 585 fols.); written in gothic \textit{textualis media}, its text arranged in two columns of 47 lines (three columns prepared for points of reference), with the headings of books written in red in the script of text and red touches used as punctuation throughout. Its chapters are numbered in roman numerals in red and blue and the running headers in its upper margins are written in rustic capitals anduncials in red and blue. The bible was acquired by The Newberry from E.E. Ayer in Dec. 1920. For further details see entries in Paul Saenger, \textit{A Catalogue of the pre-1500 Western Manuscript Books at the Newberry Library} (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989): 35-6 and in De Ricci (1935-40): I, 537 (no. 324535).} but was later equipped for English Franciscan use through the addition of supplementary materials after the bible’s text (at fols. 579v-82v).\footnote{1222 These supplementary materials - for English Franciscan
use - include a table of biblical lessons for the Proper of Saints in calendrical order, followed by lessons for the Common of saints with reference to book, chapter, alphabetical subdivision of chapter a-e, and incipit of verse. The bible also contains a calendrical table of incipits for lessons for the Temporal of the Mass (on fols. 584r-85v).

The bible's Franciscan provenance is confirmed by references to St. Francis and to masters and scholars (on fols. 581r and 582r), as well as by the rubric of the prologue to the Psalms, in addition to the depiction of a friar at the bottom of the Genesis initial (on fol. 1v). Although the bible was copied in France, a possible link to England or to friars of English origin is indicated by the mention of King Edmund ("Sancti Edmundi Regis et martiris", fol. 581v).

The English Franciscan table of liturgical reading added to Newberry Library, Ms. 19 is also found in at least two further 13th-century English Franciscan portable bibles, both of which remain in British collections. The first is in a bible belonging to the Parish Church of Appleby Magna in Leiceistershire, copied in England during the second half of the 13th century, like Newberry Library, Ms. 19, and its dimensions are only slightly smaller (153 x 110 mm, 533 fols.). In the late 13th century, the bible

1223 Entries include “Sancti Francisci patris nostri” (fol. 581r), “Sancti Edmundi Regis et martiris” (fol. 581v) and “Ad magistros et scolares” (fol. 582v).

1224 fol. 583v now includes 15th-century annotations. In addition to these two tables, the text of III Ezra of the Apocrypha was also added, positioned between the two tables (at fols. 583r-84r; titled “Esdre I[us]”).

1225 Note that St. Clare is not mentioned (Saenger, Newberry Library Catalogue 1989: 36).

1226 The rubric to the prologue of Psalms in Newberry Library, Ms. 19 reads “Origo prophetie Dauid Regis Jerusalem psalmorum numero cl legie in pace, frater karissimmeatque soror” (fol. 231r).


remained in English ownership, probably Franciscan. It was at this time, only a few short decades after the bible had been copied, that liturgical materials for Franciscan use were added to folios previously left blank at the rear of the volume, between the bible text and the INH (fols. 491r-4v), including a table of Gospel and Epistle lections of the temporale for the year (fol. 491r-v) and tables of biblical texts suitable for feast days and special occasions (fols. 492-4v). However, the enticing vacant space offered by the blank folios following the INH (fols. 531v-33) did not remain unused for long; a similar table for Advent to Easter only was added on these folios in the 14th century.

The second bible which contains a series of headings and entered texts similar to those in the Newberry and Appleby Bibles is Perth Museum & Art Gallery, Ms. 462. The Perth bible was perhaps copied at a slightly earlier date (mid-13th century?) and is slightly larger than the Newberry and Appleby Bibles, measuring 203 x 146 mm (326 fols.). The list of Bible readings from Saints’ days (fols. 158r-v) indicates that this bible was also in Franciscan hands during the 13th century. Scholars have long attributed the

---

1230 As witnessed by an inscription on fol. i.v which records that the bible was given “in usum Ecclesie de Appleby” by John Mould on 8 February 1701/2 (cf. a second ex-libris inscription on fol. 2r, “E Libris Jos.: Waldron”); for further details on this bible, including its attributed Franciscan provenance, see J. Nichols, History of Leicestershire IV.2 (1811): 434 cited by Ker, MMBL II, 1977: 46.

1231 Cf. Similar series of headings and entered texts in the Perth Museum Bible (Ms. 462; MMBL IV [1992]: 156-8) and in Bodleian Library, Oxford, Ms. Auct. D.4.9 (Summary Catalogue II.1 [1922]: no. 1968 [138]), possibly indicating a common derivation from the friars of Babwell, near Bury St. Edmunds?

1232 The bible was given to the Corporation of Perth by J.A. Dewar, first Baron Forteviot, and placed in the Perth Museum in 1938; previously sold by J. & J. Leighton in 1912 (Catalogue of manuscripts mostly illuminated, many in fine bindings...: no. 27, at £45; a cutting from catalogue containing this entry - is pasted inside the bible’s front cover). For bibliographical description of the Perth Bible see N.R. Ker & A.J. Piper, MMBL IV (1992): 156-58.

1233 fol. 158r-v, “De sancto Andrea Ge. 4.G. tollens noe...” (in the blank space after Psalms, 13th century): Lists of Bible readings for saints’ days (38), Christmastide (7), Common of saints (7), and “In dedicatione ecclesie”, “In translatione sanctorum”, “Ad solitarie viuentes”, “Ad religiosas personas”, “Ad pretatos”, “Ad subditos”, “De magnatibus et nobilibus”, “Ad ordinandos”, and “Ad infirmos”; including 19 entries for Francis and 8 for Edmund king and martyr; references are by book and chapter and, at first only, letter divisions (much as in the Appleby Bible; see MMBL II: 45). Additions on front leaves include: Epistle lections for Advent through second Sunday in Lent (fol. vi, 13th century); directions for saying offices of B.V.M., and a list of the six feasts “in quibus dicantur Mat’ hora vesperarum” (fol. iiv, 14th century); a table of gospel lections for the year, for saints and common of saints (fols. iii-v, 14th century); and on fols. vv-vi (15th century), “Nota quomodo est contra singula vicia repugnanda per scripturam etc. Superbia. Turrim babel cuerit Gen’la … Luxuria … Baptismat decollavit M[a] 6. Mulier. Mulier compulit adam … Versus Adam sampsonem. sic daudi. sic Salamonem/Femina decepit. quis modo tutus erit.” (a-c) in one hand, (d) Lists of Bible readings under each deadly sin (Superbia-Luxuria), and Mulier. In addition, the bible contains a ‘Rules for preaching’ text also found in the Appleby Magna Parish Church Bible (fols. ?), in Bodleian Library, Oxford, Ms. Auct. D.4.9 and in Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, Ms. 246 (fol. 399r); there is surely a significant connection here that behooves further analysis.
bible’s glorious decoration to the mid-13th century Oxford artist William de Brailes, but beyond this, evidence of the Perth bible’s provenance is either uncertain or unknown; a 14th-century addition on fol. 325v allows us to identify the bible as belonging to the Lincoln diocese by that time, but the bible offers little else that might allow us to discern its later provenance, except for a signature on fol. 325r (“Richard Smartford is my name”) followed by 8 lines of verses in Smartford’s hand.

Bodleian Library, Oxford, Ms. Auct. D.4.9 (213 x 168 mm, 539 fols.) is another English pocket bible that was supplied with a table of biblical texts suitable for feast days and special occasions very similar to that found in the Appleby Magna Bible. In this

---

1234 Sir Sydney Cockerell was the first to attribute the Perth Museum Bible to de Brailes, in his study The Work of W. de Brailes: An English Illuminator of the Thirteenth Century (Cambridge: Roxburghe Club, 1930): 26. Cockerell’s identification was based on the resemblance of the ‘I’ initial on fol. 3r to that in Oxford Bodleian Library Ms. lat. bibl. e.7 (later Dyson Perrins Ms. 5; see Dyson Perrins catalogue, pl. XX e) and was made without Cockerell ever having actually seen having the manuscript itself, but rather only a reproduction of the bible’s Genesis initial in a bookseller’s catalogue (J. & J. Leighton, London, Catalogue of Manuscripts, mostly illuminated, 1912, no. 27). Cockerell’s identification of the Perth bible as a de Brailes product was subsequently supported by Graham Pollard and others (see Pollard, “William de Brailles,” Bodleian Library Record V [1955]: 202–9 [204] and N. Morgan, Survey IV.1 [1982]: 115).

1235 Inscription reads “Iohannes permissione diuina lincoln’ episcopus dilecto filio domino M.Ca. ...” (fol. 325v, 14th century).

1236 Although Smartford has not, to my knowledge, been identified in any publication to date, it seems likely that he was the same man of that name (husband of Bridgitt Smartford) whose burial on 3 May 1669 is recorded in the Register of the Parish of St. James Clarkenwell; see “A True Register of all the burials in the Parish of St. James Clarkenwell” in A True Register of all the Christenings, Marriages, and Burials in the Parish of St. James, Clarkenwell from The Year of Our Lorde God 1551 [V] Burials, 1666 to 1719, Ed. Robert Hovenden (London, 1893): 14. Cf. One Richard Smartford is also identified in the household accounts of Lord William Howard of Naworth Castle (entry dated 1620), see Selections from the Household Books of the Lord William Howard of Naworth Castle, Surtees Society vol. 68 (Durham: Andrews & Co. for the Surtees Society, 1878): 163.

1237 This 8-line stanza, rhyming abababcc, reads: “To thee yet dere thought most disloiall Lord whom Impious love keeps in a barbarous land, thu wronged wife Octavia sendeth word, of the unkind wounds received by thy hand; great Antony O let thin eis afford but to permet thy hart to understand the hurt thou doust and doe but reade her teares that stil is thin thought thou wilt not be hers.” The bible’s description in the Sotheby, Wilkinson & Hodge catalogue (1902) suggested that the verses “seem to be a quotation from an old Play on Antony and Cleopatra.” (Catalogue of the valuable and extensive library of printed books and illuminated & other important manuscripts of the late Henry White, esq. [1902], lot 161). Although neither addition constitutes definite proof that Smartford owned the book, it seems unlikely that he would have added these verses to the bible if it were not his personal property. The bible’s 20th-century sales history is as follows: Sotheby, Wilkinson & Hodge, Catalogue of the valuable and extensive library of printed books and illuminated & other important manuscripts of the late Henry White, esq. (1902), lot 161; Maggs, Catalogue 246: Old Time Literature (1909), no. 804; Maggs, Catalogue 256: Rare and interesting books, prints and autographs (1910), no. 90; J. & J. Leighton, London, Catalogue of Manuscripts, mostly illuminated (1912), no. 27 (when spotted and identified by Cockerell as containing work by De Brailes).

1238 Possibly indicating a common derivation from the friars of Babwell, near Bury St. Edmunds? Cf. F. Madan & H.H.E. Craster, Summary Catalogue II.1 (1922); no. 1968 (138); presented to the Bodleian Library by Ralph Barlow in 1606.
volume, a series of introits for Epistle and Gospel readings (the “Ordo officiorum anni”, fols. 531r ff.) and a list of lections (fol. 533r) were inserted at the back of the bible. The bible has demonstrably seen heavy use: there are also many theological notes, including a skeleton harmony of the Gospels (fol. ii) and a list of the books of the Bible (fol. 535v). Likewise in another English bible now in the Bodleian Library, Ms. Auct. D. inf. 2.1 (late 13th-century; 238 x 175 mm, 465 fols.), although in this bible, its list of the Epistles and Gospels for Sundays and holy days precedes rather than following the bible text (fols. iii,r, iv, iv,v; cf. fol. ii,v).

Trinity College, Dublin, Ms. 421241 is another tiny English bible copied during the second half of the 13th century (145 x 98 mm; 508 fols.), containing the “Versus de Concordia Euangeliorum” (fols. 502r-4r)1242 followed by tabulated lists of biblical passages for liturgical reading (fols. 504v-8v), many of them annotated by a 15th-century reader whose same hand also wrote the names of a number of saints of

---

1239 In Bodleian Library, Oxford, Ms. Auct. D.4.9 the New Testament begins at fol. 387v and the IHN (here the “Interpretaciones bibliotheca”) begins at fol. 489r; the first 124 folios are particularly heavily annotated.
1240 Accompanying the list of readings are the Eusebian canons for the Gospels (fol. iii,v). The bible also contains miscellaneous theological notes (fols. iv and 451r) and many verses on points of Latin grammar and prosody (fols. iir, 451v and 464r); F. Madan & H.H.E. Craster, *Summary Catalogue II.1* (1922): no. 1967 (137-8).
1242 The “Versus de Concordia Euangeliorum” (at fols. 502r-4r) begins “Quatuor est primus primis trinus alter optimus” and concludes “librum Ioha. Finit.” (Walther no. 15297) is the same version as that included in UPenn RBML Ms. Codex 1560, and another copy is in TCD Ms. 41 (at fols. 473-76v); cf. Colker (1991): I, 69-73 (item 7, ‘Versus De Concordia Euangeliorum’: “Quatuor est primus primis trinus alter optimus – librum Ioha. finit”).

1243 The sequence of the temporale, saeculare and ‘special persons’ is followed on fols. 504v-6r and again on fols. 506v-8r. The lists in the first section (i.e. fols. 504v-6r) are arranged under rubricated headings including “In die ascensionis”, “Dominica I post trinity.”, “In sancti Ed mundi mar.”. The headings for “Ad moniales”, “Ad prelatos”, “Ad curiales”, “Ad peregrinos”, “Ad mercatores”, and some others are without entries, but the headings “Vientes solitaire” and “Claustrales” include headings. Which Colker compares to those recorded by Ker as present in the Appleby Magna, Leics. Bible: Marvin L. Colker, *Trinity College Library Dublin: Descriptive Catalogue of the Mediaeval and Renaissance Latin Manuscripts*. 2 vols. (Aldershot, Hants.: Scolar Press for TCD, 1991): I, 73-5 [74].
English background on the bible’s final leaves (fols. 506v-8v).\textsuperscript{1244} A table of epistle and gospel readings for the Temporal (Advent through 24\textsuperscript{th} Sunday after Trinity) was one of several 13\textsuperscript{th}- and 14\textsuperscript{th}-century additions to the flyleaves of York Minster Library Ms. XVI.N.6,\textsuperscript{1245} here including entries for the dedication of a church, Sanctorale, and the Common of saints (copied in three columns; Fig. 3.13).\textsuperscript{1246}

\textbf{ii} Lists of themes for sermons

The lengthy lists of collected suitable themes for sermons frequently found in portable 13\textsuperscript{th}-century bibles were another important 13\textsuperscript{th}-century preacher’s tool.\textsuperscript{1247} This kind of list is quite similar to the lists of Epistle and Gospel readings for the Mass, in that they too are organized by the liturgical year.\textsuperscript{1248}

The contents of Free Library of Philadelphia, Ms. Lewis E 39, a mid-13\textsuperscript{th}-century Venetian pocket bible (175 x 120 mm, 403 fols.),\textsuperscript{1249} must have constituted an invaluable resource for a mendicant preacher, having been supplied with a cornucopia of sermon composition aids and other additions for liturgical use, the contents of which possibly indicate Franciscan use. The bible was equipped not only with a Concordance text, subdivided by rubricated bracketed divisions (fols. 374v-75v; Fig. 3.14A)\textsuperscript{1250} but with several additional Concordance-type lists of readings, topics, themes and subjects in alphabetical

\textsuperscript{1244} These saints of English background are: Wulfstan, Guthbert, Guthlac, Alphege, George, Botulph, Ethelreda, Alban and Oswald; the same hand annotated the lists of biblical passages for liturgical reading on fols. 504v-6r.
\textsuperscript{1245} A large ‘pocket’ bible copied in England in the middle of the 13\textsuperscript{th} century (203 x 143 mm, 333 fols.), containing the biblical text (fols. 1-316v) and the \textit{IHN} (fols. 318-33v); see Ker & Piper, \textit{MMBL} IV, (1992): 750-1 and H.H. Glunz, \textit{History of the Vulgate in England from Alcuin to Roger Bacon} (Cambridge: CUP, 1933): 259-93 [267].
\textsuperscript{1246} Lists of readings added during the 13\textsuperscript{th} century on fols. iv-vi. The Sanctoral contains 108 entries, with references not filled in for Germanus, Lambert, Francis epistle, 11,000 Virgins, Brice and Edmund, etc.
\textsuperscript{1247} A few surviving 13\textsuperscript{th}-century portable bibles contain additional collections of sermon themes to be used for the specific purpose of preaching against heresy (really a specialized type of real concordance) such as the \textit{Summa contra hereticos et manicheos}; to date, eight survive copies in 13\textsuperscript{th}-century bibles are known (Light 1987: passim, and Light 2011B: 169, 180). Other texts for preachers less commonly found in 13\textsuperscript{th}-century bibles include copies of the \textit{Ars praecandi}, collections of Saints’ lives and \textit{exempla} and several different glossaries of difficult words (Light 2011B: 180).
\textsuperscript{1248} Some copies include only the Sanctorale, while others begin with Advent in the Temporale (Light 2011B: 178).
\textsuperscript{1249} Wolf (1937): 47; De Ricci: II, 2027 [no.10]; cf. bibliographical description in the FLP’s online catalogue here.
\textsuperscript{1250} The Concordance is inserted between the end of the biblical text (fols. 10r-374r) and the start of the \textit{IHN} (fols. 376r-99r) on fols. 374v-75v.
order. Indeed this bible was enriched with thirteen folios’ worth of supplementary lists, tables and indexes, added to previously blank folios at both the front and the back of the book (fols. 1r-9v, flyleaves vi-xii). A number of lists written in microscopic sized writing were added at the front of the volume, including lists of Saints’ days (fols. 4r–6v; Fig. 3.14B) and of readings (fols. 6vb-8v; Fig. 3.14C), and the first of two alphabetical indices of *incipits* (fols. 8v-9v; Fig. 3.14D). The other - in the hand of the later annotator whose minute-sized handwriting fills the margins of pages throughout the bible – was copied onto the book’s rear flyleaves (fols. vi-xii).

Amongst the numerous additions to Bodleian Library, Oxford, Ms. Auct. D.5.10, a tiny bible produced in northern France in the second quarter of the 13th century (measuring only 123 x 86 mm, with a minute written space of 92 x 59 mm) are fifty-one sermon themes for Christmas, and a list of liturgical readings which also includes introits. Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, Ms. 437, a ‘pocket’ bible (190 x 135 mm, 300 fols.) includes *themata* for sermons at the back of the bible (fols. 284r-95r; Fig. 3.15A), followed by an abbreviated concordance-type list of topics in the Gospels (fol. 295r-96r; Fig. 3.15B) and finally a list of Epistle and Gospel readings for the Temporale (fol. 296r-v).

**iii Real (or Subject) and Verbal (or Topical) Concordances**

Auxiliary tools to aid and hasten the process of sermon-composition were created from the early 13th century on and became available in several forms: concordances to

---

1251 The texts included on fols. 4r-9v are as follows: fols. 4r-6v: Lists (fols. 4r-v, readings for lists of days and months; fols. 5r–6va, ?, subdivided with brackets; fols. 6r–6va, an alphabetical list); fols. 6cb–8c, Lists of Saints’ days and readings etc., with red initials, including entries for Pentecost, St. Stephen and St. John (on fol. 7r), for Mary M. and St. Peter (fol. 7v), “Ad…” and Prayers for… (fol. 8r-v) and “Lepresos” and “Peregrenos” etc. (fol. 8v); fols. 8v–9v, an alphabetical index of *incipits*. The leaves preceding those on which these additions were supplied (the bible’s first three folios) are from a 14th-century liturgical manuscript, left over from a previous binding.

1252 Light (2011B): 178-9, also 176.

1253 Light (2011B): 176, also 178, 179.

1254 See M.R. James CCCC catalogue (1912): II, 345; see also description for CCCC Ms. 437 available online at Corpus Christi College’s Parker Library on the web resource here.

1255 The first reads “Dom. I in adventu domini.,” followed by “Cum appropinquaret... Nota quod hoc euangelium deseruit duobus diebus”; and the last is for “Dom. xxvi post pent.,” on “Est puer unus hic.”

1256 Bible (fols. 7r-276v) then *IHN* (fols. 278r-83r).
the Bible made it possible to quickly find other occurrences of a word; distinctiones offered lists of biblical words presented with the several spiritual meanings that each word could have (it was from these distinctiones that large dictionaries eventually evolved; and model sermons, especially the postillae with their exegesis of the liturgical readings, not only provided structural help for making a sermon but gathered much topical material for their development and for the instruction of the faithful.

The usefulness and success of the third wave of concordances produced by the Dominicans at Saint-Jacques in Paris (before 1286) were both predicated upon the usefulness and success of the 13th-century ‘Paris’ Bible. It was their employment of the ‘new’ organizational schema for dividing the Vulgate text into standardized chapters, long attributed to Stephen Langton (d. 1228), that had been introduced at the turn of the 12th to 13th centuries and which had become firmly established by the 1230s, that ensured the success of the third concordance of the Dominicans of St. Jacques, and it was in the textual blueprint of the ‘Paris’ Bible, produced in unprecedentedly high numbers in portable pandect format that this system of chapter-divisions had already became widely circulated throughout Europe by the final quarter of the 13th century.

Thus-equipped with a reliable system for supplying references to the biblical text – in essence, a ‘common vocabulary’ for referencing specific sections of The Bible - the Dominican scholars devised a system of subdividing each chapter into alphabetical partitions. The first concordance divided each chapter into seven sections, identified by letters a through g, each section of each chapter equipped for coded, yet clear, reference according to its designated letter, thus “xii a” would point to the first quarter of chapter 12, “xii b” to the second quarter, and so on. The Dominicans’ third concordance refined this alphabetical indexing system further, retaining the sevenfold division (a-g) for longer chapters and supplementing it with a fourfold division (a through d) for shorter

---

1257 Two types of concordance emerged; the real or subject concordance, which comprised a collection of topics arranged logically rather than alphabetically with a list of appropriate biblical passages; and the verbal or topical concordance, that listed alphabetically every appearance of a word in the Bible; Light (2011B): 179.


1259 The division of the Bible’s chapters into verses as we know them today was not introduced until the 16th century, by the Paris printer Etienne Robert in 1534; see Saenger (1997); Van Liere (2014): 44-5, 231.
chapters. This system corresponded to the references in both the Dominicans’ concordances and *distinctiones*. By the end of the 13th century, the Dominicans’ system had become widespread. Both the Dominicans’ concordance and its alphabetized system for dividing and referring to text enjoyed enduring popularity.

This success of the Dominicans’ third concordance as an effective and efficient indexing technology and navigational tool for searching the Scriptures, and, most important of all, one that was demonstrably useful and widely used, can be attributed to its integration of two factors: first, its capitalizing use of the consistent model for Scriptural citation popularized by the ‘Paris’ Bible in its new blueprint for ordering the books of The Bible and for dividing up their text; and second, its integration of the reliability of this innovative mode for ensuring reliable Scriptural citation in combination with the increased precision of biblical reference provided by the Dominicans’ own innovative alphabetical indexing system for subdividing the chapters of the biblical books.

However, for a preacher, even more useful than alphabetical lists were topical concordances, which listed appropriate bible texts by topic. One such topical concordance can be found today in The Free Library of Philadelphia, Ms. Lewis E 31 written in England, perhaps Oxford, ca. 1230 (222 x 165 [170 x 103] mm, 2 cols./62-65 lines, 336 fols.). This bible’s text (fols. 1r-292r) has been supplemented and made more swiftly and directly navigable by the addition - directly after the conclusion of the biblical text - of a concordance text which indexes Scriptural passages concerned with numerous

---

1260 These revisions were described in the prologue to the third concordance as follows: “One point must be heeded at the outset by anyone wishing to search the concordance in this book: namely that whereas in the first concordance, called the Concordance of St. Jacques, each chapter is divided up into seven sections by the seven letters of the alphabet, namely a, b, c, d, e, f, g, in the present work, longer chapters are divided in the same way, into the same number of sections, but shorter chapters are divided into only four sections, that is, into a, b, c, and d. a contains the first part; b the second part that moves further away from the beginning and extends to the middle; c moves away from the middle and contains the third part of the shorter chapter; and d extends from the third part to the end of the chapter.” (cited in Clemens & Graham 2007: 188-90).


subjects (fols. 293r-299v; see Fig. 3.16). The concordance opens with a preface explaining its own structure and narrating its contents.\(^{1264}\)

A series of prefatory tools and devices added at the front of an early 13th-century ‘saddle-bag’ bible, now All Soul’s College, Oxford, Ms. 3 (215 x 170 mm, 334 fols.), whose text was, unusually, copied in a single column of 27 long lines) provided its user with a remarkably extensive selection of definitions and distinctiones compressed into only ten folios.\(^{1265}\) Following selections from Johannes Beleth’s 12th-century *Rationale divinorum officiorum* on fols. 1r-6v,\(^ {1266}\) these prefatory folios include the following texts and tools: a collection of proprietates rerum, in roughly alphabetical order (fols. 1v-4r);\(^ {1267}\) a list of distinctiones of words and phrases according to their scriptural meaning (fols. 5r-6v);\(^ {1268}\) a subject-index to the Bible under 194 headings (fols. 7r-8v);\(^ {1269}\) followed, on fols. 9r-10r, by further lists of terms with scriptural references (“adventus lu. xxij.; “consolatio [Joh’] iij,” etc.), together with a schematized list of related virtues (“compassion, concordoa, liberalitas, pietas, gracia…” and vices (“[de]speratio, rancor, torpor, pusillanimitas, querela, accidia…”));\(^ {1270}\) finally, fol. 10v contains over 220 proverbs in roughly

\(^{1264}\) The concordance opens (on fol. 293r) with the following rubricated preface: “Incipiunt concordancie bible / distincte per v. libros. Prima pars p[er]tinet ad depravaci[onem?] pr[ima] hominis cu[m] suis oppositis. Quaqu[era] p[ar]t enumerati sunt. Prima est de p[ea]cato: & eius effetti[tus]...” (‘Here begins the concordance of the bible, organized in five books. The first book deals with the topics pertaining to the deprivation of the first Man, and their opposites. There are four parts to it: first, sin and its effects. Second, the principle vices and their rubrics. Third, the vices of the mouth and their rubrics, and their opposites and the five senses. The fourth part consists of the previously mentioned vices in combination, and their opposites.’). The text itself begins with the following rubricated incipit, marked with a capitulum mark in blue: “Prima pars p[er]tie[n]t ad depravaci[onem?]” (Luke 18:42) on fol. 329v.

\(^{1265}\) Copied ca. 1200-25 in either England or France; Biblical text (fols. 11r-302v) and IHN (fols. 303r-330v); Andrew G. Watson, *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Medieval Manuscripts of All Souls College, Oxford* (Oxford: OUP, 1997): 5-8.

\(^{1266}\) On fol. 1r, a series of definitions followed by another of distinctions (“Hic est cherubin habens .vi. alas. prima ala. confessio ... ij a. ala. satisfactio...”) and other theological notes; on fols. 4r-v, fifteen brief *exempla* (beginning on fol. 4r, “Quidam demoniacus reuelabat omnia peccata...”) plus four added in a contemporary hand (some of which begin “Legitur in vitas partum.”)

\(^{1267}\) “Angelus, Anulus, Ancilla, Aquila” to “Vinum, Vulpes, Vir iustus, Virgo, [Christus].”

\(^{1268}\) Beginning fol. 5r, “Theos deus ut quorundum opinio est...”; and ending on fol. 6v, where a second hand filled the available blank space with a list of topics and scriptural references to them.

\(^{1269}\) On fol. 7r, “Contra indigne sumentes vel conficientes eucharistam... De uiritate crucis et eius signo... De passione...” and on fol. 8v, “Quod uia domini angusta sit in primo [sic]. postmodum uero lata...” etc.; continued later on fols. 331r-34v (“De sapiencia et diuin a lege...”), concluding on fol. 334v (“De spe...”).

\(^{1270}\) At the top of fol. 10r are *distinctiones* on the words “vanitas” and “oculus.”
alphabetical order. If the bible’s user’s need was rather for liturgical texts in the bible (and his need assuming the first 10 folios alone hadn’t finished him off), he could turn to the back of the volume (fols. 330v-31v), where a list of epistles and gospels of the temporale for Advent through the 25th Sunday after Trinity had been inserted after the IHN.

III For Liturgical Use

However, despite the central importance of the act of preaching in 13th-century society, and the frequency with which one encounters 13th-century portable bibles supplied with texts for preachers, or with exegetical tools such as gospel harmonies, or verse summaries of the Bible, suggesting that these copies were used as study bibles, the most common non-biblical texts circulating in 13th-century bibles were rather liturgical texts, including calendars, capitularies (that is, lists of liturgical readings for the Mass), texts for the Divine Office, and, as we will consider below, bibles that include Missals or other texts for the Mass.

This observation should not perhaps be surprising, since the fact that the content of the liturgy was essentially biblical needs little comment, and it was primarily through the liturgy that people – including those who could understand Latin - knew the Bible during the Middle Ages. Certainly literate monks and clerics of the Middle Ages knew the Bible through many paths – but the liturgy was one of the most important; they heard


1272 List of epistles and gospels of the temporale as those in All Soul’s College, Ms. 1, fols. 305r-330v (beginning “Incipiunt interpretaciones sancti Remigij. Aaz apprehens”); cf. Beinecke RBML, Yale, Ms. 1100, fols. 1v-3v

1273 The verse summary known as the Summarium biblicum is studied by Lucie Doležalová (see Bibliography).

1274 As demonstrated in Light’s 2011 survey of the non-biblical texts found in a group of 215 bibles (Light 2011: passim); on 13th-century portable bible-missals and the addition of liturgical texts to portable bibles see Light (2013): passim (esp. 185-86).

1275 This statement refers to the educated who knew Latin; the illiterate (i.e. people who knew no Latin) probably derived their knowledge of the Bible primarily from sermons; Pierre-Marie Gy argues that the illiterate, who constituted the majority of the population, had no direct knowledge of the Bible, and knew it only through the ministry of clerics; see Pierre-Marie Gy, “La Bible dans la liturgie au Moyen Age,” in Le Moyen Âge et la Bible, Eds. Pierre Riché & Guy Lobrichon (Paris, 1984): 537-52 [552].
the Bible during Mass, they recited the Psalter in its entirety each week, and heard extensive readings from the Bible during the Night Office and in the refectory.  

The medieval books used for celebrating the Mass and the Office

To understand the significance of the liturgical use of this new type of bible (portable pandect) permitted by the addition of such texts, it is important to briefly review the function and contents of the medieval books used for celebrating the Mass and the Office (particularly the missal and the breviary), and the history of their development. It was through hearing the Bible read aloud in the liturgy of the Church, during mass and in the prayers of the divine office (the daily liturgical prayer) that most medieval Christians knew the Bible.

Breviaries (The Daily Office)

The texts required for the daily office were copied in multiple books, often in complicated combinations. The most basic was the Psalter, containing the totality of the psalms (in either biblical or liturgical order), the canticles used each day (the most important being the ‘Benedictus’ at Lauds and ‘Magnificat’ at Vespers, each with variable antiphons) or on specific days of the week, litany of saints, and sometimes a hymnal component. The officiant recited the collects, some variable and some fixed, at the different hours from the Collectar, which also contained the variable short readings called capitula, while the chants for the office (most notably antiphons for the psalms and

---


1277 See Franz van Liere, Introduction to the Medieval Bible (2014): 208-36 (on the Bible in Liturgy and Prayer, see 209-14; on the Bible preached, 214-16; for a brief history of sermons, see 216-23 [esp. on the 12th century, 219-222 and on mendicant preaching, 222-23]; on written sources and the Spoken Word, 223-28; on tools for the medieval preacher, 228-33; and on the Bible in medieval sermons, 233-34).

canticles and the often long and complex responsories after each lesson at Matins) were collected in the Antiphonal.\footnote{Among the books used for other kinds of services three were particularly important: Processionals, collections of the chants used at processions on important occasions, including the Rogation season just before Ascension Day; Manuals, collections of rites such as baptism, marriage, visitation of the sick, and burial, all intended for pastoral use as needed (hence sometimes called ‘occasional offices’); and Pontificals, books distinctively for bishops (hence their name), which included such specifically episcopal services as confirmation, ordination, dedication of churches, coronation (although not always), and special blessings (those pronounced by the bishop after communion were sometimes collected into a separate volume called a Benedictional); R.W. Pfaff (2009): 8. Cf. for definitions of these books and their functions, see Harper (1991): 214-16, 220-1; Palazzo (1998): 195-212; Hughes (1982): 160-244; and Krochalis & Matter (2001): 437, 454-55.} For the three main kinds of readings at Matins (by far the longest of the ‘day offices), several books could be used: a Lectionary for the biblical passages, a Homiliary for the condensed sermons (mostly from the Fathers), and a Legendary or Passional for the excerpts from saints’ lives; or all the readings may be contained in a single Office Lectionary.\footnote{For further discussion of the size and contents of breviaries see John Harper, The Forms and Orders of Western Liturgy (1991): 45-57, 61-2; R.W. Pfaff (2009): passim, but esp. 320-4, 423-34, 454-6 and 531-4; Hughes (1982): 197-223, 238-44; cf. Jeanne E. Krochalis & E. Ann Matter, “Manuscripts of the Liturgy” (2001): 439.}

However the Breviary (or ‘Portforium’) contained the texts necessary for all the daily offices for an entire year.\footnote{Occasionally the texts of all the ‘day offices’ (except Matins) were collected into a Diurnal; cf. R.W. Pfaff (2009): 8, Harper (1991): 297, Palazzo (1998): 149-168; and Hughes (1982): 118-121.} As a result, this compendious volume was often a fat book, and either extremely hard to read, or divided into two seasonal halves, or both. Breviaries came in all shapes and sizes, containing various selections of texts and with or without the musical notation for the chants, according to how, where and by whom they were to be used. S.J.P van Dijk and J. Hazelden Walker illustrated the richness of this variety in their description of eight different types of medieval breviaries, classified by their date (earlier, or ‘primitive’, and later, ‘more perfect’ versions) and further distinguished by their size and location of use (in ‘choir’ or ‘portable’ format).\footnote{See S.J.P Van Dijk & J. Hazelden Walker, The Origins of the Modern Roman Liturgy (London, 1960): 32-34 (nos. 1-8: primitive choir breviaries, nos. 1-2; primitive portable breviaries, nos. 3-4; choir breviaries, nos. 5-6; portable breviaries, nos. 7-8); also see their extremely useful list of surviving 11th and 12th-century breviaries in Appendix no. 42 (528-42); esp. examples of noted portable breviaries on 539 (monastic: nos. 101-3, secular: nos. 104) and of portable breviaries at 539-42 (monastic: nos. 105-115, secular: nos. 116-132).}

b Missals (The Mass)
Biblical readings are a central part of every Mass.\footnote{On the Mass see John Harper, \textit{The Forms and Orders of Western Liturgy from the Tenth to the Eighteenth Century} (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991): 62-3, 109-126; and R.W. Pfaff (2009): 6-8; and on the books of the Mass, see Eric Palazzo, \textit{A History of Liturgical Books} (1998): 19-110 (see esp. on the books of readings, 83-105; and on the genesis and development of the missal, 107-10); see also Light (2013): 185-89 [188-9].} Although the readings for Mass or pericopes,\footnote{The opening portion of the Eucharistic celebration, known as the Fore-Mass, consisted of biblical readings, usually two in number, although on certain feasts there were more. The first reading was generally known as the Epistle, since on Sundays it was selected from the Pauline Epistles, even though it was at times drawn from other parts of the Bible. During the Easter season, for example, it was from Acts, and on some weekdays it was from the Old Testament. The second reading was always from the Gospels. On Ember days and Wednesday and Friday during Holy Week, there were three lessons, beginning with an Old Testament reading; some Feasts such as the Easter Vigil included even more readings. This outline is generally true for Roman Use; certain liturgies included three readings for most feasts (Light 2013: 188 & 188 n.11); cf. S.J.P. van Dijk, “The Bible in Liturgical Use” (1969): 224-26; Pierre-Marie Gy, “La Bible dans la liturgie” (1984): 537-39; and A.G. Martimort, \textit{Les lectures liturgiques et leurs livres} (Turnhout: Brill, 1992): 16-20.} were taken from the Bible, bibles were probably used for the readings during Mass only very early in the history of the Church.\footnote{The biblical readings were marked within the text, and accompanied by lists of the readings, known as capitularies, listing the biblical texts read during Mass arranged in the order of the liturgical year (usually by their opening words and closing words); see A.G. Martimort, \textit{Les lectures liturgiques} (1992): 21-26; and E. Palazzo, \textit{Liturgical Books} (1998): 87-9. Scholars have expressed different opinions on the question of whether bibles were used as lectionaries for the Mass and Office; several have argued that they were in fact used in this way; the evidence is strongest for early medieval bibles: see Richard Gameson, “The Royal 1.B.vii Gospels and English book production in the seventh and eighth centuries” in \textit{The Early Medieval Bible. Its Production, Decoration and Use}, Ed. Richard Gameson (Cambridge: CUP, 1994): 24-52 [32, n.37]; cf. in the same volume, Patrick McGurk, “The Oldest Manuscripts of the Latin Bible”: 1-23 [17-18]; David Ganz, “Mass Production: Carolingian Bibles from Tours”: 53-62 [59]; Rosamund McKitrick is more cautious in her assessment of the use of 9th-century Bibles \textit{ibid}, “Carolingian Bible Production: the Tours Anomaly”: 63-77 [75-6]). For later bibles, Diane Reilly has convincingly argued that Bibles were used for readings during the Office and in the refectory in the 11th and 12th centuries, but de Hamel suggests a different interpretation (\textit{The Book}, 2001: 73-6).} Instead, a number of different types of books were used for the mass, according to the contents and function of each.\footnote{The prayers (both the fixed canon and the variable mass sets), proper prefaces, and mass-ordinary (the basic rite) were contained in the Sacramentary. The lessons could be read from an Epistle book and a Gospel book (sometimes called an Evangeliary) or Gospel Lectionary, the latter containing only the gospel pericopes, in liturgical order – or from the missal itself. (The selections of biblical lessons for a given occasion - i.e., for reading at mass - are collectively called ‘pericopes,’ ‘things cut out.’) The chants themselves were mainly copied in a separate book, the Gradual, although elaborations of various kinds are sometimes encountered in a separate Troper or Sequentiary (rarely, Proser); cf. Pfaff (2009): 7-8 [7].} For most of the Middle Ages, the usual liturgical books used for the Mass readings were Evangeliaries (including the Epistle readings, read by the sub-deacon), Evangeliaries (including the gospel readings, chanted by the deacon), and Mass lectionaries (which included both types of readings).\footnote{See Martimort, \textit{Les lectures} (1992): 33-43; and Eric Palazzo, \textit{Liturgical Books} (1998): 94-105. Mass Lectionaries including both the Gospel and Epistle readings seem not to have been very common; see Diane Reilly has convincingly argued that Bibles were used for readings during the Office and in the refectory in the 11th and 12th centuries: see Richard Gameson, “The Royal 1.B.vii Gospels and English book production in the seventh and eighth centuries” in \textit{The Early Medieval Bible. Its Production, Decoration and Use}, Ed. Richard Gameson (Cambridge: CUP, 1994): 24-52 [32, n.37]; cf. in the same volume, Patrick McGurk, “The Oldest Manuscripts of the Latin Bible”: 1-23 [17-18]; David Ganz, “Mass Production: Carolingian Bibles from Tours”: 53-62 [59]; Rosamund McKitrick is more cautious in her assessment of the use of 9th-century Bibles \textit{ibid}, “Carolingian Bible Production: the Tours Anomaly”: 63-77 [75-6]). For later bibles, Diane Reilly has convincingly argued that Bibles were used for readings during the Office and in the refectory in the 11th and 12th centuries, but de Hamel suggests a different interpretation (\textit{The Book}, 2001: 73-6).} Gospel books, equipped with lists
of the gospel readings in liturgical order (Capitularies or ‘capitulare evangeliorum’), were also commonly used liturgically, especially early in the Middle Ages, although lectionaries offered a more practical solution, which included only the text of the pericopes arranged in the order of the liturgical year rather than in the order of the Bible.

Missals contained the words of the chants and proper lessons, and later came to supplant the Sacramentary (which included only the prayers needed by the celebrant), a development rooted in changing liturgical practice.\footnote{This transition was a gradual process, beginning as early as the 10th or 11th century; by the first half of the 12th century there were many more missals copied than sacramentaries, and by the 13th century, missals had almost totally replaced the Sacramentary; see Light (2013): 187-88. The evolution of the Missal is discussed in Victor Leroquais, Les sacramentaires et les missels manuscrits des bibliothèques publiques de France (Paris, 1924): xii-xiii; Joseph A. Jungmann, The Mass of the Roman Rite: Its Origins and Development (Missarum sollemnia), translated by Francis A. Brunner, 2 vols. (Westminster, Maryland, 1951-1955; repr.1986): I, 104-7; S.J.P. van Dijk & J.Hazelden Walker, Origins of the Modern Roman Liturgy (1960): 57-65; Andrew Hughes, Medieval Manuscripts for Mass and Office (1982): 143-159; and Eric Palazzo, A History of Liturgical Books (1998): 107-10.} From possibly as early as the 11th century, the celebrant was required to say all the prayers of the Mass, including the biblical readings and the texts sung by the choir; some out loud, some privately to himself.\footnote{The celebrant would also have used his Missal to follow the readings as they were read or chanted by the sub-deacon and deacon. On the genesis and development of the missal, see Eric Palazzo, A History of Liturgical Books (1998): 107-10; Jeanne E. Krochalís & E. Ann Matter, “Manuscripts of the Liturgy” (2001): 449-52; John Harper, The Forms and Orders of Western Liturgy (1991): 58-66; and R.W. Pfaff (2009): passim, but esp. 324-5, 369-71, 379-81 and 451-2.} He [the celebrant] therefore needed access to the complete texts of the Mass, as provided in a missal, even when celebrating High Mass.\footnote{Palazzo dates this development from 11th century (Liturgical Books 1998: 107-8); Jungmann dates the development later, to the 12th century, and states it was common in the 13th century (Mass of the Roman Rite 1955/86: I, 106), as does Leroquais (Les Sacramentaires 1924: xiii); noted in Light (2013): 187 n.9.}

The evidence found in surviving 13th-century portable pandect bibles does suggest that at least on occasion, bibles were used as Mass books, or were equipped with the necessary texts and re-purposed for such use. These bibles therefore challenge the conception that complete bibles were not used as liturgical books in the 13th century and complicate our understanding of which books were used for reading during Mass in this period.

\textbf{ii} The addition of Lists of Epistle and Gospel readings for the Mass (Capitularies)
These lists of readings for the mass are a continuation of two liturgical texts found from very early dates in the Middle Ages: lists of Gospel readings (most commonly found in Gospel books), and lists of readings from the Epistles (much less commonly found). Parallel to the development of combined bible-missals was the development of lists of biblical readings for the Mass (capitularies or “capitula lectionum”). These lists of Epistle and Gospel readings (or ‘lections’) for the Mass, organized according the liturgical year, with the feasts of the ‘Temporale’, or the Proper of Time, the ‘Sanctorale’, or Proper of Saints, and the common of saints were also the most common of those extrabiblical texts added to 13th-century portable bibles which related to the liturgy.

Since the Gospels were divided from a very early date according to the Eusebian sections used in the Canon Tables, earlier Gospel lists commonly used these as their system of reference; lists of Epistles identify the reading only by its opening words, an imperfect solution that explains the comparative rarity of these lists. The popularization of lists that include both Gospel and Epistle readings was a 13th-century innovation, since they also depended upon bibles that were complete in one volume, and divided into a system of chapters that solved the problem of how to link the reading in the list with the corresponding biblical passage.

The inclusion of these lists in portable pandect bibles of the 13th century is not only a reminder of the central importance of the liturgy within the medieval church and contemporary society, but also presents something of a paradox. On one hand, lists including readings from both the Gospels and the Epistles depended upon the format of these bibles, as complete in one volume, and the organization of their contents, divided into a system of chapters that solved the problem of how to link the reading in the list with the corresponding biblical passage. On the other hand, how are we to ‘square’...
this fact with the common assumption that complete bibles were not used as liturgical books in the 13th century; the books usually used for reading during Mass rather being Gospel Books, Missals, which included all the texts needed to say the Mass, or Lectionaries, containing the full text of the Epistle or Gospel readings for the Mass arranged in liturgical order.\footnote{\textsuperscript{1298}}

New York Public Library, Ms. MA 130 (204 x 132 mm, 589 fols.)\footnote{\textsuperscript{1299}} is an English bible written ca. 1250,\footnote{\textsuperscript{1300}} which includes a very carefully organized table of the readings for the Mass (begins fol. 3r; Fig. 3.17), added to the bible in the 15th century, perhaps in Italy (Veneto region?).\footnote{\textsuperscript{1301}} The table is arranged in three columns, with each passage identified by the biblical book, chapter number, incipit and explicit; it begins: “Incipit tabula ad inueniendu[m] cap[itu]la ep[isto]la[rum] et euang[e]lio[rum] tocius / anni secu[n]du[m] ordine[m] et stillu[m] curie romane. et p[r?]o d[o]m[ini?]ca p[?]a &? adue[n?]tu,” beneath an added header “.Yh[?]s.” (fol. 3r).

We may compare it to another bible at the NYPL which contains an added list of readings; Ms. MA 12,\footnote{\textsuperscript{1302}} a French bible produced in Paris ca. 1225-50,\footnote{\textsuperscript{1303}} containing 605 folios, each measuring 136 x 89 mm. In NYPL, Ms. MA 12, the added list of readings (fols. 596r-603v; copied in a different hand to that of the bible text) is quite formal, like that of MA 130, but arranged in a different layout. The list, with the given ‘title heading’ of “Tabula ep[isto]laru[m] et eu[n]gelio[rum]. De t[em]p[o]re.” (fol. 596r; see Fig. 3.18) is copied in two continuous columns, and includes readings for the Office of matins as well as the readings for the Mass. References are to the biblical book and chapter number and often include a reference to a particular system of reference –

\footnotetext[1300]{Provenance: Early owner Jan Wydeteyn; Wilberforce Eames obtained the manuscript in 1926 for his library (Brooklyn, NY) from W. M. Voynich; gift of Mr. Wilberforce Eames to NYPL in 1940.}
\footnotetext[1301]{See catalogue record and digitized images for NYPL, Ms. MA 130 available on Digital Scriptorium here.}
\footnotetext[1302]{Light (2011B): 175; on NYPL, Manuscripts and Archives Division, Ms. MA 12 cf. De Ricci, I, 1317; catalogue record and digitized images available on Digital Scriptorium here.}
\footnotetext[1303]{Provenance: Frater Johannes Vuatat of Paris (1355); owned (1640) by Thebaut, and 18th century by Antoine Moreau; bought in NY by Thomas Addis Emmet, 1868; given to NYPL by John S. Kennedy, 1896.
that of the Dominicans’ concordance texts\textsuperscript{1304} - which was used to virtually divide each book’s chapters into seven sections, from a (indicating a text at the beginning of the chapter) through g (a text in the seventh, and final, section of the chapter).\textsuperscript{1305}

The early provenance of a lavishly-decorated\textsuperscript{1306} portable bible, now British Library, Egerton Ms. 2867 (210 x 140 mm, 535 fols.)\textsuperscript{1307} can be discerned from its liturgical calendar (fol. 423r-4r; Fig. 3.19A),\textsuperscript{1308} whose contents allow us to date and localize the production of the bible as having taken place at the Benedictine priory of Christ Church, Canterbury before 1246.\textsuperscript{1309} Furthermore, the bible’s Canterbury provenance is further supported by the featuring of Christ Church saints and the dedication of Dover, a cell of Christ Church priory, as a minor feast in the bible’s calendar (fol. 424r; Fig. 3.19B),\textsuperscript{1310} while the inclusion of readings for the ordination of

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{1304} The Dominicans’ alphabetized reference system is only found in manuscripts - including bibles - from the second quarter of the 13\textsuperscript{th} century onwards; see R.H. & M.A. Rouse, “The Verbal Concordances to the Scriptures,” Archivum fratrum praedicatorum 44 (1975): 5-30 [10].

\textsuperscript{1305} Further examples of small 13\textsuperscript{th}-century bibles featuring these capitula lists include CCCC Ms. 463 (175 x 127 mm; includes a calendar [fol. 241r-46v], Table of Epistles and Gospels for Temporale [fol. 247r], followed by List of Cantica etc. [fol. 249r-90v] in a 15\textsuperscript{th}-century hand), Christ Church College, Oxford, Ms. 105 (opening of a list of the readings [epistle, lesson, gospel] for Sundays and feast days, 13\textsuperscript{th}/14\textsuperscript{th} century [fol. 374r]), All Soul’s College, Oxford, Ms. 1 (ex-St. Augustine’s, Canterbury: 223 x 147 mm; a list of epistles and gospels to the Temporale appended after the Bible text [fol. 367v-68v] plus a list of the commonest seven Old Testament and three New Testament canticles added by an early 15\textsuperscript{th}-century hand [fol. iiiv]).

\textsuperscript{1306} Decorated with 71 large historiated initials in colors and gold at the beginning of most books and prefaces, and most Psalm divisions, often with decoration extending into the borders; large or small initials in colors and gold with penwork decoration, some with dragons, animal heads, or foliate forms; small initials in red with highlighting in blue, or in blue, with highlighting in red; running headers and numbers in red and blue. In the calendar (fol. 423r-4r), large ‘KL’ initials in red and blue with red and blue pen-flourishing, small initials in red or blue; and in the Psalms (fol. 244v-270v), larger initials in red with blue pen-flourishing, or in blue with red pen-flourishing.


\textsuperscript{1308} Plus sermon notes situated between the Old and New Testaments (fol. 425-29v); the biblical text occupies fols. 3r-533v (the OT on fols. 3r-422v and the NT on fols. 430r-533v), preceded by a table of contents (fol. 1v-2r).

\textsuperscript{1309} Edmund of Abingdon, Archbishop of Canterbury (canonized in 1246) is absent in the bible’s calendar (fol. 423r-4r) suggesting that the volume was written before that date.

\textsuperscript{1310} The bible’s post-mediaval provenance can be discerned from four surviving inscriptions within the volume, including those of Thomas Dorman and John Beeching (“Thome Dorman Liber”, fol. 2r and
local bishops etc. in a series of added lections (fol. 534r-v; Fig. 3.19C) provides further evidence.1311

iii 13th-Century Bible-Missals

Laura Light’s 2013 study of 26 13th-century bible-missals (a descriptive term used by Laura Light1312) is the first to consider these volumes together as a group defined by their contents.1313 At first glance these contents seem unremarkable, and yet this is in fact a very unusual combination. Although missal-bibles were never a common type of manuscript, a significant number of copies have survived, certainly sufficient to underline the fact that the liturgical use of the Bible in the 13th century and later is an essential part

"John Bechyng", fol. 534v; both 16th-century) and the inscription “W.A.S.M.D.” (fol. 3r; 17th-century); the bible subsequently belonged to Sir Wyndham Knatschbull (1844-1917) from whom the British Museum purchased the bible on 9 February 1907.

1311 The bible’s Christ Church Canterbury provenance is further witnessed on its first few leaves, which contain a pair of inscriptions – of temporary possession if not of ownership - added by monks of that house; those of Roger Benett (“Liber Rogeri Benett monochi ecclesie christi cantuarie”), fol. iv) and Johannes L… (“Biblius ecclesie Christi Cantuarie [endicitus (?)] eidem ecclesie per Johannem L…”, fol. 1r [inscription now erased and Johannes’ surname illegible])

1312 The 26 bible-missals considered in Light (2013) are as follows: France (9): Boston Public Library, Boston MAS Ms. qMed 202; British Library, Ms. Add. 57531; Law Society, London, Ms. 3 (on deposit at Canterbury Cathedral); OT (107 fols.); Schøyen Collection (London & Oslo), Ms. 115; Biblioteca Nacional, Madrid, Ms. 29; BnF, Paris, Ms. lat. 36; BnF, Paris, Ms. lat. 16266; Philadelphia, PA, UPenn RBML Ms. Codex 236; Private Collection; England (11): Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge, Ms. McClean 16; St. John’s College, Cambridge, Ms. 239/N.1; CUL, Ms. Hh.1.3; BL, Ms. Harley 1748; BL, Ms. Harley 2813; Bodleian Library, Oxford, ms. Lat. Bib.e.7; BnF, Paris, Ms. lat. 163; BnF, Paris, Ms. lat. 215; BnF, Paris, Ms. lat. 10431; Huntington Library, San Marino CA, Ms. HM 51; Huntingdon Library, San Marino CA, Ms. HM 26061; Italy (1): BAV, Ms. Ottob. lat. 532; Spain (1): Bibliothèque Mazarine, Paris, Ms. 31; Not Examined Personally [by Light]/ Unknown Origin (3): KRB, Ms. 14 (8882); Biblioteca Nazionale Braidense, Milan, Ms. III (AD.X.44); BM, Poitiers, Ms. 12; Laura Light, “The Thirteenth-Century Pandect and the Liturgy,” in Form and Function in the Late Medieval Bible, Eds. Eyal Poleg and Laura Light (Boston: Brill, 2013): 185-215 [‘Appendix’, 208-14].

of its story, and one that significantly alters our modern understanding of the use of the Late Medieval Bible.\footnote{Light (2013); 168.}

The size of the 23 bible-missals in Light’s study varies; although none is a very large volume, 9 measure over 200 mm in height,\footnote{The largest, BnF, ms. lat. 10431, which measures 242 x 174 [168-3 x 106-3] mm; and St. John’s College, Cambridge, Ms. 239/N.1 measures 255 x 180 mm and was made for a Gilbertine House (see M.R. James, St. John’s, 1913: 277-8); while Huntington Library, San Marino CA, Ms. HM 26061, is also moderately large, measuring 220 x 154 [156 x 103] mm, and may have been made for a house of Canons Regular (see C. Dutschke, Guide: 650, 654).} while the remaining 17 Bible-Missals are small volumes, measuring less than 200 mm in height.\footnote{The size of the smaller bibles ranges from the Franciscan example, CUL, Ms. Hh.1.3, 198 x 150 mm, to the smallest, London, Law Society, Ms. 3 (107.f; also Franciscan), which measures only 123 x 79 mm. The smallest bibles in Light’s group are Oslo and London, Schoyen Collection, MS 115 and BnF, lat. 215, both Dominican; and two of unknown use; Biblioteca Nacional, Madrid Ms. 29 and KBR, Ms. 14 (8882); Light (2013): 193-4, 214.} In general, these bible-missals are somewhat smaller than many missals copied independently, which vary greatly in size (portable missals were copied, and many of these are quite small, measuring less than 200 mm in height,\footnote{Examples of small-format missals include Salmon, Les manuscrits liturgiques, cat. nos. 302, 322, 323, 392, 429, and 441; all but two of these are described as Dominican or Franciscan; the smallest, cat. 323, measures 145 x 106 mm (noted in Light [2013]: 272 n.27).} while examples of larger size certainly exist\footnote{Examples of larger missal volumes measuring ca. 365-380 x 265 mm, and slightly smaller manuscripts measuring ca. 330 x 220 mm are both common. To the best of my knowledge, there is no study of the format of medieval missals; the examples used by Light are based on the dimensions of missals described in Pierre Salmon, Les manuscrits liturgiques latins de la Bibliothèque vaticane, 2. Sacramentaires, épistoliers, évangéliaires, graduels, missels, Studi e Testi 253 (Vatican City, 1969).} - the very smallest of these bibles are certainly smaller than most Missals copied independently.

The biblical readings in a missal represent a significant proportion of its text, thus the combination of a bible and a missal together in a single volume offered obvious practical advantages. Nonetheless the combination of a Missal and a Bible in a single volume seems to have been a 13th-century invention; there are no known examples earlier than the 13th century. Why do bible-missals appear only at this time? Two innovations made combined bible-missals possible.\footnote{See Laura Light, “The Thirteenth-Century Pandect and the Liturgy,” in Form and Function in the Late Medieval Bible, Eds. Eyal Poleg & Laura Light (Boston: Brill, 2013): 185-215 ['Appendix', 208-14]: 189-190.}

First of all, a bible and a missal copied together comprise a very lengthy text. The ability to make a volume that included this amount of text depended on the availability of
thinner parchment, and the ability to write smaller, more compact scripts within a more compressed written space. These technical innovations that made the creation of small portable one-volume bibles possible, also made it possible to create bible-missals. The second prerequisite that made a bible-missal possible was the widespread use of numbered chapters, and the practice of using these chapters to identify biblical passages. These developments were crucial to understand the essential practicality behind these combination volumes.

In a Missal, the two readings for each Mass are copied out in full for each feast. As noted above, these take up a large proportion of a missal. In combined bible-missals, the readings are identified briefly in the missal section of the manuscript, and the complete text of the readings was found in the Bible section. The new 13th-century bible was a book that assembled the complete Bible in one searchable volume, with easily identifiable and clearly numbered chapters. These chapters made it possible to include references in the text of the Missal that enabled the users of these books to find the readings in the biblical text itself. This use of the Bible, which any modern user would find quite commonplace, was in fact still new in the 13th century, made possible by changes in the format and organization of biblical manuscripts.

Bible-missals have a curiously dominant place in the history of the liturgy in 13th-century England: two English witnesses to the Dominican liturgy before the reforms introduced in 1256 by Humbert of Romans, Master General of the Dominicans 1254-

---


1321 See Paul Saenger’s various works on the development and significant of the ‘new’ system of biblical chapters, including: “Biblical Citation” (2005); “The Anglo-Hebraic Origins of the Modern Chapter Divisions of the Latin Bible” (2008); and “Graphic Mise-en-Page” (2013).
1263, are both bible-missals; a bible with a missal is one of only five surviving 13th-century English Franciscan liturgical manuscripts; and similarly, all three illuminated missals included in Nigel Morgan’s survey of Gothic manuscripts from England during the period 1190-1250 are bible-missals.

What can we discern of these bible-missals’ early provenance? The missal (or missale plenum) was the liturgical manuscript that included all the texts necessary for the priest to say the Mass, and thus were ideal volumes for use during a private Mass and became useful volumes for parish churches. By this logic, Light argues that bible-missals were generally owned, or used, by priests or bishops. Nevertheless, the surviving manuscripts provide strong collective evidence of their use by Franciscans and Dominicans; although three of the nine larger bible-missals (i.e. measuring over 200 mm in height) are monastic in origin, two display evidence of mendicant provenance, while most of the smaller examples are demonstrably mendicant in origin.

Ten contain sufficient evidence for us to place them in mendicant hands in the 13th through 15th centuries.

One is now in Oxford (Bodleian Ms. Lat. bib. e.7, ‘the De Brailes Bible’) and the other is in Cambridge (Fitzwilliam Museum, Ms. Mclean 16); discussed in R. Pfaff, Liturgy in Medieval England (2009): 313-14. Light comments that these two manuscripts are probably the only surviving examples, and suggests that while scholars - including Pfaff - have universally considered Fitzwilliam Ms. Mclean16 to be of English origin, there is a possibility that it was copied in Paris, although the ms. was certainly in England at an early date (Light 2013: 282 n.49).


See N.J. Morgan, Survey IV.1 (1982): no. 69 (Bodleian Library, Ms. Lat. bib.e.7 and BnF, Ms. lat. 10431) and no. 77 (Huntington Library, Ms. HM 26061). Light argues that these manuscripts’ survival through the Reformation is probably attributable to the contemporary veneration of their sacred biblical text in spite of the Catholic liturgical texts their contents also included. (Light 2013: 326)

The Appendix to Light’s 2013 study provides a convenient handlist of 26 surviving examples, although the original use cannot of course be determined conclusively for every one of them; Light (2013): 208-14.

As Light notes, this level of certainty about their original use and ownership sets these books apart from the vast majority of late medieval bibles that include no direct evidence of their original owners (Light [2013]: 188-89).

Light notes that of the nine larger bibles, one is Franciscan (Boston Public Library, Ms. qMed 202: 225 x 154 [143 x 90-88] mm), and another is Dominican (Poiters, Bib. Mun., Ms. 12: 206 x 135 mm), “reminding us that not all mendicant books were very small.” Light (2013): 193.

Three are Franciscan (CUL, Ms. Hh.1.3, BL, Ms. Harley 2813 and Law Society, London Ms. 3 [107.8]); six are Dominican (Bibliothèque Mazarine, Paris Ms. 31, BnF, Mss. lat. 163 and 215, Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge, Ms. Mclean16, Bodleian Library, Ms. Lat. bib.c.7 and Schøyen Collection, Oslo, Ms. 115); and one (Private Collection: Christie’s London, 13 June, 2012, lot 7) includes added texts that attest to its use by Dominicans at a later date. However Light points to BL, Add. Ms. 57531 as constituting a warning against hasty generalizations (e.g. that the smallest bibles were always for mendicant use) since, as Light notes, the bible is clearly Cistercian in origin, and measures only 163 x 128 [115 x 86] mm (Light [2013]: 193-4).
centuries; six were possessed or used by Dominicans (all pocket size) and four demonstrate early Franciscan provenances (all pocket size save one).

It is not surprising that Franciscan and Dominican exemplars dominate the number of bible-missals whose contents suggest connections with particular groups of medieval book users. Traveling friars were often provided with portable breviaries and bibles, and a volume that included both a missal and a bible, and could thus function as both, must have been invaluable. The partial missals in mendicant bibles usually include the Prefaces, the Canon, and Votive Masses, including Masses for the Dead, with a few Proper Masses. A French example, Law Society, London Ms. 3 (fols. 107 ff) was probably made for a Franciscan. The missals in the bibles made for Dominicans appear in general to be even briefer, and are often accompanied by a calendar. The content of the missal texts in these bibles, with their focus on Votive Masses, suggests that their primary use was for private Masses said by traveling friars, rather than for the conventual Masses said as part of the daily liturgy in Franciscan and Dominican Houses. However, not all of these books belonged to Franciscans and Dominicans; other priests

---

1329 Bodleian Library, Oxford, Ms. Lat. Bib.e.7 (England, Oxford, during the second quarter of the 13th century, ca.1234-40: 168 x 108 mm, 441 fols.), Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge, Ms. McClean 16 (likely of English origin and copied before 1254: 165 x 110 mm, 639 + 4 fols.), Schøyen Collection, London and Oslo, Ms. 115 (Paris? ca. 1225-50 (140 x 90 mm, 457 fols.), Private Collection (Paris, ca. 1260: 154 x 102 mm, 538 fols. [with Dominican missal and calendar added later (ca. 1295) on eighteen folios at the beginning of the book]), BnF, Ms. lat. 163 (England, mid-13th century: 185 x 120 mm, 285 fols.), BnF, Ms. lat. 215 (England, ca. 1240-50: 135 x 87 mm, 584 fols.), Bibliothèque Mazarine, Paris, Ms. 31 (copied during the second quarter of the 13th century, possibly in Spain: 182 x 117 mm, 362 fols.)

1330 CUL, Ms. Hh.1.3 (England, ca. 1250-75: 198 x 150 mm, 364 fols.), BL, MS Harley 2813 (England, Oxford? ca. 1225-50: 183 x 133 mm, 506 fols.), Boston Public Library, Boston MA, Ms. qMed 202 (Southern France? ca. 1225-50: 225 x 154 mm, 376 fols.), Law Society, London [on deposit at Canterbury Cathedral, Ms. 3 107.1] (Old Testament France, 13th century: 123 x 79 mm, 468 fols.).

1331 Further research on small portable missals has long been needed, including a careful comparison of the texts of the missals in these bibles; likewise a detailed study of small portable missals owned by Dominicans and Franciscans in addition to these bible-missals would be invaluable.

1332 Its Mass texts include the Prefaces and Canon, followed by a series of Votive Masses of the Holy Trinity, the Holy Spirit, the Holy Cross, of the Virgin, for the dead (“pro uno defuncto,” “pro defunctis,” “pro defunctis fratris,” “pro vivis et defunctis,” “in agenda mortuorum”), against the persecutors of the Church, for peace, for the sick, and a Mass for St. Francis, followed by blessings of salt and water, three more Votive Masses, and prayers and cues for the burial service. (for further description of its contents see Light 2013: 209). Its missal is similar in contents to those in British Library, Ms. Harley 2813 and Boston Ms. qMed 202 (cf. Light 2013: 211, 208).

1333 Dominican examples with very brief missals include BnF, Paris, Ms. lat. 215 (fols. 259v-263r) and the Schøyen Collection Ms. 15 (fols. 214r-217v), both of which also include calendars, in addition to the De Brailes Bible (Bodleian Library, Ms. Lat. bib. c. 7, fols. 199r-204r), which lacks a calendar; in contrast, the missal in Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge, Ms. McClean 16 (also Dominican) is extensive and complete. Cf. Light (2013): 208-14.
traveled, and their portability and perhaps, Light suggests, their “affordability” – compared with acquiring a Bible and a Missal, or a larger example of either – may also have been an attraction.”

To my knowledge, UPenn RBML Ms. Codex 236 is the earliest known surviving portable bible-missal, having been copied around 1220 in northern France, probably in Paris. The volume is of moderate size, now measuring 218 x 148 mm, and comprises 465 folios, mostly in quires of twelve folios, and is particularly fascinating for it compresses a vast quantity of text into its modestly-proportioned single volume. Of particular interest is the wealth of liturgical material that the book contains, including both a complete missal (fols. 402v-20v) and a breviary (fols. 421r-57r),

---

1334 Three used by Cistercians (BnF, Ms. lat. 36 (Paris, 1230s: 310 x 195 mm, 372 fols.), BL, Ms. Additional 57531 (Northern France, mid-13th century: 163 x 128 mm, 544 fols.) and BnF, MS lat. 10431 (England, copied ca. 1225-50 [after 1235/6 and probably before 1246]: 242 x 174 mm, 357 fols.), one may have been owned by a house of Regular Canons (Huntington Library, San Marino CA, HM 26061: England, between 1225 and 1250: 220 x 154 mm, 381 fols.) and another shows signs of Gilbertine provenance (St. John’s College, Cambridge, Ms. N.1 (239) (England, ca. 1250-75: 255 x 180 mm, 408 fols.), cf. Light (2013): 285 n.57.

1335 Laura Light cites Penn Ms. Codex 236 as the earliest example of a 13th-century bible-missal known to her, perhaps dating from the 1220s; the bible had previously been dated only to the second quarter of the 13th-century (ca. 1235-40) (Light 2013: 194-9, 210, also Figs. 8.1-2).


1337 The bible is now bound to 230 x 168 mm in an 18th-century French brown morocco binding, wearing slightly at the hinges, with metal clasps; gold leaf on spine and marbled endpapers; cf. full catalogue description by Amey Hutchins in Penn in Hand, Penn’s online catalogue of manuscripts, available here.


1339 The Missal (fols. 402v-420v) begins with the Prefaces and Canon, followed by the variable texts for the Mass for the liturgical year, arranged as usual according to the Temporale, Sanctorale, and Common of Saints, and concluding with Votive Masses.
again quite complete. Also present are a liturgical calendar (fols. 400v-1v) and a selection of hymns (fols. 457r-58v), all original. It is therefore an important manuscript to examine in some detail.

As in the case of the other bible-missals we have considered, the inclusion of these liturgical texts permits UPenn Ms. Codex 236 a double functioning as a bible text (for private consultation) and as a prayer book (perhaps for use in church). However this bible’s inclusion of a breviary in addition to a missal extends the number of ways in which could be used still further; not only could UPenn Ms. Codex 236 be used for reading and studying the Bible, but through its inclusion of the requisite texts for the celebration of the Mass and the prayers necessary for observing the daily Office, this bible fully equipped its user for two distinct kinds of worship. However, although this dynamic volume was presumably produced/designed with the specific needs of a patron or community in mind, having been designed to permit multiple different kinds of bible use, the volume itself offers few clues as to the circumstances of its production and early provenance. Nevertheless, Light has theorized that this bible may have been made for a house of canons or for a secular priest, a suggestion which seems entirely plausible.

The liturgical texts of the Missal and Breviary original to UPenn Ms. Codex 236 were supplemented at a later date by a table of Epistle and Gospel incipits (fols. 460r-62v; Figs. 3.20B-C) added through the insertion of three extra folios at the very end of the bible (Quire Q). This table includes the standard readings for Sundays and special feasts, but also those for innumerable ferial days and votive masses; assigning readings for some 315 occasions, this section offers almost a daily scheme for Bible-reading. This list of incipits in particular bears the marks of considerable revisions at different dates, as

1340 The texts for the Divine Office conclude with a section of hymns without musical notation (fols. 457r-458v). The Breviary contains nine lessons for major feasts, and we can thus rule out a monastic origin. By comparison, in Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vatican City, Ms. Urb. lat. 597, the two lengthy Bible and breviary texts are similarly compressed into a single volume but via a far greater degree of compression, for the book itself measures only 130 x 82 mm. However on the other hand, it should be noted that this extraordinary compression was achieved at the expense of the thickness of the codex, which contains a staggering 867 folios (Light 2011B: 177 and 177 n.34). For further details on this bible see Pierre Salmon, Les manuscrits liturgiques latins de la bibliothèque vaticane. I: Psautiers, Antiphonaires, Hymnaires, Collectaires, Bréviaires, Studia e testi 251 (Vatican City, 1968): no. 346 [167].

1341 Its biblical text (fols. 28r-400r; in 2 cols./lines) is prefaced by the HNV (fols. 2r-27r; unusually, arranged in 2 rather than 3 cols.) and the apocryphal Prayer of Manasseh (fol. 27v).

witnessed in the multiple erasures and crossings-out in ink and in red (e.g. fols. 460vc-461ra, 462ra; Fig. 3.20C).

The later addition of this table raises important questions, implying that a later user needed or desired to access the bible’s contents of the codex in a new or different way that required the addition of this table, presumably indicating a new or different use of the book, or perhaps its use in a new or different venue. Equally significant is the fact that the table was written on three separate folios of parchment and then bound into the volume. We have seen similar examples in other 13th-century bibles in which the later users of similar bibles, who sought to add in a reference text or navigational tool to guide or facilitate their ‘new’ use of an ‘old’ bible, simply wrote their interpretational aids wherever blank page-space was available in their bible. In the case of UPenn Ms. Codex 236, the bible’s owner – or possessor - at that time would have found 2½ folios’ worth of blank space already available at the back of the bible (fols. 458vb-459v; still blank today) but chose instead to meet the additional cost of inserting new folios to permit sufficient space ensuring that the contents of his ‘new’ table would not be hopelessly crowded. Ultimately this reader seems to have deemed it preferable to have a table whose text he would be able to read, and by extension, that would constitute a useful addition, and he was willing to meet the extra expense required to obtain it. This is surely significant.

Based on the evidence of its script and decoration, Light argues that UPenn Ms. Codex 236 was certainly made in northern France, possibly in Paris. UPenn Ms. Codex 236 is lavishly decorated, including a miniature of the Crucifixion at the beginning of the Canon of the Mass (fol. 402v: see Fig. 3.20A), and many six-line historiated initials,
some also zoomorphic, particularly at the beginning of books. There is also extensive use of gold in the bible’s miniatures (Fig. 3.20D), with some flaking, and extensive use of red for rubrication and red and blue for headings, chapter numbers.

Furthermore, the bible’s calendar includes a number of feasts associated with Paris. The evidence of the saints included in the volume’s calendar suggests that UPenn Ms. Codex 236 dates from after 1218 and probably before 1228-35. Thus a date in the 1220s is in general in keeping with the style of the pen-initials and illumination, despite the fact that it is written below the top line, which ordinarily would suggest a date after ca. 1230. If this bible does in fact date from the 1220s, as Light suggests, it is one of the earliest examples of a bible copied containing only the modern chapter divisions (commonly attributed to Stephen Langton); the bible lacks capiúla lists and older chapter divisions. Furthermore, Light argues that the evidence of the prologues in UPenn Ms. Codex 236 suggests that although the primary exemplar from

---

1346 For example, a major historiated zoomorphic initial forms the left border at the beginning of Genesis with miniatures of Adam and Eve, Noah’s ark, and Abraham and Isaac (fol. 30v; Fig. 3.20D). Cf. Another major zoomorphic initial forming the left border at the beginning of Jerome’s prologue to Genesis, depicting a monk in his scriptorium (fol. 28r). The bible features historiated initials before thirty-two of its biblical books. Some comments on the style of the bible’s decoration and illumination are included in Leaves of Gold. Manuscript Illumination from Philadelphia Collections, ed. James Tanis and Jennifer Thompson (Philadelphia, 2001): no. 2 (27-29); “further study would be of interest”: Light (2013): 196 n.29.

1347 Also some filigree decoration; the first leaf of the book of Job has been cut out (between fols. 185-186) while other leaves have also had sections cut out.

1348 Including the translation of Eligius, 1212 (25 vi), the translation of Marcellus, bishop of Paris, 1200 (26 vii), Samson (8 vii), Magloire (24 x) and Genevieve (26 xi); and moreover, as Light points out, it lacks saints that point strongly to anywhere else (Light 2013: 197); cf. Victor Leroquais, Les bréviaires manuscrits de bibliothèques publiques de France ... Paris (Macon, 1934): I, cxii-cxiii, and Branner (1977): 197.

1349 Since the calendar includes William of Bourges (10 i), canonized in 1218, but nothing later; for example the calendar lacks the translation of Thomas Becket (7 vii), 1220, Francis (4 x, usually 3 x in Paris), 1228, Dominic (5 viii), 1234, Fiacre (30 viii), 1234, Elizabeth (19 xi), 1235, and the reception of the Crown of Thorns (11 viii), 1239 (Light 2013: 197); cf. Leroquais, Les bréviaires manuscrits (1934): I, cxii-cxiii.


1351 Light (2013): 197. The biblical books in Penn Ms. Codex 236 follow the order of the ‘Paris’ Bible, with the exception that Tobit is followed by Esther and Judith. The bible includes four of the six prologues new to manuscripts of the Bible without the Gloss which were included in the Proto-Paris’ Bibles from ca. 1200, as well as in the Paris Bibles of ca. 1230 and later, and also includes numerous additional prologues not found in the ‘Paris’ Bible (see Light 1994: 164-66 and Lobrichon 2004: 120-21). The bible is also an equally early example of a bible with the IHV in the version beginning “Aaz apprehendens …”, in this case placed at the beginning of the bible codex instead of its more usual position at the end. It is worth noting that although there are examples of bibles dating before ca. 1230 with different versions of the IHV (such as CCCC, Ms. 48 and Paris, Bibliothèque de l’Arsenal, Ms. 65) these are exceptional (Light 2013: 197 n.32, cf. Saenger 2008: 191 and Poleg 2013: passim).
which it was copied was not a Proto-‘Paris’ Bible, the scribe had one, or possibly a very early ‘Paris’ Bible, at hand which he also consulted.\footnote{Light’s examination of selected textual passages confirms this impression; although UPenn Ms. Codex 236 includes some readings found in ‘Paris’ Bibles (for example, the text at Ruth 1:7 reads “revertendi postita”) in numerous other passages it lacks these readings.” (Light 2013: 198 n.35). A ‘Paris’ or a Proto-‘Paris’ Bible from this date would very likely have been copied in Paris; however, a Bible like this one that is textually not a ‘Paris’ Bible (although it was i

Ultimately, every aspect of this sensational volume was new; created to serve a liturgical purpose, it combines in a unique way, a Bible, a Missal and a Breviary\footnote{Light (2013): 194.} and in so doing, its demonstrates that the new Parisian bibles, and their contemporaries, “were shaped, at least in part, by liturgical needs.”\footnote{Light (2013): esp. 213, also 193-4, 202, 204; see also Poleg, Approaching the Bible (2013): 114, 126, 142 n.13, 145 n.28 & Plate 4 (reprod. fols. 178v-179r); M.A. & R.H. Rouse, “Statim invenire…” (1991): 196 n.13. For bibliographical descriptions of Huntington Ms. HM 26061 see C.W. Dutschke et al., Guide to Medieval and Renaissance Manuscripts in the Huntington Library (San Marino, 1989): 649-54; full description also available at The Huntington Library online \url{here}, with digitized images available \url{here};} UPenn Ms. Codex 236 therefore constitutes a volume of considerable importance to our understanding of the late medieval history of the portable bible.

We may productively make a comparison with Huntington Library Ms. HM 26061 (220 x 154 mm, 381 fols.),\footnote{N. Morgan, Early Gothic (1982): I, no. 77 (125-26 & ills. 250-1, reprod. fols. 166, 178v).} a portable pandect bible of small ‘saddle bag’ or generous ‘pocket’ size copied in England ca. 1240\footnote{Bible text in sections at follows: fols. 22-176v (Old Testament through Psalms), 192-282v (Old Testament, Proverbs through Maccabees), 282v-381v (New Testament); books of the bible generally in the usual order (see N.R. Ker, \textit{MMBL} I, 96-7), but with the prayer of Manasses after II Paralipomenon, the prayer of Solomon after Ecclesiasticus, Baruch (its ‘epistola’ before the text) on an inserted bifolium, and Acts after the Gospels; there are 38 prologues (24 in the New Testament) and a summary of Genesis.} which, like UPenn Ms. Codex 236, includes a missal that was also original to its production, placed in the center of the book (between Psalms and Proverbs) as an integral part of the book’s original core structure.\footnote{Similar examples of 13th-century bibles produced with missals as integral components include UPenn Ms. Codex 236, Boston, Public Library, Ms. 202 and BnF, Paris, Ms. lat. 10431; see Light (2013): passim, and esp. Light’s list of 25 13th-century bible-missals: ‘Appendix’, 208-14. In the 15th century the ‘original’ missal text (fols. 177-191v) was supplemented by the addition of lists of Epistle and Gospel readings (fols. 10-21v). The headings in these lists identify that portion as Sarum use; readings for the feast of the relics of Salisbury cathedral are given on fol. 17v; in the Gospels, concordance notes (?) in red ink; in the Gospels, Acts and Epistles, notes in brown ink on readings for the Mass throughout the year.} Although the text throughout the bible\footnote{Light (2013): 198.} was annotated for liturgical and study purposes...
with considerable marginalia and added texts\(^\text{1359}\) the volume is also luxuriously decorated and illuminated,\(^\text{1360}\) including a full-page Crucifixion miniature with Mary and John on the page facing the Canon of the Mass (fol. 178v); a highly unusual ‘find’ in a 13\(^{\text{th}}\)-century bible of any size.\(^\text{1361}\)

Another distinguished English bible with missal texts of pocket size is Bodleian Library, Oxford, Ms. Lat. Bib. e.7 (167 x 116 mm,\(^\text{1362}\) 440 fols.),\(^\text{1363}\) also known as The De Brailes Bible for it is probably the earliest of the bibles chiefly illuminated by William de Brailes, and extensively illustrated\(^\text{1364}\) in Oxford, between ca. 1234 (or earlier) and 1240.\(^\text{1365}\) This bible contains a series of masses and related mass texts positioned between the Psalter and Proverbs (fols. 227r-236v; see Fig. 3.21), and written across the page,

\(^{1359}\) Additions include: Grossetestian indexing symbols in brown ink in the margins in Proverbs (fols. 192-197), somewhat cropped; a note on the Hebrew alphabet on fol. 349r, preceding the IIIHN; 6 poems and other verses on biblical matters added on fol. 379v; a list of the books of the Bible - not in the order of this manuscript (!) - has been added to fol. 381v (following 2 blank folios, fols. 380-381); on fol. 159r, upper margin, “Rubee figure distingunt libros moralium” referring to arabic numerals in red ink, 1-55, added in the margins of Job, fols. 159-165v, to connect references to the books in Gregory the Great’s Moralitas. On the Grossetetian symbols, see See R. W. Hunt, “Manuscripts containing the Indexing Symbols of Robert Grosseteste,” Bodleian Library Record 4 (1952-53): 241-54; R. H. Rouse, “New Light on the Circulation of the A-Text of Seneca’s Tragedies,” JWCI 40 (1977): 285 n.12.

\(^{1360}\) The bible’s decoration has been attributed to the Robert of Lindsey group, style of; bible-missal includes seven historiated initials, 13- to 9-line at fols. 22 (Prologue), 24 (Gen.), 166 (Psalms), 284 (Matt.), 292 (Mk.), 297 (Lk.) and 306 (John), with 12- to 7-line painted initials for the books of the Bible, and 10- to 4-line initials for prologues, in parted red and blue with flourishing in both colors.

\(^{1361}\) See discussion in Chapter 1 above (section 3.vi) and Figs. 1.2-4. Similar examples of luxuriously-illuminated 13\(^{\text{th}}\)-century bibles-missals include UPenn Ms. Codex 236, Bodleian Library, Ms. Lat. Bib.e.7 and BnF, Paris, Ms. lat. 36 and 10431; see Light (2013): passim, and esp. Light’s list of 25 13\(^{\text{th}}\)-century bible-missals: ‘Appendix’, 208-14.


\(^{1365}\) Claire Donovan dates this bible more specifically to “ca. 1234 (or earlier)-40” in The de Brailes Hours: Shaping the Book of Hours in Thirteenth-Century Oxford (London: The British Library, 1991): 203, no. 16.
unlike the rest of the manuscript which is written in double columns. St. Dominic is the only saint named in the missal text (fol. 204r) with an additional office for his Translation inserted in a different hand on the lower margin; the inclusion of masses for St Dominic (together with other evidence\textsuperscript{1366}) strongly suggests that the manuscript was made after the date of Dominic’s canonization (in 1234) for a member of the Dominican house in Oxford (founded in 1221).\textsuperscript{1367,1368} The bible’s inclusion of the Mass of St. Dominic, whose presence in the book could indicate that the volume’s production was begun even before that date,\textsuperscript{1369} together with Oxford provenance (on liturgical and stylistic grounds, together with the evidence of de Brailes) all suggest an origin connected with the early Dominican community in Oxford.\textsuperscript{1370}

Similarly British Library, Harley Ms. 2813 (ca. 1225-50, 183 x 133 [114 x 74] mm, 2 cols./51 lines) is a bible whose origins have been linked to the Oxford Franciscans.\textsuperscript{1371} The Harley Bible also has a series of masses between Psalms and Proverbs; they begin with masses for the Trinity, the Holy Spirit, the Cross, Angels, and St Francis, and are followed by others for Advent, Christmas, the Purification, and so

\textsuperscript{1366} Cf. in Chapter I and Excursus I.
\textsuperscript{1367} In addition to the Bibles discussed here, de Brailes may have illuminated other texts for the friars, or for others closely associated with them; Michael Camille proposed that Bibliotheca Apostolica Vaticana, Ms. Borgh. 58, with three historiated initials attributed to de Brailes, “was produced ca. 1230 for someone associated with the Oxford Franciscan convent”; see Camille, “An Oxford University Textbook Illuminated by William de Brailes,” The Burlington Magazine 137, no. 1106 [May 1995]: 292–3 [299].
\textsuperscript{1369} St. Dominic died in 1221, his relics were translated in 1233 and he was formally canonized in 1234; see Warner’s Dyson-Perrins catalogue (1920): 25.
The presence of St Francis (d. 1226) here and in following prayers (Figs. 3.22A-B) allows us to date the manuscript no earlier than the year of his canonization in 1228 and allows us to assume that it was made for a Franciscan. In addition, passages of the biblical text, including Proverbs, are annotated using marginal indexing symbols of the sort devised by Robert Grosseteste (d. 1253), the famous bishop, scholar, philosopher, author and translator.

BL, Arundel Ms. 303 is another early English pocket bible of comparably tiny size (138 x 93 [107-8 x 63-4] mm, 2 cols./44 lines, 484 fols.) copied during the same period (between 1228 and 1234). This bible may also have been produced in Oxford, like Bodleian Ms. Lat. e.7, and it too has a mendicant provenance, having perhaps been made for an Oxford Dominican, as witnessed by the table of readings (fols. 1r-2v) and Calendar for Dominican use (fols. 3v-4v) preceding its Bible text (fols. 5r-442v) and the IHN (fols. 443r-83r), and suggested by an erased caucio note dated 1432 (?) on fol. 483v.

For a list of these see Kidd’s full bibliographical description; description of the bible; Peter Kidd, “A Franciscan Bible Illuminated in the Style of William de Brailes,” British Library Journal (2007, Article 8): 1-20 [16-20, esp. 17].


See also online record for BL, Arundel Ms. 303 in The British Library’s Catalogue of Illuminated Manuscripts, available here.

The bible may subsequently have passed into the possession of Thomas Howard (1585-1646), 2nd Earl of Arundel, 4th Earl of Surrey, and 1st Earl of Norfolk; certainly owned by Henry Howard (1628-84), 6th Duke of Norfolk, who presented the bible to The Royal Society, London in 1667 (its ink stamp on fol. 3r: “Soc. Reg. Lond / ex dono HENR. HOWARD / Norfohcienis.”); purchased from the Royal Society by the British Museum in 1831, together with 549 other Arundel manuscripts.
iv Conclusions: The Form and Function of 13th-Century Bible-Missals and The Liturgical Use of Portable Bibles

What conclusions may we draw concerning the importance of these portable 13th-century bible-missals? These surviving manuscripts demonstrate that 13th-century bibles certainly were used liturgically. The new format and organization of the 13th-century portable bible enabled preachers and students to easily search and locate the biblical passages they needed for their sermons and commentaries, while this new bible also provided its users with access to the biblical readings for the Mass (as well as those for the Divine Office). These books also supply crucial evidence in evaluating bibles with other types of liturgical texts, including those with liturgical calendars, and most significantly, those with lists of epistle and gospel pericopes for the liturgical year (or capitularies).

Thus these bibles also bear testament to the role played by liturgical needs in shaping the re-organization of the Bible in the period ca. 1220-35 (a period of creativity and innovation manifested in the reorganization of the Vulgate both textually and physically), as witnessed in UPenn Ms. Codex 236’s innovative inclusion of both a breviary and a missal, a design intended to accommodate liturgical use. Even the portable bibles owned by the Dominicans and Franciscans, almost always presented as manuscripts for preachers, should be seen, at least in part, as designed for liturgical use.

Finally, as a book owned and used by individuals, we may see the new one-volume portable bible as the forerunner in new trends in private, as well as public devotion, highlighting the significance of the role it played in linking the individual, the Bible and the liturgy.

Further questions include: How can we contextualize these examples within the context of other late medieval bibles? Or in relation to late medieval biblical manuscripts? And what wider significance does this specific kind of portable bible enact within the histories of the medieval Bible as text and as book?

Light notes: “This may seem to be a very basic point, but it is not self-evident.” (Light 2013: 206).
Calendars are a common liturgical addition; for example see the 16 listed in Light (2011B): 177.
For Bibles with capitularies, or lists of biblical pericopes, see Light (2013): 190 n.16.
‘The Economics of Use’: The Early Professional Book Trade and the Costs and Prices of 13th-Century Portable Bibles

As we have seen, the portable bibles produced during the 13th-century have been taken together as constituting a single ‘type’ of bible (‘the 13th-century bible’; a standardized uniformly-ordered set of texts in a single small volume), characterized as vehicles of change manifested through their standardization of the contents and appearance of the Bible. However as we have also seen, in its eagerness to include all the changes visible in how the Bible came to be copied during this revolutionary century under a single ‘umbrella’ ‘type’ of bible, this portrait mistakes its mark.

Furthermore, if the greatest change visible in the appearance of the Bible as it was produced during the 13th century was one of miniaturization and compression - that is, the imposition of ‘a uniformity of (small) size’ – this picture fails to accommodate trends regarding how the appearance of these bibles’ pages were treated, by which I mean the amount and type of decoration and/or illumination they contained. In other words, if the thousands of copies of these bibles were – and are – very similar from the outside, they are certainly not necessarily so very similar once opened.

Beyond Portability and Functionality: The Affordability and Ownership of Portable Bibles

The miniaturization of the Bible represented by its appearance in the portable copies of the 13th century was by no means peculiar to the production of bibles, but was part of a widespread reduction in the size of books produced over the course of the 13th century: from portable bibles and breviaries to students’ textbooks and other manuals.

---

1383 Positioning questions of cost, price and expense (and illuminated/luxury bibles) in relation to explaining the miniaturization of 13th-century bibles as motivated by a privileging the practical over the ‘picturesque’.
including collections of English parliamentary statutes were produced in small pocket-sized formats.\textsuperscript{1384}

Michael Clanchy notes that “As part of the shift from memory to written record, the emphasis in production had moved by 1300 from large liturgical folios to small intelligible manuals,”\textsuperscript{1385} and although the basic explanation for books getting smaller is that they were gradually changing their function - “The traditional large books were intended to be placed on lecterns and displayed or read aloud [from] in monastic communities” while the new smaller formats “were designed for individual private study, if they were academic books, or meditation, if they were religious”\textsuperscript{1386} - Clanchy argues that this picture is neither as simple nor as straightforward as it first appears, being predicated upon incongruities and contradictions, for within the broad context of 13th-century book production: “Portability and economy are not a complete explanation for small books, as some of them are elaborately ornamented,” and indeed “Illuminated bibles are among the works most frequently produced in pocket-sized formats.”\textsuperscript{1387}

Clanchy’s complicating emphasis on ‘disproving the rule’ that is the standard explanation for why this period saw a reduction in the physical size of books equates book form with book function (so far so good) - “The new smaller formats were designed for individual private study, if they were academic books, or meditation, if they were religious” - although small bibles were a special case in that they were both religious and academic texts which functioned for both purposes of both individual private study and for meditation/other ‘religious’ uses. However Clanchy proposes that the inclusion of ornamentation and illumination in these bibles must be considered as negating, or at least disrupting, this equation of books’ function (i.e. their format as designed to encourage particular modes of bible use) dictating their form (i.e. their smaller size and portability); in other words, such bibles were produced in portable format to permit and respond to a desire by a particular group of users to use these books in a particular way, and in pursuit

\textsuperscript{1384} M.T. Clanchy, \textit{From Memory to Written Record. England 1066-1307}, 2\textsuperscript{nd} ed. (Oxford” Blackwell Publishing, 1993): 114-144 (esp. 134-5) & pls. XVI-XVII; Clanchy here defines ‘pocket size’ formats as 15 x 12 cm or less [134-5].
\textsuperscript{1385} M.T. Clanchy, \textit{From Memory to Written Record} (1993): 134-5.
\textsuperscript{1386} For example, the earliest Book of Hours extant in England (the De Brailes Hours, BL, Add. Ms. 49999) is literally a handbook; “its dimensions are those of an adult’s pair of hands, so that it can be used without effort.” M. T. Clanchy, \textit{From Memory to Written Record} (1993): 134-5.
\textsuperscript{1387} M. T. Clanchy, \textit{From Memory to Written Record} (1993): 135.
of these uses of these bibles, these bible-users privileged the practical over the decorative and never the twain should meet.

However, the production and survival of many examples of ‘luxury’ portable bibles demonstrate that while portability and economy may not constituted a complete explanation for the production of all small bibles, neither are the functional advantages or practicality of bibles copied in this format and the extent to which they include decoration and/or illumination mutually-exclusive.

Concerning the production of expensive ‘luxury’ portable bibles

Over the course of the 13th century portable bibles came to be produced containing an increasingly broad range of degrees of decoration; put another way, a great number of them were produced as what are considered ‘luxury’ bibles, their pages alive with vibrant decoration and sparkling with lavish illuminations. Then, as today, such delights did not come cheap, and the production and purchase costs for these ‘luxury’ copies of ‘the 13th-century portable bible’ would clearly have been higher than those for plainer copies which contained little or no decoration or golden embellishment. The production of these expensive copies reflects a growing contemporary demand for luxury books and copies of a higher quality. To locate the motives, means and agents of the production of more luxurious and expensive yet still compact and portable copies of the Bible in the 13th century, we must turn to consider the emergent professional book trade of this period.

The social make-up of this audience/consumer market - whose increasing use of portable bibles catalyzed copies’ production and sales - was certainly not limited to preachers, friars, masters and students. It is very clear that the early book trade, especially in Paris, Oxford and Bologna, was not only catering for an academic market but also had a local clientele that was both lower and higher than the university in the hierarchy of customers, including royal and ecclesiastical administrators, wealthy aristocratic families,

---

1388 Does this result in the limited accessibility of portable bibles or simply of certain (‘luxury’/expensive) copies? Is there an increase in the production of ‘luxury’ portable bibles? What portion of the overall number of portable bibles produced do ‘luxury’ bibles represent?

1389 Books whose primary function was to serve as luxurious commodities – gifts, symbols of status etc. - rather than as tools for study, teaching or learning.
and communities of urban friars. Examples of 13th-century portable bibles produced for royal patrons include the portable bible owned by King Louis IX of France and subsequently by Jean, duc de Berry (now BnF, Paris, Ms. lat. 10426) – which is not as extraordinary as one might expect ("an ordinary, ‘off-the-peg’ specimen": R. Gameson)\textsuperscript{1390}, whereas the bible of Charles V (now Bibliothèque de l’Arsenal, Paris, Ms. 590) is visually a book “fit for a king”\textsuperscript{1391} and the bible given by Blanche de Castille to Saint-Victor (now BnF, Paris, Ms. lat. 14397) is similarly lavish (although not portable). 13th-century portable bibles which belonged to for aristocratic patrons included copies owned by Thomas of Gloucester, Margaret, Duchess of Clarence (now BL, Add. Ms. 40,006) and Dame Eleanor Cobham, Duchess of Gloucester (now Trinity College, Dublin, Ms. 44).

Ultimately, such expensive copies were being produced in response to the rich tastes of wealthy urban lay customers, many of them people who had never owned books before, from clerks and administrators of estates to royal officials and the local nobility.\textsuperscript{1392} From the producers’ perspective, demand was not in short supply, and thus the entrepreneurial book makers of the early professional trade made certain that neither were bibles in short supply to ensure that this demand never went unmet.

\textbf{b} In 13th-Century Paris: The Prominence of Portable Bibles within the canon of Illuminated Luxury Bibles produced in Branner’s Ateliers\textsuperscript{1393}

For example, as discussed above\textsuperscript{1394}, of the fourteen-plus 13th-century Parisian ateliers (or paintshops) identified and distinguished by Branner, four can demonstrably be seen as having specialized in the production of bibles, and particularly bibles in portable format (that is to say that of the manuscripts Branner attributes to them, an

\textsuperscript{1390} BnF, MS lat. 10426 (295 x 205 mm): Robert Branner, “Saint Louis et l’enluminure parisiennne”, Septième centenaire de la mort de Saint Louis: Actes des colloques de Royaumont et de Paris, ed. Louis Carolus-Barré (Paris, 1976): 69-84 (esp. 82-83 with Fig. 6); see Gameson (2013): 79 & n.30.


\textsuperscript{1392} De Hamel, “The European Medieval Book” (2010): 44

\textsuperscript{1393} Cf. Appendix IB.

\textsuperscript{1394} See Chapter 2.
overwhelming majority are bibles, and an overwhelming majority of these bibles are in portable size.\footnote{These Parisian ateliers who specialized in portable bibles are: the Gautier Lebaude Atelier (of the 15 manuscripts ascribed to the Gautier Lebaude Atelier, 13 are bibles, and 10 of these 13 bibles are portable; comprising 6 ‘pocket’ and 4 ‘Saddle Bag’); the Mathurin Atelier (of the 29 manuscripts ascribed to the Mathurin Atelier – which comprises 25 manuscripts ascribed to the Atelier outright and 4 manuscripts ‘Closely Related’ - 27 are bibles, including all 4 ‘Closely Related’ manuscripts, and 24 of these 27 are portable bibles; comprising 21 ‘pocket’ and 3 ‘Saddle Bag’); the Soissons Atelier (of the 21 manuscripts ascribed to the Soissons Atelier, 18 are bibles, and 14 of these 18 are portable bibles; comprising 12 ‘pocket’ and 2 ‘Saddle Bag’); the Aurifaber Atelier (of the 35 manuscripts ascribed to the Aurifaber Atelier, 32 are bibles, and 30 of these 32 are portable bibles; comprising 22 ‘pocket’ and 8 ‘Saddle Bag’); and also the Johannes Grusch Atelier (of the 36 manuscripts ascribed to the Johannes Grusch Atelier, 15 are bibles, and 10 of these 15 are portable bibles; comprising 7 ‘pocket’ and 3 ‘Saddle Bag’). These are significant proportions; together 82 of the total 94 manuscripts attributed to these workshops are bibles and the vast majority of them are portable bibles.} In 13th-Century Oxford: The prominence of bibles (especially portable bibles) out of the manuscripts attributed to The de Brailes Atelier (William de Brailes and Associates)\footnote{Of all the books attributed to William de Brailes and the De Brailes Atelier, which include deluxe psalters, the earliest extant English Book of Hours, university textbooks...}
and individual leaves;\textsuperscript{1402} bibles represent the largest portion.\textsuperscript{1403} To date, a total of twelve bibles have been identified as products of the De Brailes atelier or attributed to that workshop; four are in Oxford\textsuperscript{1404} and another in Cambridge;\textsuperscript{1405} three currently reside in Philadelphia;\textsuperscript{1406} two are in London,\textsuperscript{1407} and two more are to be found in Perth and York respectively.\textsuperscript{1408}

It is fitting that the work and characteristic style of de Brailes was first identified in a pair of 13th-century pocket bibles by Sydney Cockerell in 1930,\textsuperscript{1409} whose attribution was echoed by Graham Pollard in 1955.\textsuperscript{1410} From these humble beginnings, an additional six bibles featuring decoration in De Brailes’ style were identified by Adelaide Bennett in 1972.\textsuperscript{1411} A little over a decade later, Nigel Morgan added one more (in 1985).\textsuperscript{1412}


\textsuperscript{1403} For an updated list of manuscripts and leaves attributed to de Brailes and his associates, see Nigel Morgan’s companion vol. to the recent facsimile Leaves from a Psalter by William de Brailes, [II] Commentary (London, The Folio Society, 2012): Appendix II (91-98).

\textsuperscript{1404} Two are in the Bodleian Library (Ms. Lat. bibl. e.7 and Ms. Laud Lat. 13), and two are in college libraries (Merton College, Oxford, Ms. 7 and Christ Church, Oxford, Ms. 105)

\textsuperscript{1405} Gonville & Caius College, Cambridge, Ms. 350

\textsuperscript{1406} Free Library of Philadelphia, Ms. Lewis E 29, E 30 and E 31

\textsuperscript{1407} British Library, Harley Ms. 2813 and Gray’s Inn, London, Ms. 24

\textsuperscript{1408} (Perth, Museum & Art Gallery Ms. 462 and York Minster Library, Ms. XVI.N.6)

\textsuperscript{1409} The two bibles are now Bodleian Library, Ms. Lat. bibl. e.7 (then ex-Dyson Perrins, Ms. 5) and Perth, Museum & Art Gallery (Ms. 462); see Sydney C. Cockerell, The Work of W. de Brailes: An English Illuminator of the Thirteenth Century (Cambridge: Roxburghe Club, 1930): 5.

\textsuperscript{1410} Pollard attributed seven manuscripts to de Brailes; Graham Pollard, “William de Brailes,” Bodleian Library Record V (1955): 202–9 [203-5].

\textsuperscript{1411} Bennett also extending the scope of the group by attributing their origins to a de Brailes workshop rather than to William alone. The six bibles Bennett attributed to de Brailes are Free Library of Philadelphia, Ms. Lewis E 29; York Minster Library, Ms. XVI.N.6; Bodleian Library, Oxford, Ms. Laud Lat. 13; Gray’s Inn, London, Ms. 24; Gonville & Caius College, Cambridge, Ms. 350; and Merton College, Oxford, Ms. 7. See A. Bennett, “The Place of Garrett 28 in Thirteenth-Century English Illumination,” Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis (Columbia University, 1976): discussed at 58-63 and listed in Appendix I A-C, nos. 14-17, 19-20 [307-12].

\textsuperscript{1412} Christ Church, Oxford, Ms. 105; Morgan’s five de Brailes bibles (“the main examples of the bibles produced by the Oxford workshop of de Brailes”) are: Gray’s Inn, London, Ms. 24; Bodleian Library, Oxford, Ms. Laud Lat 13; Christ Church, Oxford, Ms. 105; Merton College, Oxford, Ms. 7; and Free Library of Philadelphia, Ms. Lewis 29. See Nigel J. Morgan, Survey IV.1 (1982): 86. For an updated list of manuscripts and leaves attributed to de Brailes and his associates by Morgan, see his companion vol. to the recent facsimile Leaves from a Psalter by William de Brailes, II: Commentary (London, The Folio Society, 2012): Appendix II (91-98).
recent years, three further proposed identifications have swelled the ranks of the corpus of bibles from the de Brailes workshop still further; in 2007 Peter Kidd argued for the addition of a bible related to the Oxford Franciscans,\textsuperscript{1413} and only last year Cynthia Johnston suggested two further de Brailes portable bibles.\textsuperscript{1414}

In addition to bibles’ overwhelming domination of the De Brailes corpus of manuscripts, what is immediately striking about the bibles themselves is their size; ten of the total twelve are of portable size, including four of ‘pocket’ size,\textsuperscript{1415} and six of ‘saddle-bag’ size.\textsuperscript{1416} Indeed we may go further; if we extend the parameters of our ‘pocket size’ category by only 3 mm (i.e. increase the max ‘pocket’ height from 200 to 203 mm),\textsuperscript{1417} half of these bibles (six) may be considered ‘pocket’ bibles.\textsuperscript{1418}

Bibles also dominate the group of eight manuscripts attributed to the William of Devon group, a collection of French-trained illuminators working in Oxford from the middle of the 13\textsuperscript{th} century, which includes five bibles.\textsuperscript{1419} In comparison, only one of the six surviving books containing work attributed to the Sarum Master, active in Salisbury

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item[\textsuperscript{1415}] Bodleian Library, Ms. Lat. bibl. e.7 (167 x 116 mm); Free Library of Philadelphia, Ms. Lewis E 29 (185 x 125 mm); British Library, Harley Ms. 2813 (183 x 133 mm); and Free Library of Philadelphia, Ms. Lewis E 30 (146 x 108 mm).
\item[\textsuperscript{1416}] Perth, Museum & Art Gallery Ms. 462 (203 x 146 mm); York Minster Library, Ms. XVI.N.6 (203 x 143 mm); Bodleian Library, Oxford, Ms. Laud Lat. 13 (4to); Gray’s Inn, London, Ms. 24 (232 x 160 mm); Gonville & Caius College, Cambridge, Ms. 350 (245 x 157 mm); Free Library of Philadelphia, Ms. Lewis E 31 (222 x 165 mm). Only two of the total twelve are ‘lectern’ bibles: Merton College, Oxford, Ms. 7 (310 x 205 mm) and Christ Church, Oxford, Ms. 105 (300 x 210 mm).
\item[\textsuperscript{1417}] And thus include Perth, Museum & Art Gallery Ms. 462 (203 x 146 mm) and York Minster Library, Ms. XVI.N.6 (203 x 143 mm).
\item[\textsuperscript{1418}] Comprising: Free Library of Philadelphia, Ms. Lewis E 30 (146 x 108 mm); Bodleian Library, Ms. Lat. bibl. e.7 (167 x 116 mm); British Library, Harley Ms. 2813 (183 x 133 mm); Free Library of Philadelphia, Ms. Lewis E 29 (185 x 125 mm); York Minster Library, Ms. XVI.N.6 (203 x 143 mm); and Perth, Museum & Art Gallery Ms. 462 (203 x 146 mm).
\item[\textsuperscript{1419}] In addition to one Psalter and a Book of Hours; see N. Morgan, \textit{Survey IV.2} (1988): nos. 159-164 (152-162).
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
ca. 1244-55, is a bible (BL, Royal Ms. 1.B.XII, the Bible of William of Hales; dated by its colophon to 1254).\textsuperscript{1420}

Although this evidence could hardly be taken as suggesting that portable bibles constituted a significant proportion of the decorated and/or illuminated books being produced in 13\textsuperscript{th}-century Paris, Oxford (and London?), it does demonstrate that while portability and economy may not constitute a complete explanation for the production of all small bibles, neither are the functional advantages or practicality of bibles copied in this format and the extent to which they include decoration and/or illumination mutually-exclusive. The production and survival of many examples of ‘luxury’ portable bibles shows that although the size of these bibles suggests a practical privileging of functionality (as suggested by their portability) over a concern for aesthetic luxury (as represented by the high quality of the decoration and illumination with which their contents were embellished) there was demonstrably a demand for beautiful ‘luxury’ pandect bibles in portable format, and an audience of sufficient size and means to pay for them.

13\textsuperscript{th}-century bible-missals were not commonly luxurious illuminated books; many of the bible-missals Light identifies, such as Boston, Ms. qMed 202 and British Library, Ms. Harley 1748, lack illumination and therefore, suggests Light, “must have been less expensive.”\textsuperscript{1421} However a number of such bible-missals are very fine luxurious books with distinguished illumination; in addition to UPenn Ms. Codex 236, examples include Bodleian Library, Oxford, Ms. lat. bib.e.7, Huntington HM 26061 and BnF, Paris, lat. Mss. 36 and 10431,\textsuperscript{1422} although it should be noted that this level of opulence is neither very common nor characteristic of this ‘type’ of 13\textsuperscript{th}-century bible.

However it is important to note that although bible production comes to take place on a larger, grander scale than that known hitherto, through the early professional book trade, and thus that copies were becoming increasingly available as a result of the vast numbers of portable bibles produced, the increasing availability of portable bibles did

\textsuperscript{1420} The other five books consist of two psalters, a missal, a bestiary, and an Apocalypse; see N. Morgan, Survey IV.2 (1988): nos. 98-103 (53-66).
\textsuperscript{1421} Light (2013): 194; cf. also ‘Appendix’ (208-14).
\textsuperscript{1422} For summary descriptions of these bible-missals (and relevant bibliography) see Light (2013): Appendix (208-14).
not automatically result in the increased accessibility of all portable bibles. In other words, although more bibles became available because more were being produced at a faster - and accelerating - rate, ‘portable bibles’ were not easier to access simply by virtue of their increased availability per se; the prohibitive pricing of a portion of these bibles produced (namely ‘luxury’ copies) must have rendered them inaccessible to many potential users.

In a recent essay considering the form and function of 13th-century portable bibles, Peter Stallybrass has recently raised three “major problems” concerning how these bibles were used (“about which we certainly do not know enough”), the first of which concerns their cost. Stallybrass argues that a 13th-century pocket bible “was always a luxury item,” a fact that he attributes to the high costs of materials required for their production, in particular “the beautiful thin parchment used for so many of the pocket Bibles.” By extension, Stallybrass suggests that “the staggering cost” of these bibles would have directly impacted those who would have used these bibles, based on their relative possession (or lack) of the financial resources necessary to be able to have access to copies. In particular, Stallybrass singles out mendicant use, claiming that while the friars demonstrably used these bibles, the “staggering cost of even the plainest of Bibles” suggests that their purchase “was more likely to have been institutional than personal.”

However Stallybrass’ suggestion that portable bibles would have been expensive books as a kind of book and thus could not be purchased by the majority of the medieval population stands at odds with the idea that the appearance of the Bible copied in portable format marked the beginning of a kind of ‘democratization’ of the audience who gained access to copies of the Bible in the 13th century, both in terms of their (increased) number and the broadening of their social make-up (i.e. more people using copies from

---

1423 The three major problems that Stallybrass raises are: Problem 1, the cost of these bibles; Problem 2, the size of the script in pocket bibles; Problem 3, how Late Medieval Bibles could be (and were) actually used in practice; see Peter Stallybrass, “Epilogue,” in Form and Function in the Late Medieval Bible, Eds. Eyal Poleg & Laura Light (Boston; Leiden: Brill, 2013): 379-394 [on Problem 1, see 388-90; on Problem 2, see 390-1; and on Problem 3, see 391-4].

1424 “Although such manuscripts would, of course, have required only a fraction of the skins used in the making of the giant Romanesque Bibles, the fineness of the parchment (from whatever animal it came and however it was prepared) must surely have meant it was always a luxury item.” Peter Stallybrass, “Epilogue,” in Form and Function in the Late Medieval Bible (2013): 388.

1425 Peter Stallybrass, “Epilogue,” in Form and Function in the Late Medieval Bible (2013): 388.
across a wider portion of the spectrum of medieval [English?] society than ever before). Laura Light argues that these portable 13th-century copies are the first bibles to be owned by individuals and to be used exclusively by a single user, through their private possession by individuals, while others – including Richard and Mary Rouse and Lori Anne Ferrell - have argued that these books had radical consequences for access to the Bible, particularly for members of the laity.

How can we reconcile these seemingly opposing views? Some caution and qualification are required here. From which side of the producer-consumer fence did the motivator for the acceleration and escalation of their production originate? Which came first, a supply of bibles or a demand for them? Did supply expand to meet an expanding demand (viz. user/customer-driven), or did the increasing supply of copies generate an increasing demand for more? (viz. producer-driven) Furthermore, did the use of these portable bibles by a greater number of new users and owners of portable bibles from across a wider ‘social range’ stem from their increased availability period? (i.e. more people use them because there are more copies being made, and thus there are more copies available for them to use) or was the broadening of their user-group the result of these bibles’ increased availability to these audiences? (i.e. the more copies there were, the cheaper copies became and thus the wider became the group of potential users).

d Concerning the production of expensive ‘luxury’ portable bibles

1426 “For the first time in the Middle Ages, in the thirteenth century Bibles were copied in significant numbers, making them much more widely available to individuals that they had been earlier. … The Paris Bible was a product of the commercial book trade, a book purchased by students and masters from the university (including many from the new mendicant orders), as well as by other members of the church, the monarchy and the court, and by many others who did business in Paris.” (Light 2011: 228-29, my italics). “For the first time in the Middle Ages, the Bible became a book owned and used by individuals, ranging from the students and masters of the new and rapidly growing universities, to the bishops and priests of a church that was emphasising its pastoral role as never before, to the wandering preachers of the Franciscan and Dominican orders. Moreover, although the language of the Latin Bible meant its use and study were primarily the province of the clergy, the existence of many finely illuminated copies suggests that Bibles were also owned and treasured by wealthy members of the nobility and urban elite.”[Light 2012: 380, my italics).

1427 Richard and Mary Rouse argue that these bibles represent the Bible’s descent “from the communal altar to become the private property of the priest, a personal possession of the friar” (M.A. & R.H. Rouse, Authentic Witnesses 1991: 214) while Lori Anne Ferrell argues that “These new smaller-scale, practical Bibles were...not only the harbingers but also the primary symbols of a changing, increasingly intimate relationship between the Bible and ordinary people” (Lori Anne Ferrell, The Bible and the People 2008: 38).
Were portable bibles expensive books (and thus portable bibles were of limited accessibility) or rather was it that certain portable bibles (i.e. ‘luxury’ copies) were expensive? In order words, do we find evidence of portable bibles being relatively affordable as a kind of book and thus not exclusive for the kind of audience who might be able to use them, while ‘luxury’ or ‘deluxe’ copies were, by definition, available only to a limited audience?

Through its very nature as a commercial network, the enterprising individuals of the early professional book trade and the type and quality of volumes they produced were responding to the rise of a new market for books; the increase in wealthy patrons fuelled the production of luxury bibles, whose lavish contents and top-notch quality were catering to this market (i.e. costly to produce thus expensive purchases).

However, since an increase in the ‘luxurious’ quality of a book inevitably effects a direct increase in the cost of its production and its price of purchase, and a proportional decrease in its affordability, and since affordability directly impacts the size and make-up of potential User/Owner Group, the increased cost (and reduced affordability) of luxury bibles also reduced their accessibility.

Now while it is true that this reduction in the accessibility of portable bibles is a reduction in the accessibility of ‘a specific kind of bible’ to ‘a particular section of these bibles’ overall User/Owner Group’ (i.e. the inaccessibility of luxury bibles to those of limited financial resources, or at least insufficient resources to afford this kind of bible), the section of this User/Owner Group those access to this kind of bible was impacted (owing to their limited financial resources) comprised precisely the clientele in response to whose requirements the texts and format of portable bibles had first been tailored, and thus to whose use they were best suited; in order words, the friars and the pecunially-challenged members of the university communities.

For example, consider the friars’ use of portable bibles: although mendicant ideals of poverty and purpose stimulated a pragmatic attitude to books, and friars’ books were generally volumes of utilitarian character, in which the use of decoration was restricted and its execution was austere, many examples of friars’ bibles survive which are certainly not ‘of utilitarian character’, and in which the use of decoration was not restricted nor its execution austere. Many could certainly be described as ‘luxury bibles’; highly decorated,
sometimes with extensive programs of illumination. If portable bibles were such very expensive books (etc.) this is certainly perplexing.

Concerning the cost/price/‘expense’ of portable bibles in general

In thinking about the relationship between the (new) users of portable bibles and their cost/price and affordability (which could constitute the deciding factor dividing use and users from owners and ownership) we must consider the different methods through which individuals could physically access a (portable) bible for personal, private use. Through what different kinds of transaction did bibles change hands? Where did such transactions take place and who was involved? If these are the first bibles to be owned by individuals and, through their private possession, to be used exclusively by a single user, how could individuals acquire bibles for this specific ‘new’ kind of private and personal use in late medieval Europe?

As we have seen, ‘new’ bibles could be acquired from ‘new’ sources via ‘old’ methods; in other words, copies of the ‘new’ Bible could be obtained through ‘new’ providers in ‘new’ locations (i.e. via the ‘new’ commercial book trade in urban centers, and one’s purchase may not itself have been a ‘new’ copy - i.e. one’s purchase may have been second-hand; a fact that was itself novel).

However the available methods of bible-acquisition had not changed. Although there were certainly more opportunities for purchasing a bible, purchase was still only one of multiple methods through which one could access a copy of the Bible. Most commonly, one could borrow, or be loaned, a copy, most likely from your institutional library (or possibly request the loan of a copy from the library of a another institution, perhaps a neighboring house); but one could possibly borrow one from a friend or colleague. One could also receive a copy, for example as a gift or as a bequest etc. (after all, then, as now, books made for the best presents). Moreover, theft was also an option, either stolen outright deliberately (for the unscrupulous or the criminally-inclined) or, in the case of bibles borrowed but never returned, ‘stolen’ accidentally (i.e. ‘stolen’ by absent-minded borrowers).

1428 See Appendix II.B.
1429 i.e. In order to obtain a copy to which an individual had the exclusive use and complete freedom of personal access to its contents, rather than via accessing a copy through ‘in-house’ consultation of a ‘communal’ copy or ‘reference’ volume.
Let us therefore pursue the question “Were portable bibles ‘expensive’?” This certainly seems to be a relatively straightforward question and not an unreasonable one; it is generally among the first questions asked today when showing medieval manuscripts to a non-specialist audience (particularly an audience of students!) However, although sensible and understandable questions to ask, they are not simple to answer. To attempt to answer these questions raises another query, consisting of two parts: first, ‘Can we assess whether or not these bibles were ‘expensive’?’ and second, ‘How can we assess whether these bibles were ‘expensive’?’ Here we encounter the twin challenges of the relatively scarcity of the medieval book prices necessary from which to draw data-based conclusions and the fact that what little evidence does survive is notoriously difficult to interpret. Put simply, medieval book prices are few in number, hard to find, and slippery to interpret. All in all, the whole business is guaranteed to inspire a resounding headache in even the most redoubtable of scholars.

The troublesome nature of medieval book prices – as elusive and resistant to quantification – is rooted in the nature of book production as a bespoke trade, where buyers would likely contract with several different practitioners of the book arts (such as a parchment maker, scribe, illuminator, and binder), either directly or through a stationer, to purchase products that precisely met their specifications and budget and the nature

1430 Bell noted, “There seem to be few surviving instances of recorded book prices in England before the end of the thirteenth-century”; indeed, of 1,500 prices Bell collected relating to premodern books, “scarcely a dozen relate to dates previous to 1300” (although Bell does not make clear what he means by “recorded book prices”, i.e. what he considers to qualify as a “recorded book price” or as a record of a book’s price, and does not specify where, when, or by whom the prices he is discussing were recorded). Bell comments: “In some ways this is strange, for the very rarity of books in the earlier period made them especially objects to be undertaken with care, and even ceremony” and thus one might reasonably expect the finances of their production to be recorded with some care. H.E. Bell, “Price of Books” (1936): 312.

1431 Or as Bell puts it, “such prices as there are tend to be picturesque… [and] do not give a firm basis for statistical conclusions!” (H.E. Bell, “Price of Books” 1936: 312-13). NB: Although Bell seemed unimpressed by the “picturesque” nature of descriptions of this kind, they are certainly valuable as records offering insight into the means and methods of the kinds of economic transactions through which books changed hands in medieval society; and what’s more, they are undeniably charming in their own way. Cf. Eamon Duffy, Marking the Hours: English People and Their Prayers (London; New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 2006): 22.

of medieval manuscript as a unique hand-produced item - since scripts, illumination, parchment, and binding may differ considerably between manuscripts compared in a single set of examples. Thus, as Overty puts it, “Any examination of manuscript prices can often take on the clichéd difficulty of comparing apples and oranges.”

Thus it is perhaps not surprising that the subject (of medieval book prices) has received comparatively little scholarly attention, although useful studies have included H.E. Bell’s study of the price of books in medieval England, studies by R. Malcolm Hogg and Wilbur Lang Schramm on book prices in the 13th and 15th centuries respectively and E.A. Savage’s Old English Libraries includes a handy reference list of ‘Prices of Books and Materials for Bookmaking’. Nor is scholarship on the costs associated with manuscript production extensive, although studies which have touched upon various commodities as components of manuscript production include James E. Thorold Rogers’ exploration of the prices of parchment and paper while J.J.G. Alexander and Christopher de Hamel have both used prices to examine the cost of scribes, illumination, and parchment.

---

1435 H.E. Bell’s study is still the most often cited by scholars, offering more of a survey of manuscript prices rather than a comprehensive analysis; see H.E. Bell, “The Price of Books in Medieval England,” Library 4th ser., 17 (1936-7): 312-32 (on writing prices see 314-17, on illuminating prices see 318-20, on the cost of materials see 320-21, and on binding prices see 321-24; cf. on the prices of complete volumes see 324-32).
What guidance have scholars provided on the medieval price(s) of Latin bibles?

John R.H. Moorman estimated that in the 13th century bibles were prohibitively priced: “The average price of even the cheapest bibles...must have been something like £50 in modern money [in 1945],” a view supported by Margaret Deanesley, who argued that “The Vulgate was so valuable a book that few individuals except bishops possessed it before 1300,” although added that “It had become cheap enough for most cathedral clergy to possess one before 1400.”

De Hamel (2001) argued that a bible purchased in 1473 for 20s/£1 (in Oxford) constituted “no small sum” and that another purchased for £3 6s. 8d ca. 1463-80 (in Hereford) represented “a considerable sum for a second-hand book” (see ). However, in terms of a ‘suggested price-range’, the ‘standard’ estimation remains H.E. Bell’s suggestion that during the period 1300-1530, a ‘typical’ price for a Latin bible would have been between £2 and £4, a conclusion based on 36 priced Latin Bibles from different dates between the 14th- through early 16th centuries, the majority - or almost two-thirds - of which ranged in price from £2 to £4 (23 of 36 examples), with around a quarter costing over £4 (8 of 36) and a sixth costing under £2 (5 of 36).

The cost of all books, in terms of their ‘cash value’, was determined by a number of common basic factors, including the length of its text, the kind and quality of materials required for its production, and the book’s binding (whose cost was determined by the number of volumes the work comprised and their size). Furthermore, there were a number of ‘Optional Extras’ complicit in the production of certain kinds of books, factors such as the amount and quality of decoration and of illumination added, and whether the text required glossing or the addition of musical notation. And obviously, the relative

---

1442 The bible measures 152 x 102 mm and contains 542 folios. Pede’s purchase is recorded (personally?) in a faint note written in a 15th-century hand on a rear flyleaf, “Ista biblia sunt [or “sac”?] magistri canapede doctore quem emebat apud Hereford pro iii lib viiij d.” (cited in De Hamel, The Book: 139). Cf. entry in M.R. James, A descriptive catalogue of the manuscripts in the library of Eton College (Cambridge: CUP, 1895): 112-14 (113).
expense attendant on all these factors could be influenced by the quality of the craftsmanship; simply put, you got what you paid for.\textsuperscript{1444}

However, it is important to emphasize that these factors determining books’ price of purchase are all based on costs incurred at the time of its production; i.e. a book’s price of purchase in the 13\textsuperscript{th} century was determined by the costs incurred during its production (respective costs of scribal labor, of materials and of binding etc.).\textsuperscript{1445}

Any attempt to offer an approximate figure for how much a bible cost to purchase, or to gain a rough picture of the sum at which a bible was valued (i.e. how much it was thought to be ‘worth’ financially) must take into account the particular date and environment of the purchase. How expensive these bibles were could depend, at a basic level, on when one was purchasing the book and upon the kind of purchase transaction one was making. The first type of type of purchase transaction was that made at the time of the book’s production – in the 13\textsuperscript{th}-century (i.e. purchased first-hand from the producer via a bespoke trade), and the second type of type of purchase transaction was that made post-production, or after the book had already been produced – after the 13\textsuperscript{th} century, e.g. 14\textsuperscript{th} through 15\textsuperscript{th} centuries (i.e. purchased secondhand). The first involved the book’s ‘cost’, or the amount of money that the book cost to produce (i.e. the sum expended in the book’s production; how much the book cost to make);\textsuperscript{1446} therefore ‘cost’ concerns the act of production and relates to producers and patrons. The second involved the book’s ‘price’, or the amount of money necessary to expend/oultay to purchase the book (i.e. the book’s price ‘on the shelf’/’in the store’; the amount of money paid for the book by the purchaser - how much a bible cost to purchase);\textsuperscript{1447} therefore ‘price’ concerns the act of purchase or acquisition and relates to purchasers.

\textsuperscript{1447}‘price’ \textit{@OED}: \{IV\} Cost: \{IV.8a\} “Payment of money for the purchase of something.”; \{IV.8b\} “The amount of money expected, or required, or given in payment for a commodity or service.”
2 Production Costs and Purchase Prices for 13th-Century Portable Bibles

I Bespoke Trade ~ The Costs Involved in Bible Production

In suggesting a ‘typical’ price for a Latin bible of between £2 and £4 (during the period 1300-1530), Bell suggested this price range to be “neither high nor low as the prices of other books went,” arguing that within the wide range of prices of books, bibles tended to be located somewhere between service-books, at the expensive end of the spectrum, and university texts were at the opposite end. Bibles’ intermediate position between these two categories may reasonably be attributed to the fact that in certain cases, bibles bore what Bell called “a close kinship” to service-books and, in others, to the simpler academic texts.

As a class, service-books tended to be most extravagantly decorated and the prices paid for their illumination on occasion ran to extraordinary heights. For example, of the colossal costs involved in the production of the Missal for Abbot Litlyngton of Westminster in 1383-4, whose production cost a gigantic £39 10s 10d, the writing of the missal was its lowest cost (at slightly over £4) amount the cost of its illumination was by far its greatest expense, at a glittering £26 0s 14d, a sum which included £22 0s 3d for its large initials (“grossae litterae”) and 10s for its “pictura” (the full-page miniature of the Crucifixion), followed by £8 14s 7d for its binding (including 21s “pro ligacione”, 8s 4d “pro coopertura”, 6s 10d “pro broudera”, 12s for six “nodulis” and 4s

---

1452 The £4 cost included two years’ board and lodging for the scribe, Thomas Preston (who was paid just over 9d per week); Westminster Abbey, London, Age of Chivalry: no. 715.
6d “in j baga”) and £5 7s 8d for its parchment (comprising 32 dozen “percamenti vitulini” plus a further three quires of twelve folios apiece). Furthermore, a large portion of service-books also required the addition of musical notation, a requirement that could significantly influence their production costs, since this was a task that “would have required special skills beyond those of many ordinary scribes.”

On the other hand, out of the total production costs of £3 4s 1d for writing, illuminating and binding a lectionary (or is this a Legendary; referred to as a “legend”) for the Church of St. Ewen, Bristol in 1468-71 (recorded in extracts from the Parish accounts), the writing of its text was by far the most costly expense, at 29s 2d compared to 15s 12d for parchment and 18s 11d for illuminating and correcting its

Concerning the cost of having the Missal bound, the Abbot’s Treasurer’s Roll specifies the following charges: “pro ligacione xxjs.; pro coopertura viiijs. iiiijd.; pro broudera vjs. xd.; in vj nodulis xijs.; in j baga iiijs. vjd.” and the earlier account records a further £6 2s 7d already paid for binding expenses; Westminster Abbey, London, Age of Chivalry: no. 715.

The book utilized 156 prepared skins (consisting of thirteen quires of twelve folios each, each bifolium being a single calf skin) at a cost of £4 6s 8d for “xiiij duo decenis percamenti vitulini” plus a further payment of £1 1s for three further quires of twelve folios at 7s each in 1386-7.


Extracts from the Parish accounts of the Church of St. Ewen, Bristol, 1469-70 are printed in Sir John MacClean, “Notes on the Accounts of the Procurators, or Churchwardens, of the Parish of St. Ewen’s, Bristol,” in Transactions of the Bristol and Gloucestershire Archaeological Society, XV (1891): 139-182 [257, 260]; also reproduced in J.H. Middelton, Illuminated Manuscripts in Classical and Mediaeval Times: Their Art and Their Technique (Cambridge: CUP, 1892): 223.

The 1468-9 accounts record two payments “for wrytyng of the same”; the first for 25s and the second for 4s 2d.

Two payments for parchment are recorded in the 1468-9 accounts: the first for 10s 6d for seventeen quires of vellum and the second for 5s 6d for a further nine skins and one quire - “for j dossen and v quayers of vellom to perform the legend” / “for ix skynnys and j quayer of velom to the same legend”.

---

1454 Concerning the cost of having the Missal bound, the Abbot’s Treasurer’s Roll specifies the following charges: “pro ligacione xxjs.; pro coopertura viiijs. iiiijd.; pro broudera vjs. xd.; in vj nodulis xijs.; in j baga iiijs. vjd.” and the earlier account records a further £6 2s 7d already paid for binding expenses; Westminster Abbey, London, Age of Chivalry: no. 715.
1455 The book utilized 156 prepared skins (consisting of thirteen quires of twelve folios each, each bifolium being a single calf skin) at a cost of £4 6s 8d for “xiiij duo decenis percamenti vitulini” plus a further payment of £1 1s for three further quires of twelve folios at 7s each in 1386-7.
1457 Extracts from the Parish accounts of the Church of St. Ewen, Bristol, 1469-70 are printed in Sir John MacClean, “Notes on the Accounts of the Procurators, or Churchwardens, of the Parish of St. Ewen’s, Bristol,” in Transactions of the Bristol and Gloucestershire Archaeological Society, XV (1891): 139-182 [257, 260]; also reproduced in J.H. Middelton, Illuminated Manuscripts in Classical and Mediaeval Times: Their Art and Their Technique (Cambridge: CUP, 1892): 223.
1458 The 1468-9 accounts record two payments “for wrytyng of the same”; the first for 25s and the second for 4s 2d.
1459 Two payments for parchment are recorded in the 1468-9 accounts: the first for 10s 6d for seventeen quires of vellum and the second for 5s 6d for a further nine skins and one quire - “for j dossen and v quayers of vellom to perform the legend” / “for ix skynnys and j quayer of velom to the same legend”.
1456 On the other hand, out of the total production costs of £3 4s 1d for writing, illuminating and binding a lectionary (or is this a Legendary; referred to as a “legend”) for the Church of St. Ewen, Bristol in 1468-71 (recorded in extracts from the Parish accounts), the writing of its text was by far the most costly expense, at 29s 2d compared to 15s 12d for parchment and 18s 11d for illuminating and correcting its
contents and binding the volume (and of these, the illumination and decoration of the book constituted the greatest sum by far).1460

In comparison, university texts seem to have been written a good deal more cheaply than service-books.1461 This is attested by a group of seven Peterhouse, Cambridge manuscripts presented to the college in the 15th century - including texts of Augustine, Ambrose and Jerome - all of which contain detailed accounts of the amounts spent on their parchment, writing, illumination and binding,1462 demonstrating that they were copied at roughly twice as many words for the unit of payment as in the case of service-books.”1463

i The Cost of Scribal Labor: Scribes and Speed of Writing

It is very difficult to draw any define conclusions with regard to medieval writing rates for several reasons: first, such prices depended upon the speed at which the text was copied; second, the speed of copying was itself influenced by the length of the text (not on book size); and third, medieval scribes were paid according to widely differing units of wage-measurement (on the one hand, payment might be at a piece-rate with the scribe receiving a fixed sum per leaf, per quire or for the pecia; on the other hand, the scribe might simply be paid on the basis of the time he spend writing.)1464 Nevertheless, in most cases, extraordinary productions excepting, scribal labor constituted the major expense of book production.1465

---

1460 The illumination and decoration of the legend cost 13s 6d (“for the lumining”), compared to less than half that amount for “the binding and correcting of the seid Boke”, which cost 6s plus an additional 5d for “a red Skynne to kever the legent” [1470-1 accounts].
1463 The unit of measurement in the scribe’s account is the quire, and the writing of the manuscripts themselves was done at a fairly constant word-rate of 6,200 per shilling, with the exception of Peterhouse Ms. 88, where the rate is ca. 4,700 words per shilling. Although it often seems that time-rate payments were much lower than those at piece-rates, however this discounts the fact that time-rate payments were often accompanied by free board, livery and lodging. See H.E. Bell, “The Price of Books in Medieval England,” Library 4th ser., 17 (1936-7): 312-32 [315-17].
1464 Although Bell argued that it is possible to make an estimate of an average writing price by relating these various units of measurement to each other and finding their lower common multiple in terms of words per shilling; H.E. Bell, “Price of Books” (1936): 314-17 [314].
At the most basic level the speeds at which medieval scribes could copy texts were governed by what Michael Gullick calls three “fundamental and self-evident truths”: first, “Medieval scribes would usually have written quickly, for writing with a quill on parchment demands speed for success”; second, “All things being equal, we can assume that two contemporary scribes writing the same script would have written at about the same speed”; and third, given that the longer the job took, the lower the speed, since the longer the work takes, the more the scribe will be slowed down, and the more his average will be reduced,1466 “One scribe working in two or three short stints no more than several hours each would probably nearly always have worked faster than one scribe working more or less continuously for eight or more hours.”1467

Thus although the general appearance of a mid-13th-century copy of a text may, at a glance, seem quite close to the appearance of a mid-12th-century copy of the same text, there are of course differences between the hands of a mid-12th-century monastic scribe and a mid-13th-century university scribe, whose hand was designed to be written more quickly.1468 The factors that would have influenced the speed at which monastic and urban-based professional scribes worked may be divided into two categories: the environmental, concerned with the makeup of scribes and the particular conditions in which they worked; and the practical, concerned with materials and techniques.1469

a Environmental factors

Professional scribes ‘came into their own’ in the 13th century; by around the final quarter of the 12th century a professional book trade was beginning to emerge in some university and urban centers and from the last decade of the 12th-century

1466 J.P. Gumbert, “The Speed of Scribes,” *Scribae Colofonii* (1995): 57-69 [62-3]. Cf. Michael Gullick: “Only one text I know written before 1200 mentions the number of hours worked in a day. This is a short piece of verse in a 10th-century manuscript, which opens with a complaint: how arduous above all crafts is the work of the scribe (a common complaint in scribal colophons). The text concludes by stating how hard it is to work bent over parchment for six hours a day.” Michael Gullick, “How Fast Did Scribes Write?” (1992): 43. Gullick also emphasizes that “The powerful impression that books were produced quickly did not mean that they were produced carelessly.” (Gullick, “How Fast Did Scribes Write?” 1992: 42, my italics).


onwards evidence is known concerning an urban-based book trade in several centers, especially in Oxford and London in England, and in Paris and Bologna in France and Italy. However the commercialization of book production which developed over the course of the 13th century by no means implemented an immediate and complete cessation of monastic book production, nor, as Ian Doyle has demonstrated, were the majority of books for ecclesiastical centers in the later Middle Ages written by professionals. Members of enclosed communities certainly did write books for their communities, but not all books written in or for enclosed communities were written by community members. Professional scribes had been active in book production at ecclesiastical centers in England since the 11th and 12th centuries, as Michael Gullick has shown, contra Ker. Their engagement by these communities was intended to help meet the overwhelming and pressing contemporary need to provide books, a need which perhaps could not be met by relying exclusively upon the scribal skills of members of enclosed communities themselves. Furthermore, professionals would of course have been able to work longer hours than cloistered members of


1471 Or, as Schnurman put it, “even monks copied pocket Bibles” (!); Schnurman also argued that “I do not think that the professional workshops were the usual sources from which these uniform, very skillfully written small manuscripts came.” See Schnurman (1960): 198; cf. ibid. on the history of the book trade and the copying of bibles, 1-32; on format and script, 66-78; on dated bibles, 152-156 (cf. on colophons, 157-169).


1474 Gullick defines professional scribes as “Scribes who were not members of enclosed communities but worked writing books for such communities [who] were presumably paid for their work or time in either money, kind or both.” Michael Gullick, “Professional Scribes in Eleventh- and Twelfth-Century England,” in English Manuscript Studies 1100-1700: Vol. 7, Eds. Peter Beal & Jeremy Griffiths (London: British Library, 1998): 1-24 [1].

communities,\(^{1476}\) who had less time available to them to spend writing according to the time necessarily spent in the performance of the Divine Office.\(^{1477}\)

The kind of space in which the scribe was working and where that space was located could impact the speed at which he was able to copy significantly; for example if he was working in enclosed or more isolated situations and was thus compelled to undertake time-consuming or labor-intensive tasks – such as preparing, pricking and ruling his parchment before writing could commence - that might otherwise have been done for him by others or outsourced to professionals.\(^{1478}\)

Before the cloister became an important center in the life of monastic communities, monks probably copied books in their cells, but later the work-place of monastic scribes was usually situated in a sheltered part of the open cloisters, sometimes using carrells, the presence of specific ‘scriptorium’ rooms being “extremely rare” [before the later Middle Ages?].\(^{1479}\) If working out-of-doors, for example in the cloister, the number of hours a day a monk or nun could have spent writing would be restricted. “North of the Alps, bitter winters were no doubt usual and could fingers would have slowed or stopped production,” especially for scribes writing the tiny scripts of pocket bibles which would surely have imposed more arduous demands upon one’s fingers. Henri, the scribe of the Bonne-Esperance Bible, stated that he began work on 26 August 1132 and finished in July 1135, but that he did not work when the weather was

\(^{1476}\) Furthermore, as they might have worked at more than one center, professionals could also have been a means by which new ideas and styles in script and decoration were transmitted from one center to another. Finally, their employment would reflect directly upon the ethos surrounding book production within enclosed communities. In seeking to determine who within the ecclesiastical community was responsible for hiring these professionals and who paid them, one looks to the precentor, or cantor, to whose office the production and maintenance of books - within most enclosed communities of monks, canons or others - were closely bound by the 12th-century, and whose office and administrative responsibilities were also closely tied to those of ‘librarian’ in monastic communities throughout the Middle Ages. (Gullick, “Professional Scribes” 1998: 1). On the monastic equation of the administrative roles of the precentor and ‘librarian’, see Richard Sharpe, “The medieval librarian,” in CHLBI I (CUP, 2008): 218-41, passim (esp. 218-222; on the precentor/ librarian’s income, see 220-222); see also Richard Sharpe, “Library catalogues and indexes,” in CHBB II (CUP 2008): 195-218 [199].


An enclosed scriptorium would have afforded scribes shelter from the weather, especially important during the northern winters. However, as Gullick phrases it, “Evidence for enclosed scriptoria is not common, and scribes’ complaints about cold are not rare.” The earliest reference in English sources to a building housing a scriptorium seems to be at St. Albans. It is not until the 13th-century that another enclosed scriptorium is recorded, when it appears that one had been constructed at Westminster Abbey by 1266 (“domus scriptoriae”).

*b* Practical factors

The increased uniformity of European book production, visible by the mid 12th century and more or less complete by the 13th century reflects the essential character of the work of the urban-based professional, which may be characterized as one of “the

---


1483 In the *Gesta abbatum Monasterii Sancti Albani* (the abbey’s 14th-century chronicle) the scriptorium is clearly described as an independent building (“…quod construxit, scriptorio libros prae electos scribi fecit”), whose construction is credited to the dynamic Abbot Paul (1077-93). Paul commissioned the building of the scriptorium as part of his drive to ensure the swift expansion of the abbey’s library, also arranging that revenue be provided to be used for making books (“Abbate Paulo, scripturarum amatore, ad volumina ecclesiae necessaria facienda…”) and engaging a number of professional scribes to copy texts. Gullick argues that the construction of the St. Albans scriptorium as an independent structure was dictated by all three of these factors; by building the scriptorium as a separate structure: “The professionals would have been kept out of the cloisters and not have disturbed the daily routine of monastic life,” and equally “the monks would not have disturbed the work of the scribes.” *Gesta abbatum Monasterii Sancti Albani*, I, Rolls Series 28 (London, 1867): 57-58. Michael Gullick, “Professional Scribes” (1998): 7 (cf. 7 nn.38-39). A well-known visual colophon showing a layman and monk working side by side in the cloisters is at the end of a manuscript made at Echternach ca.1039 (Bremen, Staatsbibliothek, cod. b.21, fol. 124v); this image is also used in J.J.G. Alexander, *Medieval Illuminators* (1992); Fig. 16 [12].


maximum effect created with the minimum of effort.”\footnote{1486} The mechanics of this change must have been realized by differences in training, one focus of which was certainly the rapid production of work, whether of script or of decoration.\footnote{1487} Needless to say, for the professional scribe, time was money; many scribes were paid for their labor rather than for their time, and this would have encouraged the rapid execution of work.\footnote{1488}

The practical considerations which could influence the speed at which scribes copied texts included the type of script, how much text was to be copied, the amount of text on each page, the number of letters on the page or how complicated the layout of the page was and how much preparation time was required; the quality that the text need to be, and of course how readily available exemplars were.\footnote{1489}

It is imperative to emphasize that although considerations of size and quantity are implicit in various of the determining factors which influenced the speed at which a text could be copied, the amount of time required to copy a text was \emph{not} proportionate to its physical format in the Middle Ages (as has often been assumed erroneously). The speed at which scribes copied out texts was not influenced by considerations of size; of either the physical format of the book or of its writing – just because a book was small or copied in smaller handwriting, does not necessarily mean that its text could be written more quickly.

Thus small books in ‘current’ script could take a long time to produce whereas large books in more formal, calligraphic scripts could be written at considerable speed and \textit{vice versa}.\footnote{1490} Indeed J.P. Gumbert suggested that the difference between the relative speeds of copying texts in the highest type of both \textit{textualis} and \textit{cursiva} compared to

\footnotesize{
\begin{itemize}
\end{itemize}
}
medium quality *textualis* and common *cursiva* and *hybrida* scripts could be as significant as a ratio of 2 to 1, estimating the average speed for copying texts in the former scripts at just over 1 fol./day and an average of about 2 fols./day for the latter.\(^{1491}\) Ultimately there was no significant way of speeding up the process of copying a text in a clear professional script such as an service book or a bible.\(^{1492}\) This is crucial for our understanding of bible production in the 13\(^{th}\) century.

No bible could ever have been copied quickly, irrespective of its dimensions, for the simple reason that the complete biblical text is extremely long and required copying time of a proportional length.\(^{1493}\) There was no quick-fix solution. Although this may seem self-evident, it is easily overlooked.\(^{1494}\) It is particularly easy to forget when considering the 13\(^{th}\)-century production of portable pandect copies, since almost every other variable measurement was impacted (book size, number of leaves, thickness of parchment etc.) and given that their defining characteristic as vehicles of change is usually their agency in representing and implementing ‘reduction’, ‘miniaturization’ and ‘compression’. What’s more, one of the compression strategies that made the miniaturization of the Bible possible in the 13\(^{th}\) century depended on the physical shortening of the biblical text, through the use of a wider range of abbreviations employed more frequently, even if one was to replace or extract every abbreviation and symbol used in copying the biblical text in the 13\(^{th}\) century, from “e[st]”, “p[er]” and “[con]” to “[ibus]” and beyond, it is doubtful whether this would have any really significant impact on the amount of time required to copy a text that was hundreds of thousands of words long.\(^{1495}\)

---


\(^{1492}\) Stallybrass (2013): 389.


\(^{1494}\) For as John R.H. Moorman noted: “With modern methods of printing and producing books we do not always realize what a very large book the Bible is, nor now costly would be its production were it not certain of an enormous sale.” John R.H. Moorman, *Church Life in England in the Thirteenth-Century* (Cambridge: CUP, 1945): 98

\(^{1495}\) “In manuscript [The Vulgate] would occupy many hundreds of leaves even if inscribed in the smallest of hands… The Vulgate of course contains fewer words than the English version, and the medieval habit of contracting words, so that sometimes only a single letter was left, helped to reduce the labour of the scribes. But even so, the copying of a whole Bible must have been a very laborious process. … The labour of writing out so big a work would be enormous, and it is therefore no wonder that Bibles fetched high prices.” John R.H. Moorman, *Church Life in England in the Thirteenth-Century* (Cambridge: CUP, 1945): 98, 98 n.2. (NB the Bible being a “very large” book and “so big a work” in the sense that its text is ‘very long’)
As J.P. Gumbert has emphasized, “One cannot expect to determine ‘the’ average speed of ‘the’ scribe of ‘the’ Middle Ages”; one can only offer suggestions based on indications “of what speeds were usual and what were extraordinary.” With this proviso, Gumbert estimated that for late medieval scribes copying “normal, average books...of a normal size and in ordinary script” (whatever these may be?!), speeds of between 2 and 3 folios per day, (translating to between 12 and 20 folios per week or 60 to 90 folios per month) “appear to be quite common.”

Michael Gullick concluded that for a ‘Romanesque’ scribe (i.e. in the 11th-12th centuries), “A maximum daily rate of 150 to 200 lines...seems a realistic figure.” Bozolo and Ornato estimated that a scribe’s average production per day was 2.85 folios in quaternion quires, although copying and production rate could – and often were – be significantly slower than this.

A particularly useful resource in attempting to determine the speed at which medieval scribes could write, is Gullick’s detailed comparison of fifteen manuscripts written between the late 8th and late 15th centuries (mostly patristic texts), tabulating information concerning the speed with which they were written and the estimated number of lines per day at 6 days per week.

Gullick’s data-set includes a small bible, now Bibl. mun., Tours, Ms. 1 (264 x 181 [174 x 115] mm, 2 cols./40 lines, 408 fols.) copied in a small textura script in the northwest of Italy (Piedmont?), which took Bergognonius, its scribe, a year and a quarter to copy:

1498 Gullick qualifies this assertion by adding that “This can hardly be other than a very coarse estimate” and that “many scribes might have written less, but a few might have written more.” Michael Gullick, “How Fast Did Scribes Write? Evidence from Romanesque Manuscripts,” in Making the Book: Techniques of Production, Ed. L.L. Brownrigg (Red Gull Press: Los Altos Hills, 1992): 39-58 (esp. 46-50) [40, 52]. Gullick offers detailed analysis of the workings of Romanesque scriptoria at the Benedictine house of St. Michael's at Bamberg, at Fécamp, at Rochester Cathedral Priory, and at the Cistercian abbey at Aldersbach [44-8]. Particularly useful is Gullick's table of 15 manuscripts (mostly patristic texts) which contain information concerning the speed with which the texts were written and the estimated number of lines per day at 6 dyas per week [Fig. 1, 46-7].
1500 Michael Gullick, “How Fast Did Scribes Write? Evidence from Romanesque Manuscripts,” in Making the Book: Techniques of Production, Ed. L.L. Brownrigg (Red Gull Press: Los Altos Hills, 1992): 39-58 [Fig. 1, 46-7]. Gullick's calculations of scribes' daily rate of writing are reached “By counting the number of lines throughout the manuscript in question and dividing the total by the number of days it took to write the manuscript. ... I have calculated daily rates on the assumption that scribes worked for six days per week...but it impossible to take into account the likelihood that owing to festivals and saints' days fewer days were worked. ... No account has been taken of bank lines or leaves or the amount of space occupied by display matter.” [48-9].
Thus Bergognonus began work on 4 May 1223 and completed his task on 6 August 1224. Assuming an estimated 450 days work (at 6 days per week), he achieved an estimated rate of 126 lines per day, a speed that Gullick comments “appears rather slow.”

In comparison, a scribe of a late 12th-century glossed Exodus (now Lambeth Palace Library, Ms. 110) lamented his progress in notes added alongside the text he was copying; having begun work on “lundi”, by “samedi” he had written “only” 12 leaves. However considering the average speed of 2 (or a maximum of 3) folios per day as suggested by Gullick and Gumbert, this rate seems quite reasonable, particularly given that the text being copied would require him to negotiate its complicated layout on the page and a variety of different scripts of different sizes, probably requiring the time-consuming necessity of switching pens. The pace of the bible’s scribe seems particularly slow when compared to the copying rates of two 14th-century manuscripts: a copy of Peter Lombard’s Sentences written in Norwich in 1337 (180 fols., 1 col./51-2 lines, notarial cursive) at a known rate of 310 lines per day; or the Roman de la Rose copied at

---

1501 Although W. Wattenbach reads this colophon as an example proving that this bible took 5 years to copy (”,In 5 Vierteljahren wurde eine Abschrift der Bibel vollendet”: Das Schriftwesen in Mittelalter. 3rd ed. (Leipzig: S. Hirzel, 1896): 291.


1504 Donald Jackson, professional Calligrapher, official scribe to the British crown and the ‘Head Scribe’ overseeing the recent Saint John’s Bible project, conducted his own trials and experiments in an attempt to emulate the pace of the scribe who copied a manuscript of Lanfranc’s De corpore et sanguine Domini at Worcester ca. 1100-50 (92 fols., 1 col./29 lines, in late Caroline script) over ca. 30-1 days at an estimated rate of 197-205 lines per day. Jackson “professed admiration for the performance of his predecessor” and concluded that the manuscript’s scribe must have worked long days (certainly more than 6 hours) and would probably have been able to manage about 25 lines an hour, but probably not many more. See Michael Gullick, “How Fast Did Scribes Write? Evidence from Romanesque Manuscripts,” in Making the Book: Techniques of Production, Ed. L.L. Brownrigg (Red Gull Press: Los Altos Hills, 1992): 39-58 [46 no. 7, 49-50, Fig. 2 & 49-50].

Sully-sur-Loire in 1390 (124 fols., 1 col./45 lines, textura) at an estimated 75 days at a known rate of 297 lines per day.\textsuperscript{1506}

The aptly-named The Codex Gigas (Stockholm, Kungliga Bibliotek, Cod. Ms. A.148)\textsuperscript{1507} defies easy classification. The volume measures 890 × 490 mm today, contains 310 folios of parchment of moderate quality (in quires of eight), and weighs 165 pounds.\textsuperscript{1508} It looks like a giant bible of the 12\textsuperscript{th} century,\textsuperscript{1509} but is actually a pandect made in Bohemia in the early 13\textsuperscript{th} century.\textsuperscript{1510} However despite its immense physical size, its

\begin{flushleft}
\end{flushleft}

\begin{flushleft}
\end{flushleft}

\begin{flushleft}
\end{flushleft}

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{1508} Although these measurements are the result of re-trimming; the bible once measured around 900 x 500 mm. New items usually beginning on first leaf of a new quire). Its parchment varies a little in thickness and color, and the lower outer corners are usually a little thicker than the rest of the leaf. The hair sides tend to have a pale yellowish cast and the flesh sides are near-white. The parchment may be calfskin. One skin made a bifolium or two leaves, and originally a bifolium was about 890 by 1000 mm (although this is very large, it is smaller than the 13\textsuperscript{th}-century Mappa Mundi at Hereford Cathedral in England which is also thought to be calfskin; see Clarkson (2006): 96. Michael Gullick, “The Codex Gigas,” Biblis 38 (2007): 6-19 [7].
\end{flushleft}

\begin{flushleft}
\end{flushleft}

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{1510} The list of names and the Calendar and Necrology contain Bohemian saints and many Bohemian names, and these, together with the Bohemian chronicle, point clearly to the manuscript being a product of a Benedictine community somewhere in Bohemia; some of the names show that the manuscript must have been written in the early 13\textsuperscript{th} century, certainly before about 1230 (Michael Gullick, “The Codex Gigas,” 2007: 9-10, 16). Cf. Cf. I. Hlaváček, “The Necrology of the Codex Gigas of Bohemia (Kungliga Biblioteket
text is arranged on each page in two columns of 106 lines (Fig. 4.1), meaning that its script is quite small, with the result that, sitting in front of the manuscript on a lectern it is impossible to read the top and bottom lines without standing up to read the lines at the top of a column and then sitting down bent over to read the lines at the foot of a column.\textsuperscript{1511} Astonishingly, this colossal volume was written and decorated by a single scribe-artist, a fact that makes Gullick’s comment that “This was a remarkable achievement” seem rather a dizzying understatement.\textsuperscript{1512} Michael Gullick estimates that, assuming it took the scribe ca. 20 seconds to write one line, and consequently working at a rate of a column in 30 minutes, a page in an hour, it would have taken the scribe roughly 5 years to complete writing the text - working round the clock (!).\textsuperscript{1513} It certainly took much longer to complete the entire volume; all in (including ruling, correction, decoration and illumination), the manuscript probably took twenty or even thirty years to produce or, put another way, it appears to be the work of a lifetime.\textsuperscript{1514}


\textsuperscript{1511} Michael Gullick, “The Codex Gigas,” 2007: 9. In addition to a complete Bible, the volume contains a number of additional texts: The manuscript opens with the Old Testament (fol. 1v-118r). This is followed by: two histories by the late Antique author, Flavius Josephus; a universal encyclopedia by Isidore of Spain; and a collection of short medical texts (both practical and theoretical). After these is the New Testament (fols. 253r-286r), followed by: a short text concerning the confession of sins followed by two full page pictures on facing pages showing, on the left, the Holy City of Jerusalem, and, on the right, its famous portrait of the Devil (fols. 289v-290r); next, a very short text containing exorcisms (an aid to get rid of evil spirits); then comes a chronicle (or history) of Bohemia by a late 11th- and early 12th-century writer, Cosmas of Prague; this was once followed by the Rule of St Benedict, but the leaves with the Rule have been cut out (the only major loss that the manuscript has suffered); the manuscript (finally!) ends with a Calendar (a guide to the liturgical year) combined with a Necrology, preceded by a list of names, probably a list of benefactors to a particular monastery, whose heading is now lost. That all these texts contained in the Codex Gigas were written in one volume instead of several that could have been smaller and more practical to use, is curious and rather bewildering. Whoever decided that the Codex Gigas was a desirable book to make, perhaps the scribe, must have had access to other books to copy from (exemplars). It would also have been necessary to be assured of a steady supply of parchment; the 150+ callfskins used for the volume would almost certainly have been chosen from a far greater number. Despite the large size of the manuscript, Gullick suggests that it is very likely that the parchment was made from callfskin, and at least one 13th-century world map, the one now at Hereford Cathedral in England, was also almost certainly made on a callfskin a little larger than the ones in Codex Gigas. See Michael Gullick, “The Codex Gigas,” \textit{Biblis} 38 (2007): 6-19 [7-9, 10, 13]; Carl Nordenfalk, “Heaven and Hell in a Bohemian Bible of the Early Thirteenth Century,” in \textit{The Year 1200: A Symposium} (MMA, NY, 1975): 283-300 (passim).


\textsuperscript{1513} \textit{The Devil’s Bible} TV Movie (Michael Hoff Productions for The National Geographic Channel, 2008): 26:40-27:53 mins.

\textsuperscript{1514} The scribe probably ruled all the lines on each leaf (a slow process), for there is a striking consistency to the arrangement of the lines on each leaf throughout the manuscript, suggesting it was done by one person. The same scribe almost certainly did all of the initials, all the minor ones in red, as well as major ones,
In comparison, two 15th-century examples demonstrate just how long this copying of the Codex Gigas that the time required for copying could still vary greatly. A large six-volume bible written by a single scribe of the Brethren of the Common Life in Zwolle (the Netherlands) between 1462 and 1476 includes dates at the end of each volume which suggest that the daily rate was 45 lines per day of large, formal *textura quadrata*. However, further notes within the volume show that production was not continuous, although when the scribe wrote at a steady rate he appears to have written about 60 lines per day and it has been suggested that taking into account days not worked such as Sundays and festivals, the daily rate was likely to be about twice this, or about 120 lines per day.\textsuperscript{1515} In contrast, the two-volume Giant Bible copied in Mainz was completed over a period of 15 months between April 1452 and July 1453, these ‘outside dates’ for its copying having been recorded in the colophon of the second volume (fol. 215r):

“Finis veteri ac novi testamenti tocius biblie. Quam Calamus fidelis. Anno domini Millesimoquadringentesimoquinquagesismo secundo quarti apriliis inchoanda. Nona iulii anni sequentis superno iuvamine consummavit”\textsuperscript{1516}

What about the cost of the basic raw materials and the percentage of the price of the book they represented?\textsuperscript{1517} Ink\textsuperscript{1518} and colors seem to have been minor costs of production; except in cases where there must have been considerable decoration, the cost


\textsuperscript{1516} Now Library of Congress, Washington DC, Ms. ? (‘The end of the Old and New Testament of the whole Bible, which the faithful Calamus, beginning on 4 April 1452, brought to a conclusion, with help from on high, on 9 July the following year.’) Christopher de Hamel has recently published a detailed analysis of the dates in his article “Dates in the Giant Bible of Mainz,” in *Tributes in Honor of James Marrow. Studies in Painting and Manuscript Illumination of the late Middle Ages and Northern Renaissance*, Eds. J. F. Hamburger & A. S. Korteweg (London, 2006): 173-83, pl. 2 [174] (see also 176-89 for listing and commentary on dates).


was “not large enough to be of great importance.” By comparison, quality, format and arrangement were certainly important factors determining the amount spent on parchment or vellum. The cost of parchment depended on a number of factors, including the type of animal it was taken from (sheep skin was notably cheaper than calf skin), the size of the skin (larger skins were more expensive), and imperfections that may be present on the prepared skin.

Although the miniaturization of the Bible into a portable volume generally lead to an increase in the number of leaves such smaller bibles included, compared say to a lectern-sized copy (as discussed in Chapter Two), although the production of a portable bible required fewer pieces of parchment than that required for the production of a larger copy, this did not mean a reduction in the amount of parchment required for a bible of portable size. This can be demonstrated through the simple expedient of comparing two copies; the first a portable-format 13th-century bible containing 465 folios each measuring 218 x 148 mm and the second a lectern-format 13th-century bible of 330 folios measuring 375 x 246 mm. Here we see that the portable-format 13th-century bible required 233? bifolia measuring 218 x 296 mm apiece, constituting parchment with a total surface area of 15,035,024 mm² whereas the lectern-format 13th-century bible required 165 bifolia measuring 375 x 492 mm comprising a total parchment surface area of 30,442,500 mm². Thus the pocket bible consists of a very large number of tiny pieces of parchment, whereas the lectern bible includes a smaller quantity of larger pieces of parchment constituting a far larger surface area of parchment.

---

1522 Based on Penn Ms. Codex 236: Total surface area = 233 (#fols.) x [218 x 296] (area of 1 fol.)
1523 Based on Penn Ms. Codex 723: Total surface area = 165 (# fols.) x [375 x 492] (area of 1 fol.)
1524 Of course, large books required large pieces of parchment which required having a large skin to begin with, thus the parchment for the production of a large late medieval choir book could only be made from vellum, since “a sheep or goat skin would not have yielded a double folio of such size, and single pages could not be bound satisfactorily.” D.V. Thompson, The Materials and Techniques of Medieval Painting (New York: Dover, 1936): 27.
Overall, it seems that vellum was always more expensive than parchment made from the skins of other animals, although at present, little is known of the relative cost of different grades of parchment. The accounts rolls of Norwich and Ely Cathedral Priories give details of the sums spent on parchment in the late 13th and early 14th century and both sets of accounts distinguish between the cost of the manufacture of parchment from skins and payments for the parchment’s preparation. Thus at Ely in 1300-1, 2s. 6d was paid for 5 dozen sheepskin parchments (at ca. 9d per dozen) plus 17d for their preparation and entries for 1301-2 record payments of 5s 8d for thirteen

1525 As witnessed in purchases in London (1290 x2) at Norwich (1291/2, 1292/3 and 1295/6), at Ely (1349/50 and 1374/5) and at Westminster (1384); in every one of these purchases of parchment referred to as “vitulinus”, the sources specify that the materials were to be used for making books, not documents. However ‘uterine’ vellum was also supposedly used in the production of medieval amulets, as Don C. Skemer describes: “Rubrics and embedded instructions in amuletic texts occasionally call for writing materials to be prepared in ritualistic ways. Directions for the preparation of such amulets often call for virgin parchment (charta virginia or pergamenta virginia), which medieval use seems to have defined as charta non nata, referring to uterine parchment made from the tough membrane of the amniotic sac or from the skin of the aborted fetus of a kid, lamb, or other animal. The purity of parchment, uncontaminated by the outside word, could make a more powerful amulet.” Don C. Skemer, Binding Words: Textual Amulets in the Middle Ages (University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2006): 130-1.


1528 The statements of amounts spend on parchment in the Ely accounts may refer to “unprepared parchment, prepared parchment” or even “parchment cut, folded and ruled (for there is evidence of this from other sources), while the preparation stage involved work which “could be carried out by a parchmenter, not a scribe,” work that we know could certainly involve further scraping of the parchment’s surface with a knife, a practice described in late 13th-century sources as “corrediendum,” “coreacione,” “curturacione” or “correatura.” Michael Gullick, Extracts from The Precentors’ Accounts Concerning Books and Bookmaking of Ely Cathedral Priory (Red Gull Press: Hitchin, 1985): 2. For a detailed analysis of the medieval terminology employed in English sources for describing this preparation and its uses, see Gullick (1985): 2-3.

dozen sheepskin parchment (ca. 8d per dozen) plus 8d for the preparation of two
dozens, but in 1374-5, a payment of 13s for parchment is distinguished from costs of
27s 6d for 86 calf skins (ca. 6d per skin) plus 21s for the manufacture of parchment from
the same skins, and in 1373-4 a payment of 48s 10d for the purchase of parchment is
distinguished from a cost of 43s 10d for the purchase of vellum.

Records chronicling the purchase of parchment, vellum and other materials
survive from Norwich Cathedral Priory at a slightly earlier date in the priory’s
obedientiary rolls of 1272-1317. Here again we encounter references which
distinguish between vellum (“pellibus vitulinis” and “uelun”) and parchment
(“parcamento”) and find the preparation process referred to as “Curruracione” in two
stages (“prima” and “secunda Curruracione”). Thus in 1279-80 six dozen
“p[ar]cameni” for binding (“pro coreacione”) cost 2s 6d and 27s 8d was paid for “In
p[ar]ceno et incausto” in 1282-3 whereas 20 dozen “de uelun cum coreura” cost
27s 5d in 1288 (ca. 1s per dozen).

The accounts for 1275-6 record payment of 44s 6d for the purchase of 14
dozens “pellibus vitulin” (ca. 3s per dozen), although this sum included the additional
costs for “correir’ corundem et ligacione cuiusdam libri et in stipend’ luminar’
eiusdem libri et in…” In 1291-2 a purchase of an unspecified number of “pellibus

---

1534 E.g. “prima Cururacione, secunda Curruracione” (1292-3), and “secunda Curruracione ad pennam” (1291-2); N.R. Ker, “Medieval Manuscripts from Norwich Cathedral Priory” (1985): art cit 24 and 25.
vitulinis” is recorded for cost 38s 6d1539 although 30 dozen “pellibus vitulinorum” were purchased for 37s 3d in 1292-31540 and in 1295-6 the purchase of 32 dozen “pellibus vitulinis” cost approximately the same sum (41s 6d)1541 whereas in 1300-1 48s 4d was paid for 28 dozen “pellibus parvuleni vitulini.”1542

The obedientiary rolls of Magister Celarii, W. de Castre for the period 1292 to 1296 at Norwich record expenses involved in the production of a new bible (“noua Biblia”) allowing us to compare and contrast the relative costs of each ‘stage’ of production (e.g. the costs of writing, illuminating and binding) in relation to each other and within the context of the total costs incurred during a bible’s production in the final decade of the 13th century.1543

The accounts for 1292-93 (in Roll 11) include payments to three scribes, Peter, Robert and Simon; Peter (“Petro scriptori”) comes first, listed as having received 30s/6s 8d “pro noua Biblia,”1544 which was more than the the 21s/13s 9d received by Robert (“Roberto scriptori”) but less than the amount paid to Simon (“Symoni scriptori”), who received 34s 10d/15d.1545 Below these entries is recorded the sum of 19 s. 6d paid to “Nekes illuminatori.”1546 The entries preceding these in the roll describe the purchase of materials which I think we may reasonably assume were to be used for making the bible. The records lists a payment of 37s 2d for ‘30 dozen’ (360) fine quality skins (“In xxx

1544 “Petro scriptori pro noua Biblia” (per Talliam, xxxxs./ sine Tallia, vjs. viijd.)
1545 “Roberto scriptori per Talliam, xxjs. ixd./ sine Tallia, xiijs. iiijd.” and “Symoni scriptori per Talliam, xxxiijis. xd./ sine Tallia, xvd.”
1546 “Nekes illuminatori per Talliam, xixs. vjd.”
duodenis pell’ vitulinorum xxxvijs. iijd. qua”) and an additional 10s for their preparation (“In Curruracione dictarum pellium xs.”), which took place in two stages, both undertaken in two ‘batches’.1547

This might also allow us to hazard a guess as to estimating how long it took the scribes to write this bible, since by the time of the next (accounts) roll, the bible (or at least its second volume) was ready to be bound. The 1295-96 accounts (Roll 12) make reference to the sum of 6s paid to “Rogero Wuderoue” for the task of binding the second volume of a (the same?) bible (“ligacione secunde partis Biblie”) plus five other books.1548

We also find that three of the four men who were identified as involved in the bible’s production in 1292-3, are listed, in 1295-6, as hard at work on other projects: Simon is paid 54s for copying a “libro Britonis”, a “Summa Ricardi” and “aliis summulis diuersis” while Peter received 12d for copying the same works (as Simon) 1549 and “Nekes Illuminator” was paid 15s 6d for illuminating “diuersis libris.”1550

It would be thrilling to discovery that these costs attending the production of Norwich’s “nova Biblia” record the birth of one of the two 13th-century bibles known to have survived from Norwich Cathedral Priory.1551 The first is the bible given to the

---


1548 “Rogero Wuderoue pro ligacione secunde partis Biblie et aliorum librorum v vjs.” This cost of vjd. for binding (at least) 6 books, including the portion of the bible, seems, as far as is possible to tell (i.e. not very) proportionate with the payment of xijd. to “R. Wuderoue” at an earlier date for binding a miscellaneous number of books (“in cooperacione librorum” in 1292-3; N.R. Ker, “Medieval Manuscripts from Norwich Cathedral Priory” (1985): 243-72 [267].

1549 Simon: “Symoni scriptori pro libro Britonis et Summa Ricardi et aliis summulis diuresis xliijs. id.”/ Peter: “Petro scriptori xijd.”


Alas, this seems improbable, since the accounts suggest that the “nova Biblia” was a bible in at least two volumes, whereas these bibles are both pandects, and National Library of Wales, Aberystwyth, Ms. 21878E was written by single scribe and partially decorated in Italy during the mid-13th century (the remaining decoration completed in England) although its measurements (340 x 210 mm) are closer to those of the “nova

---


1554 Inscribed with a Norwich Cathedral Priory press-mark and donation inscription “E. xxiiij Radulph[...]/fi de Elyngham” (fol.1r, second half of 13th century) and on fol. 344v, inscribed “Liber ecclesie cath’ norwicens' quemque alienaverit anathemae sit amen quod Robertus N.,” 14th or 15th century (crossed out). Further Provenance Info: Erased, partly visible under ultra-violet light, “memorandum quod Edmundus Derham Est [ ] istius Bibliæ”, XV2 cent.; erased, partly visible under ultra-violet light, “Bibl. {co}ll. S. J. Herbip.” [Würzburg], mid XVI x XVI2 cent.; on fol. 1r, erased, partly visible under ultra-violet light, “Communitatis Sancti Johannis baptistar[ ]e stat 1660”; item no. 27 in a French bookseller’s printed catalogue, XIX2 cent., cut out and pasted on inside front cover together with a manuscript note, XX1 cent., suggesting that Messrs Quaritch obtained it from this source; item no. 3417 in Messrs Quaritch catalogue 196 (1900) cut out and pasted on inside back cover.
Biblia” suggested in the accounts, and certainly a better match than Bodleian Library, Oxford, Ms. Auct. D.4.8.1555

II Retail ~ Prices of Purchased Bibles (Price of Sale/ of Purchase) and The Secondhand Book Trade ca. 1200-1550

What was the retail price of a portable bible in the later Middle Ages (i.e. 13th through 15th centuries) and how much did one cost to buy second hand? Stallybrass argues that:

Even if, as Bozzioli and Ornato argue, manuscripts decreased in cost during the 14th and 15th centuries, with paper gradually replacing parchment, the combined cost of materials, copying and illumination would have always made a complete bible out of reach to all but a small and wealthy elite.1556

Although this statement may broadly be considered true within the broader context of late medieval bible production, it does not apply to 13th-century bibles, for their production was specific to the 13th century (hence their name) and thus had long since ceased by the 14th through early 16th centuries.

Once we move forward in time past the 13th century, our immediate concern becomes not manuscript production (bespoke or otherwise) but of a retail trade in manuscripts, and the price of these bibles now becomes a matter not of production costs but of retail value. By the late Middle Ages, 13th-century portable bibles had already been circulating as ‘secondhand books’ for over a century and high production costs have long since lost a good detail of the bite that directly influenced a copy’s high(er) retail price when it first entered the market.

Although the expense of materials and of labor involved in producing these books had previously influenced their cost and accessibility, after 1300, these factors are far less important, for they are now being sold as second-hand books, and there were thousands of them. By the 14th century there existed such a large supply of these bibles that demand for new copies ‘fresh off the quill’ dwindled, and their production with it. Bible production – only recently so engorged, went into freefall; production rate fell in response

1555 The Bible’s books in the usual order (see Ker, MMBL 1 (1969): 96-7) except that it lacks the Prayer of Manasses and includes the Prayer of Solomon after Ecclesiasticus. The prologues are the standard set with some omissions and divergencies. Cf. description on NLW’s online catalogue here.
1556 Peter Stallybrass, “Epilogue,” in Form and Function in the Late Medieval Bible (2013): 390, my italics.
to the decreasing demand for new copies, presumably accompanied by a reduction in the books’ market value (since so many copies already existed), which would have exacerbated the falling rates of production further still, as producers found it less and less profitable to make new copies. However the demand for bibles which had already been produced did not disappear; so there existed a situation of great demand and market saturation; are these not the ideal conditions for a drop in the price at which the product retailed?

Where and by whom do we see these bibles being purchased and sold? It is commonplace to characterize medieval book production as primarily a bespoke trade, or as involving production situations in which the one who intends to purchase a specific book is in close contact with its producers,” and from a production standpoint, bespoke trade “does account for the majority of manuscript books at their inception and first exchange as commodities.” In this context, “supply and demand correlate neatly because they are more or less two parts of the same whole.”

However, the ‘bespoke’ retail trade in books presents only part of the picture, for in a manuscript culture “production and retail do not coincide as neatly as they would come to in the era of print,” and to emphasize the trade in new books exclusively is to suggest that the lives of medieval books followed a linear course, which they did not. Not only does the prioritization of the production of a medieval book and the circumstances of its origin within the context of its broader life cycle fail to account for the widespread secondhand book trade in the late Middle Ages, but also has difficulty in explaining composite manuscripts, manuscript repair or refurbishment.

---


1559 “The life of a manuscript, even including its production, is not always (perhaps even not typically) something that proceeds as linearly as does that of a printed book.” M. Johnston & M. Van Dussen, “Introduction” to The Medieval MS Book: Cultural Approaches (2015): 7.

Given that a manuscript’s life cycle was influenced by concrete factors including production, use, storage, retail and refurbishment, for 13th-century bibles, by the 14th-century onwards we have moved beyond the moment of their general production.\textsuperscript{1561}

The Circulation of 13th-Century Portable Bibles as ‘Second hand Books’ in the Late Middle Ages

What is the status of ‘second hand’ bibles/manuscripts in this period? What did it mean to be a ‘second hand’ bible? What does it mean for value/price, how it circulates as regards readership/use and availability and accessibility etc.\textsuperscript{1562} As we have seen, there was a widespread trade in portable bibles from the time when copies first appeared on the market in the early 13th century, volumes that by definition – as books being sold and purchased ‘second hand’ - could not have been ‘bespoke’ by their new users/owners.\textsuperscript{1563}

The trade and circulation of secondhand books “exemplify instructive alternate practices that were informed by and in turn informed production patterns and decisions. Manuscripts were typically produced to outlive their first users; not least because the decision to produce a manuscript included a hope that it would retain its value and remain useful or relevant through more than one generation of readers – an ambition made thinkable by the durability of medieval books.”\textsuperscript{1564}

Medieval book production and prolonged use “intersect with medieval attitudes to tradition and auctoritas: when what is ‘contemporary,’ or of use or relevance in the present, includes what was written perhaps centuries earlier, it is difficult – anachronistic even – to draw a strict line between what we now mean by ‘contemporary’ and what that category

\textsuperscript{1561} Thus the position of the portable bible within the manuscript economy must “be regarded from its many angles, including, but not limited to, attention to production and first-hand commissioning and readership”; cf. Thesis 2 proposed in M. Johnston & M. Van Dussen, “Introduction” to The Medieval MS Book: Cultural Approaches (2015): 6-9 [8].

\textsuperscript{1562} Cf. M. Johnston & M. Van Dussen, “Introduction” to The Medieval MS Book: Cultural Approaches (CUP, 2015): 1-16 (6-9 = Thesis 2: ‘Because the manuscript as process resulted in its continued and constant evolution, we must focus on a manuscript’s life cycle, not just its moment of general production.’ [see esp. 6-8]


\textsuperscript{1564} Even when they were tailored to the taste of specific patrons, it was understood that manuscripts would outlast their owners: they were future family heirlooms, to be circulated in networks of gift exchange, inheritance, and resale. M. Johnston & M. Van Dussen, “Introduction” to The Medieval MS Book: Cultural Approaches (2015): 6-7.
included for medieval people." Instead, we have to come to terms with what Kate Harris calls “a medieval view in which the quality of contemporaneity in a book might actually be protracted.”

Thus we see the place of bibles amongst other books reflecting the prevalent view within medieval book culture that “Books [were considered as being able to] be used without being used up, their value remaining more or less consistent (in contrast to receiving a new valuation, such as that which attracts antiquarians).”

“As a result of value retained by (or added to) manuscripts, combined with a number of factors that made it more likely for books to enter the retail market after their initial production and use by first-generation readers or owners, a large proportion of books produced on commission would later enter the secondhand market, becoming part of a trade that was characterized by what we might call speculative retail (with the exception of the many books that were donated or bequeathed to libraries and heirs).”

Furthermore, the number of books [bibles] available, or already produced and on the secondhand market, or held in libraries, conditioned the rate of new production.

---


NB: This concerns medieval readers’ ideas of ‘contemporaneity’ in using books that were not ‘new’, having been produced at an earlier date – in the case of 13th-century portable bibles, at a much earlier date.

1566 “Belated programs of embellishment, addition, modification or, at the opposite extreme, incorporation, suggest a dynamism fitting uneasily into the constraints of ‘period’. Requiring an interpretation of use as well as a study of production, they highlight not just the length of time a medieval manuscript might remain in circulation as a serviceable copy but also promote a perception of a medieval view in which the quality of contemporaneity in a book might actually be protracted, a view special to the era before printing and particularly remote from any sense of the book as an expendable commodity.” Kate Harris, “Patrons, buyers and owners: the evidence for ownership, and the role of book owners in book production and the book trade,” in Book Production and Publishing in Britain 1375-1475, Eds. Jeremy Griffiths & Derek Pearsall (Cambridge: CUP, 1989): 163-99 [177]; for further discussion cf. Siân Echard, “Containing the book: the institutional afterlives of medieval manuscripts” and Martin K. Foys, “Medieval manuscripts: media archaeology and the digital incunable” in The Medieval Manuscript Book: Cultural Approaches, Eds. Michael Johnston & Michael Van Dussen (Cambridge: CUP, 2015): Echard, Ch. 6 (96-118); Foys, Ch. 7 (119-39).


Thus “according to this dynamic, even in a manuscript culture characterized by bespoke production, the manuscript economy extends far beyond the level of local, interpersonal exchange that was implicit to most models of manuscript production.”

There was a drastic decrease in manuscript production in the 15th century, a phenomenon attributable to the effects of war, disease and a depressed economy. For example, Joanne Filippone Overty, in her recent exploration of manuscript prices and valuations in England during the period 1300–1483, offers a quantitative analysis of the book trade as a whole during this period (when manuscript production shifted from ecclesiastical institutions, such as monasteries, to more professional urban-based organizations) considering supply-and-demand-side issues, especially the costs associated with manuscript production (with particular emphasis on the impact of the cost of scribal labor on overall production costs), aiming to gauge the fluctuations in manuscript valuations in relation to similar movements in market prices during the period covered. Overty demonstrates that labor was more significant materials in determining a manuscript's price; that the immediate impact of the Black Death on production costs, and thus prices of manuscript books, was to increase the replacement cost of books (via its resultant fluctuations in the availability of professional scribes); and that the effects of the Black Death also resulted in a sharp decrease in the price of


\[1573\] In her exploration of “manuscript prices and valuations in England during the period 1300–1483, when manuscript production shifted from ecclesiastical institutions, such as monasteries, to more professional urban-based organizations,” Overty is guided by three questions: were labor or materials more significant in determining a manuscript's price?; how did fluctuations in the availability of professional scribes affect production costs, and thus prices of manuscript books, especially after the Black Death?; and did increased demand and subsequent specialization in manuscript production (that is, a shift toward economies of scale) lower the price of manuscript books? (Overty 2008: 1-2).

\[1574\] This information is of the greatest significance for understanding “not only the ability of the book trade to meet the demands of an increasingly literate society, but also the ability of institutions and individuals to obtain manuscript books at affordable prices.” (Overty 2008: 1, 3).

\[1575\] The immediate impact was to increase the replacement cost of books - by as much as 174% over a hundred years in the case of valuations she cites from Hereford Cathedral – which is attributable to the plague’s drastic depletion of the pool of educated men most likely to engage in scribal activities - clerics and university graduates - perhaps proportionally more than the general population, and this contraction in the labor market for educated men resulted in higher wages and greater benefits, and those increased costs were passed along to book consumers.” J.F. Overty, “The Cost of Doing Scribal Business” (2008): 13.
manuscript books from the early 14th century through the late 15th century, since the resultant increased demand and subsequent specialization in manuscript production (that is, a shift toward economies of scale through more efficient methods of production) led to a lowering of the price of manuscript books.\footnote{1576}

These crises and hardships led to an influx of secondhand books onto the market, books which, as M.B. Parkes notes, were usually cheaper to buy than new copies.\footnote{1577} The remarkable durability of manuscript materials was another contributing factor, for “As a result of such durability, volumes of staple texts eventually saturated the market for secondhand books.”\footnote{1578} What’s more, if we consider the circulation or ‘social lives’ of manuscripts in the later medieval period further, secondhand books were central to lettered activity and the development of communication networks and the retail trade in used books explains only part of the picture.\footnote{1579} In the late 14th and 15th centuries, there was a marked explosion in library foundations, expansion and donation\footnote{1580} which placed pressure on stocks of secondhand books.\footnote{1581}

\section*{ii Medieval Prices of Purchase and Valuations of (Small) Latin Bibles ca. 1250-1500\footnote{1582}}

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item [1576]\textit{The rise of vernacular literacy among the increasingly well-to-do laity expanded demand to historic levels, and the book trade met these challenges with more efficient methods of production. The ultimate result, as suggested by the statistical evidence Overty presents, was a sharp decrease in the price of manuscript books, by perhaps as much as 50\%, from the early 14th century until the beginning of printing activity in the late 15th century,” J.F. Overty, “The Cost of Doing Scribal Business” (2008): 13.}
\item [1577]\textit{M.B. Parkes, \textit{Their Hands Before Our Eyes}: 42 (cited Cultural Approaches 2015: n.31).}
\item [1578]\textit{M. Johnston & M. Van Dussen, “Introduction” to \textit{The Medieval MS Book: Cultural Approaches} (2015): 8.}
\item [1579]\textit{M. Johnston & M. Van Dussen, “Introduction” to \textit{The Medieval MS Book: Cultural Approaches} (2015): 8 & n.32.}
\item [1580]\textit{See David N. Bell, “The libraries of religious houses in the late middle ages,” and R. Lovatt, “College and university book collections and libraries” in \textit{The Cambridge History of Libraries in Britain and Ireland [I] To 1640}, Eds. E. Leedham-Green & T. Webber (Cambridge: CUP, 2006); Bell, Ch. 5 [126-151]; Lovatt, Ch. 6 [152-177]. NB: “This activity has relatively little to do with the production of new books, except where ‘public’ (or ‘common’) access to library copies may have reduced the need to produce additional volumes, or where donors left money for books that had not yet been produced. …The majority of the books that ended up in these libraries appear not to have been commissioned for the library, but rather donated by a previous owner,” although “Occasionally books may have been purchased or even commissioned with their eventual donation in mind.” M. Johnston & M. Van Dussen, “Introduction” to \textit{The Medieval MS Book: Cultural Approaches} (2015): 8 & nn.34-35.}
\item [1581]\textit{M. Johnston & M. Van Dussen, “Introduction” to \textit{The Medieval MS Book: Cultural Approaches} (2015): 8, n.36.}
\item [1582]\textit{In the examples that follow, each price or valuation is assigned a designator of a number in bold within brackets, e.g. (1), cf. Appendix II.B.}
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
In our pursuit of evidence for the prices involved in the sale and purchase of bibles or the amounts of money for which copies were borrowed and loaned, it is as necessary to search inside the bibles themselves as it is to scour ‘outside’ documentary sources for details of recorded prices.

Details of purchase prices in particular are often to be found within the covers of the bibles themselves in the form of notes jotted onto flyleaves by their owners, or on the first or last leaves of the books (usually at the front of the book). This habit constitutes rather a neat reversal of the modern practice of booksellers, rather than buyers being the ones who pencil a book’s price inside its front cover or on its first page, in order to inform the purchaser of for how much the book is for sale. Whilst there is evidence of medieval booksellers adding ‘price tags’ like this to their wares, in most cases, such notes were added by the book’s purchaser after the sale had taken place to record the amount of money for which the book had been obtained, rather that to advertise the sum for which it might be acquired.\footnote{For discussion of reasons why a book buyer might record the cost of his purchase cf. Simon de Bredon’s bible below (32).}

Valuations of bibles were also recorded in the documents chronicling the administration of different kinds of institutions, including documents such as catalogues, book lists, records of donations and bequests and inventories and so on.\footnote{See \textit{The Libraries of Collegiate Churches}, Ed. J.M.W. Willoughby. CBMLC XV, 2 vols. (London: The British Library in association with The British Academy, 2013).} Locating bibles included in documents recording the private ownership of books, sources which, helpfully, often included appraisals of sums for which the bibles (and other books) were ‘valued’ and thus permit us to considering the role and significance of such valuations \textit{within the context} of their respective libraries and collections.\footnote{Here I have benefited immeasurably from the phenomenal achievement of Susan Cavanagh (1980) whose compilation of material from these sources - as part of her doctoral study of manuscripts privately owned in England during the 14th and early 15th centuries - made this archive accessible and, in some cases outright available, in a way that previously would, at worse have been impossible and at best, downright ruinous to mind and body. Susan Cavanagh, “A Study of Books Privately Owned in England, 1300-1450”, Unpubl. PhD. Dissertation, University of Pennsylvania (1980); esp. Introduction (1-21). Cavanagh’s staggering achievement extended the existing studies of this archive by F. Furnivall and H. Plomer immeasurably, particularly given the comparable brevity of these studies, the limitation of their scope and furthermore, their having been written almost a century before (although one can hardly blame them for that); see F. Furnivall, “Books in Wills and Inventories,” \textit{Notes & Queries} 7th Series 20 (1890): 125 and H.R. Plomer, “Books Mentioned in Wills,” \textit{Transactions of the Bibliographical Society} 7 (1904): 99-121.} These sources include wills, inventories of household goods and property lists featuring appraisals of books amongst
the value of the property of a scholar, priest or aristocrat, drawn up either in order for their sale or as procedure within the process of their donation or bequeathal. Valuations may also be located in the kinds of ‘appraisals’ sometimes featured in inventories of household goods or books in lists of property (especially illuminated or decorated and/or expensive bibles), occasionally supplemented by information from other contemporary materials, including registers, indentures and household accounts. These sources offer documentation of bibles that were demonstrably in private ownership in premodern England during the 13th through 16th centuries; that were owned by individuals (as part of private libraries or collections comprising one or only a few books) and found within institutional libraries, or in relation to them.

Let us consider some examples of prices for which bibles were purchased, from a bookseller or from a previous owner, which are to be found either recorded in notes added by their previous owners or purchasers in the bibles themselves or recorded in other sources (including bishop’s registers, correspondence and institutional records). (see Appendix A)

iii Bibles in private libraries

Richard de Gravesend, bishop of London 1280-1303, possessed an extensive episcopal library comprising around 80 volumes; its contents are itemized in the inventory of Richard’s effects drawn up in 1313 by the executors of his will, and the same document appraises his books at a total value of £116 14s 6d, demonstrating not only the considerable size of Richard’s library, but also that his was an extremely valuable collection. The inventory reveals that Richard owned three bibles, all stored “in Garderoba” (the wardrobe), one of which is specified as a ‘little bible’ valued at 20 s/£1 (“De xx.s. de una parva biblia vendita”).

---

1586 Or at least the contents of Richard’s library extant in 1313.
Amongst the books belonging to Simon Langham, Archbishop of Canterbury 13??-d.76\footnote{On Langham (previously a monk of Westminster Abbey and subsequently Chancellor of England), see \textit{BRUO} II: 1093-97.} which were valued at Westminster\footnote{This document was published in J.A. Robinson & M.R. James, \textit{The Manuscripts of Westminster Abbey} (Cambridge: CUP, 1909): 4-7, in which the authors note the document’s survival (albeit “in a mutilated form”) as Westminster Abbey, Ms. Munim. 9.226 and as an early and complete (though often inaccurate) copy (now Ms. Munim. 9.225), from which the document’s text was copied into the \textit{Liber Niger Quaternus} (“but somewhat carelessly”); the list is also reproduced in full in Cavanaugh (1980): 495-99.} was a “Biblia in parvo volumine” valued at 12 francs (“xii fr.”) \footnote{On the contemporary rates of exchange for francs in comparison to other currencies, see Peter Spufford & Wendy Wilkinson, \textit{Interim Listing of the Exchange Rate of Medieval Europe} (Supported by the Social Science Research council of Great Britain, 1977); \textit{?}}. Three bibles are listed in the 1328 inventory made of the books of Walter de Stapeldon, bishop of Exeter 1308-d.1326\footnote{Stapeldon: \textit{BRUO} III, 1764-5; Cavanaugh (1980): 811-14 [813]; cf. \textit{The Register of Walter de Stapeldon, Bishop of Exeter A.D. 1307-1326}, Ed. F.C. Hingeston-Randolph (London: George Bell & Son, 1892): 563-65.}, the first, described only as a bible “bone littere”, was valued at £10, while the second and third bibles, whose entries record no details beyond their valuations, were priced at 13 s 14 d and 20 s (or £1) respectively. \footnote{On Trevar, see \textit{BRUO} III, 1898-9; and entry in Cavanaugh (1980): 879-81.} We find another bible in a list of the books of John Trevaur, bishop of S. Asaph and Papal chaplain\footnote{In “librariu[m] / De una biblia in asserib[us] cu[m] nigro corio p[re]c xl.s.”, taken from the account of John de Brunham, Receiver and Administrator of the goods of John Trevar (Cavanaugh 1980: 879-81 [880]).} dated 1357-8 (31 Edward III), described as ‘a bible bound in wooden boards covered in black leather’, valued at 40 s (or £2) and recorded as stored “in librariu[m]” or in the bishop’s library \footnote{Recorded in the list of Trefnant’s books that was drawn up for probate: “i Biblia incipiens in 2o folio ‘i[m]’ extremis finibus mundi’, valoris x marc’”; Cavanaugh (1980): 874-8 [877] (on Trefnant see \textit{BRUO} III, 1900-2).}.

Another bible housed in a private episcopal library, this one in the early 15th century, belonged to John Trefnant, bishop of Hereford, previously Papal chaplain and King’s clerk, etc. (d.1404), who owned a valuable copy that was worth 10 marcs (or £6 13s 4d) \footnote{On Bowet (previously Treasurer of England (w. 1421, pro. 1423) see \textit{BRUO} III: 2154-55, \textit{TE}: 398-402, \textit{TE3}: 69-85.} The 1423 inventory of the possessions of Henry Bowet, Archbishop of York\footnote{On Bowet (previously Chancellor of England), see \textit{BRUO} II: 1052-66 (163).} - compiled by his executors - records that Bowet owned two bibles; one which
was kept in the bishop’s library (“libraria”) and a second stored in his Chapel (“Capella”); both are listed as having been “receptis” for the same sum of £6 13s 4d each. (20).

In the 1453 inventory of the library of William Duffield, canon of York and prebendary of Wistow and fellow of Merton College, Oxford, William’s bible, valued at £6 13s 4d (31) is the first entry amongst those of his books stored in his study and in his Chapel (“Libri Studiales et Capellae”), (1599) and was the most expensive of Duffield’s books by far; the second most expensive, a Book of Hours of the Use of Sarum (“portiforii de usu Sarum”), was far less costly, at 54s 4d/£2 14s 4d.

Thomas Morton, a canon residentiary of York (w. 1448) owned a luxurious ‘Bible in a red binding with silver clasps’ which he kept in his Chapel, a book valued at an impressive £6 13s 4d (24) In the final decades of the 14th century, Richard de Ravenser, Archdeacon of Lincoln and administrator of estates of Queen Isabella (w. 1385) owned a copy worth 40 s (or £2) (23). The inventory of goods belonging to Thomas of Woodstock, Earl of Buckingham and Duke of Gloucester and husband of Eleanor de Bohun, d.1397 seized in his castle at Pleshy after his death in 1397 includes at least three bibles (all included within the list of the books for the Duke’s chapel). (1604) The first two copies were both larger (each

1598 “Libraria / vj.l. xiii.s. iiij.d. receptis pro j Bibliia, cum signaculis deauratis” and “Capella / De vj.l. xiii.s. iiij.d. receptis pro uno libro vocato Bibliill”. It is possible that these two entries may in fact refer to the same bible, given their identical pricing and the fact that their respective descriptions provide insufficient data to confirm or disprove this possibility; the sole evidence for the conclusion that these entries refer to different books lies in the inventory’s distinction between the different locations in which they were stored.


1601 “j. biblia, prec’. xls.” listed in a 1386 inventory of his goods (Cavanaugh 1980: 680-83 [682])

1602 Cavanaugh (1980): 844-51 [849].


1604 The second item on this list may also be a Latin bible, although the ambiguity of the description prohibits a secure identification: “iij larges livres cov[e]3 de blanc quyr[?] ove claspes de laton[?] cont[?] entre eux la bible ps x.l.”(£10); the list also includes an English bible, “Un bible en Engleys en ij g’nt3 livres cov[e]3 de rouge quyr[?] ps xls.” (now BL, Mss. Egerton 617-18)
described a ‘a bible in an immense volume’); the second, also with silver clasps, was valued at 66s 8d/£3 6s 8d, but the third was clearly an extraordinary book, described as ‘well-written’ (“bien escrip[?]”) and bound in with gold and with two clasps of white enamel, and was therefore appraised accordingly, at 100s/£5. However the third was a ‘small bible (literally, the bible in a small volume) covered in green cloth with two silver clasps’ which was valued at 26s 8d/£1 6s 8d (7).

**iv Bibles purchased for ‘personal use’**

Richard Courtenay, Bishop of Norwich (d.1415) purchased a small bible in Paris for 12 crowns in 1414 (11). John de Kirkeby, archdeacon of Dorset, purchased a bible for 40 s (or £2) in the final months of 1342 at a sale of books previously belonging to a recently-deceased canon of Salisbury, one Nicholas Lodelawe (d. ca. Nov. 1342) (22).

The bible T. Rouse purchased from William de Walcote for £2 (40s) ca. 1349: William de Walcote, a protégé of Isabella, Queen of King Edward II and daughter of King Philip IV of France (d.1358), and William served as keeper and receiver of the queen’s great wardrobe during the early years of Edward II’s reign. However, despite his professional position as a trustworthy handler of monies and properties, William is recorded ca. 1349 as in debt to the queen, and a number of his books were sold in order to cover this sum. Amongst these books were two bibles; the first a small (“petit”) bible

---

1605 “Un bible de mesne volum ove claspes dargent p's bxvj.s. viij.d.” / “j bible de mesne volum bien escrip[?]cov[?]e3 de drap[?] dor de cipr[?] ove ij claspes dor enamaillc3 blanc p's c.s.”

1606 “Un bible de petit volum cov[?]e3 de vert quyr veil ove ij claspes dargent p's xxvi.s. viij.d.”


1608 “Una Biblia, precii xl.s.” (Cavanaugh 1980: 524-5 [525])

1609 Extracts from various documents recording the books in Isabella’s own collection and her activities as an important patron of the Arts reproduced in Cavanaugh (1980): 456-60. For further details cf. E.A. Bond, “Notices of the last days of Isabella, Queen of Edward II, drawn from an Account of the Expenses of her Household,” Archaeologia, 35 (1854): 453-69


1611 This list is recorded in the Hunter Collection of transcripts from Exchequer records (BL, London, Add. Ms. 25459, fols. 207r-v); extracts printed in Cavanaugh (1980): 901-2 [902].
'covered with a cloth de soi jehere’, which was purchased for 40 s/£2 by “T. Rous” (5a).

Richard Pede, dean of Hereford 1463-80, bought a 13th century pocket bible (now Eton College, Ms. 179) in Hereford for £3 6s. 8d (12), “a considerable sum for a second-hand book” as de Hamel notes. Nevertheless, the price Pede paid was still easier on the purse than that for which magister John Hychecocke, fellow of Whittington College, London, purchased a 13th-century English pocket bible, now Bodleian Library, Oxford, Ms. Auct. D.5.19, from magister John Smyth, priest of the parish church of St. James, Garlickhithe, costing Hychecocke the grand sum of 6 marcs 40d (or £4 2s 8d) in 1462. (13)

A note in another bible, now Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge, Ms. 1056-1975 records its purchase by Johannes Weynrich in 1458 for 12 Hungarian florins (10). In 1462 Mr. Robert Wrangwysh, a chaplain of Queen’s College purchased a 13th-century bible (now Christ Church, Oxford, Ms. 107) from John More (or Moore) for 40s (or £2) (9), and in 1473 Clement of Canterbury, monk of St. Augustine’s, Canterbury,
purchased his bible (now British Library, Burney Ms. 11) for 20s (or £1) from the
Oxford bookseller Thomas Hunt and gave it that same year to his Abbey.1617

In 1280 William Wickwayn, Archbishop of York, purchased a bible that had
previously belonged to Roger Pepyn (subdean of York, d.1266) from Master Roger de
Holt in Marton (11-16 October), although the record does not specify for how much
Wickwayn purchased the bible.1618

Walter Suffield, Bishop of Norwich 1244-57, disposed of three bibles in his will
(dated Midsummer’s Day 1256), including one which he had purchased himself; the bible
is identified as that which Suffield “bought of master Simon Blund” and was bequeathed
- along with “the cup out of which the poor children drank” - to the Hospital of St. Giles
in Norwich which he had founded in 1249.1619 Suffield left his other two bibles to
individuals, specifying that “his little Bible” should pass to brother Ralfr de Huntendon,
whilst Master Hugh de Corbrige would receive “a great bible” together with a standing
cup.1620

**v** Bibles bequeathed to individuals as personal bequests/gifts

We also see examples in which a bible, through the act of its being exchanged
between a testator and a beneficiary/legatee, can be seen to be functioning/being used as

---


a unit of currency in an economy of affection and kinship, as a signifier of community and as an act of intellectual mentoring.

Although it was largely from the late 14th century onwards that bibles began to be bequeathed to private individuals unconditionally – as opposed to being left to corporations, or being entailed, as had mostly been the case before that time\(^{1621}\) - nevertheless, we find this practice had already begun a century earlier; Walter de Merton, bishop of Rochester and founder of Merton College, Oxford (d.1277) left his bible, price 4 marcs (£2 13s 4d), to Master William de Ewell in his will. \(^{(1)}\)\(^{1622}\)

John Ware, canon of St. Stephen’s Chapel (d. 1409)\(^{1623}\) bequeathed two bibles to private individuals: one to John Campeden, archdeacon of Surrey and canon of Southwell (d. 1410)\(^{1624}\) described in Ware’s will as “parua biblea mea”;\(^{1625}\) and another to Henry Merston, canon of St. Paul’s, London (noted in Ware’s third will, dated 20 Sept. 1409).\(^{1626}\) Ware’s will specifies his gift of the bible to Merston to have and to hold until the end of his life, at which point the bible was to be sold and the money received through its sale should be distributed (presumably to the poor) for the benefit of the souls of both men.\(^{1627}\) This was quite a common request within transactions of this sort, and of course such a specification lent the donor’s philanthropic largesse a tinge of self-interest by making his gift serve a dual function as a form of spiritual self-investment; thus a gift, but a gift that also a gift that kept on giving, including to himself. And Ware was in luck;

\(^{1621}\) Deanesly argues that from the late 14th century onwards, “the wills of canons and other higher ecclesiastics would usually include a Vulgate.” Deanesly (1920): 186.


\(^{1623}\) For three book lists relating to St. Stephen’s Chapel, Westminster, see CBMLC XV: SC325-7.

\(^{1624}\) Campeden was also rector of Cheriton, Hants., warden of the Hospital of St. Cross in Winchester and a noted assistant to Wykeham in his foundation of the college, later acting as an executor of Wykeham’s will (see *BRUO*: 343-4; Kirby, *Annals*: 23, 66; Keene, *Survey II*: 1184), cf. Cavanaugh (1980): 162.

\(^{1625}\) So-described in the first of three wills Ware made, dated 8 March 1390: “Lego magistro Joanni Campened si supervixit parua biblea mea” (see Cavanaugh 1980: 910-11 [910]).

\(^{1626}\) According to *BRUO*, Merston - who in addition to being a canon was also, at one time baron of the Exchequer - purchased Ware’s library (see *BRUO*: ??)

\(^{1627}\) “Lego domino Henrico Merston’ bibleam meam ut habeat usum eiusdem ad terminum vite sue et postea vendatur et pucunia inde recipienda distribuatur pro animbus utriusque.” (Cavanaugh 1980: 911)
Merston’s will (1432/33) included specific instructions that after his death the bible given to him by Ware was to be disposed of exactly as its previous owner had requested.\footnote{Cavanaugh 1980: 584}

Incidents of bishops leaving their bibles to their nephews are particularly numerous. Richard de Gravesend, bishop of London 1280-1303, bequeathed a small bible (“unam bibliam meliorem”) to his nephew Stephen (“nepoti meo filio [Stephani Gravesend]”) in his will of 1302/3\footnote{The inventory of Richard's library was published in H.H. Milman, “A Catalogue of the Books of R. de Gravesend,” in \textit{Philobiblon Society Miscellanies}, II (1855-6): 3-10 [5-8] and is also included in Cavanaugh (1980): 382-85.} and in his turn, nephew Stephen himself bequeathed the bible (“paruam bibliam meam”) to “d[omi]no Willielmo Vygerons”, as recorded in Stephen’s will of 1336.\footnote{Stephen Gravesend was the son of Richard’s brother, Sir Stephen de Gravesend, and was later bishop of London 1319-d.1338 (for further details on Stephen see \textit{BRUO} II: 805-6); extracts from Stephen’s will are repr. in Cavanaugh (1980): 385-86 [386].} Godfrey Giffard, Bishop of Worcester (w.1301) left his little bible (“Biblia meam minorem”) to his nephew (“J. de Ebroycis nepoti meo”); the bible is singled out amongst the rest of Giffard’s books – listed under the general heading of “Libri” – as the only book he left specific instructions for and made special provision of.\footnote{Giffard: \textit{BRUO} II, 761-2. Cavanaugh (1980): 360-1 [361].}

The notorious Peter de Aquablanca, bishop of Hereford (d.1268) possessed a “Biblia simplex” or ‘Plain Bible’ which he gave to his nephew John, Dean of Hereford (and chief executor of his will),\footnote{"Item dicto Decano [Johanni decano Herefordensi] legamus biblia nostram simplicem quam penes nos habemus”; he also directed that a larger glossed bible (“biblia nostra glossata”) be sold in order to provide clothes for the poor (“vendatur et de precio panni emantur ad pauperes vestiendos”). See C.E. Woodruff, “The Will of Peter de Aqua Blanca, Bishop of Hereford” in \textit{Camden Miscellany} XIV (London: Offices of the Society, 1926): 1-9 [4]; cf. the will made by Peter’s nephew John in \textit{Charters and Records of Hereford Cathedral}, Ed. William W. Capes (Hereford: Wilson & Phillips, Printers, 1908): 186-190.} and likewise, William de Blythe, Archdeacon of Norfolk from 1359-d.1374\footnote{For details of Blythe’s biography and ecclesiastical appointments (including as canon of Chichester) held see \textit{BRUO} I: 207.} left “unam Bibliam vz meliorem et paruum portiforium meum” in his will (1374) to “Johanni de Blyth nepoti meo.”\footnote{Blythe's will (dated 21 Jan. 1374, pro. March 19 of the same year) survives in Lambeth Palace Reg, Whittlesey, fols. 129v-130; extracts repr. in Cavanaugh (1980): 103-4 [103].}
We also see bibles functioning as ‘valuable’ books through their being entailed as units of currency in the settling of debts (albeit posthumously). John Clyderowe (Clitherow), bishop of Bangor and Chancery clerk (w. 1434) – bequeathed a large bible to Nigello Bondeby in order to settle an outstanding debt owed him (“remittendo sibi omne debitum”). Similarly, John Propheete, Dean of York and King’s clerk, also left instructions in his will (8 April 1416) to bequeath his bible for the purpose of settling a ‘debt’ between himself and “Magistro Rogero Hore, consangueo meo”, to whom Propheete was ‘indebted’ in the sense that he had borrowed the bible from Hore and was making provisions to ‘set the ledger straight’, presumably safeguarding against the eventuality that should Propheete be unable to restore Hore’s bible to him before he (Propheete) died, these measures contained in his will ensured that the book would be returned nevertheless.

Propheete’s bequest also included a qualification demonstrating another example of testators wishing their bibles to end up in the hands of those who would use them and gifting their bibles as units of intellectual currency. The will states that in the case of Hore’s death, Propheete’s bequeathed bible should pass to Hore’s closest relative who was a cleric, or who was studying to become one (“aliaquin, ipse defuncto, traditur (sic) proximo de consanguinitate sua qui fuerit clericus”).

Likewise the 1310 inventory of the effects of Thomas Bitton, bishop of Exeter 1291-d.1307 drawn up by his executors includes the stipulation that “Wiberti de Littelton” should receive “j. biblia et j. liber senteciarum” but only on the condition that he be studying theology (“si in sacra scriptura studuerit”).

----


1636 “Magistro Rogero Hore, consangueo meo, c.s., volens quod Biblia sua, quam mihi dedit ad terminum vite mee, sibi retradatur; aliaquin, ipse defuncto, traditur (sic) proximo de consanguinitate sua qui fuerit clericus.” Cavanaugh (1980): 670-1 [670].

1637 “Magistro Rogero Hore, consangueo meo, c.s., volens quod Biblia sua, quam mihi dedit ad terminum vite mee, sibi retradatur; aliaquin, ipse defuncto, traditur (sic) proximo de consanguinitate sua qui fuerit clericus.” Cavanaugh (1980): 670-1 [670].

vi Bibles entailed upon corporations or purchased for institutions

Sixteen bibles were entailed upon corporations (i.e. as gifts) or purchased for institutions.

Two to Religious Houses

In 1283, Archbishop John Pecham OFM (Archbishop of Canterbury 1279-92), wrote to the provincial of the Friars Preachers, William de Hothom (“Fratri Willelmo de Hothom”) asking for the return of a bible which his predecessor had had made at a cost of 113 marcs (“c. marcas et xiii., per fratres indebite detinetur”), a colossal sum of money by any standards (2).1639

Around 1263, Pierre de Chevry, Abbot of St.-Maur des Fossés (near Paris; now in the SE suburbs of the city) paid 200 “lives tournois”1640 for a bible which the convent/abbey had commissioned from Jacques de Boulogne (or Bologna?), cleric, although it is not specified whether the bible was illuminated or not. (3)1641

recorded in the section of the inventory concerning “Solucio legati Diversis locis et personis”, 29-34 [30]); cf. extracts repr. in Cavanaugh (1980): 101-2 [101].


1640 On the contemporary rates of exchange for livres tournois in comparison to other currencies, see Peter Spufford & Wendy Wilkinson, Interim Listing of the Exchange Rate of Medieval Europe (Supported by the Social Science Research council of Great Britain, 1977): ?

1641 “Universis presentes litteras inspecturis, frater Stephanus, humilis prior Fossatensis, totusque conventus ejusdem loci, salute in Domino. Noverit universitas vestra quod, [cum] religious vir P. abbas noster, pensata utile ecclesie nostre, quondam bibliaim posilatam sive glosatam ab executoribus quondam Jacobi de Bolonia, clerici, ad opus nostrum et ecclesie nostre, emerit, pro cc libris turonensium, nos, faventes pie affection ejusdem abbatis erga nos et ecclesiam nostrum, de voluntate dicti abbatis, taetis sacrosanctis evangelis, statuimus et communi assenu ordinamus quod dictam bibliaim quoquo modo non distrahemmus
Twelve to University Colleges

Exeter College, Oxford

John Rawe (or Rowe), recorded as Rector of Exminster in 31 Jan. 1447/8, bequeathed his “parvam bibliam” to Exeter College Oxford, presumably quite a modest copy for the bible was ‘valued’ at 25 s (or £1 5s) in Rawe’s will (dated 8 Sept. 1462, prov. 24 Dec.) (25).

Corpus Christi College, Cambridge

Henry Leicester (“Henry de Leicestre”) fellow of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge bequeathed one in 1376, and in 1380 the master of the College, J. Kynne, purchased a bible at the Northampton parliament (“tempore parliamenti”; “an unlikely venue” notes Lovatt!) expressly for the specific purpose of reading in the Hall (probably a larger ‘lectern’ copy, considering the use for which the bible was intended). Thomas Markaunt, fellow of CCCC (d. 1439) owned – and bequeathed - a bible which he acquired for £3 6s 8d (26) (Fig. 4.2A) and in 1458 John Tyteshale, master of...
Corpus Christi also gave a bible to the College, although his was certainly a more modest volume than Markaunt’s, being described as a “paruus liber in quo biblia continentur”, valued at 6s 8d (“prec. viiijd.”) (Fig. 4.2B).1647

New College, Oxford

Oxford’s New College was founded in 1380 by William Wykeham, bishop of Winchester 1367-d.1404, who had also founded Winchester College two years earlier (in 1378), and both colleges received handsome provisions of books from their founder. The New College register1648 records a very grand total of 246 volumes ex dono Wykeham, including 136 volumes of theology,1649 and the 1385 catalogue of the New College library1650 records that Wykeham gave four bibles to the college;1651 two were distinguished by their respective size and decoration - one was big (“magna”)1652 and another was beautiful (“pulchra”)1653 - but the other two were simply recorded as “alia biblia”1654 (in the order “pulchra”– “alia” – “alia” – “magna”, with the large OT positioned between the alia) although one was the only bible whose ‘price’ was noted, appraised at 53s 4d (€2 13s 4d) (37).1655 Leach records the prices of two of Wykeham’s three unpriced bibles (the big, the beautiful and the second “alia” copy) as £1 6s 8d (38) and £1 (39) but

1647 “Item paruus liber in quo biblia continentur cuuis 2o fo. inc. s. quatuor prec. viiijd.” (CCCC, Ms. 232, fol. 35v).
1648 The Register of New College, known as the Liber albus, was compiled ca.1400 and survives in New College, Oxford, Archives Ms. 9654 (Reed’s donation fols. 3v-17v). For further details of New College, Oxford manuscripts see “Codices MSS. Collegii Novi” in Henry O. Coxe, Catalogus Codicum MSS. qui in Collegiis aulisque Oxoniensibus hodie adservantur (Oxford: Bodleian Library/ University Press, 1852, repr. with addenda: Catalogue of the manuscripts in the Oxford Colleges, 1972): I, 1-123.
1649 The remaining 100 books given to New College by Wykeham (of the total 246 he donated) consisted of 30 books of philosophy, 43 of canon law and 37 of civil law; see Arthur F. Leach, “Wykeham’s Books at New College,” Collectanea III, Ed. M. Burrows, Oxford Historical Society 32 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1896): 223-41 (for the books of philosophy New College received of Wykeham see 234-5, and for those of canon and civil law, see 235 and 240-1).
1651 In addition to a majestic copy of the Old Testament: “Magna biblia veteris testament / 2o fo. ’in textu)annis et ge” (Leach 1896: 225).
1652 “Una biblia magna / 2o fo. ‘alia perstabat’” (Leach 1896: ?).
1653 “Una pulcra biblia / 2o fo. ’qui populo’”(Leach 1896: 225).
1654 “alia biblia / 2o fo. ’Quare natus es’” (Leach 1896: 225).
1655 “alia biblia, 2o fo. ’(in textu) vixit autem’, Pretii 53s. 4d.” (Leach 1896: ?).
it is not clear which is which. Only one of the four bibles New College acquired from Wykeham remains in the college library today; Ms. 1, a small folio bible (407 fols.) previously owned by J. Penyton.\footnote{\textsuperscript{1656} Since Coxe did not record 2\textsuperscript{nd} fo. identifiers in his MS catalogues (curses!) and his entry for Ms. 1 makes no mention of the book containing a note of price (if indeed such a note was every written in the book itself); the most like candidate that may be a match for one of the four Wykeham bibles in the 1385 New College catalogue is Wykeham’s “biblia pulchra”, since Ms. 1’s size is not particularly noteworthy (in that it is not particularly large) but its decoration certainly is ("quoad literas librorum initiales, picturis ornatus"); (Coxe, 1).}

New College also profited greatly from the generous donations of William Reed (Rede), bishop of Chichester 1369-d.1385,\footnote{\textsuperscript{1657} For biographical details of Reed (or ‘Rede’, ‘Red’) including further particulars on his career and the many and varied positions he held, see \textit{BRUO} III: 1556-60, cf. Cavanaugh (1980): 689-714 [703]. For discussion of Reed’s library see F.M. Powicke, \textit{The Medieval Books of Merton College} (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1931): 28-32, 162-83 and also Rodney Thomson’s superb recent essay offering new insights on Reed as collector and, as disperser of his own library, benefactor: “William Reed, Bishop of Chichester (d.1385) – Bibliophile?” in \textit{The Study of Medieval Manuscripts of England: Festschrift in Honor of Richard W. Pfaff}, Eds. George Hardin Brown & Linda Ehrsam Voigts (ACMRS: Tempe, Arizona/ Brepols: Turnhout, Belgium, 2010): 281-93.} who was, along with Richard de Bury, \textit{the} bibliophilic bishop par excellence of 14\textsuperscript{th}-century England.\footnote{\textsuperscript{1658} As evidenced in Rodney Thomson’s description of Reed as “The man who assembled by far the largest collection of books owned by a private person in fourteenth-century England – perhaps in all Europe – and then, systematically and deliberately,…gave it all away.” (Thomson 2010: 281).} Reed possessed the largest collection of books owned by a private person in 14\textsuperscript{th}-century England, and perhaps in all Europe,\footnote{\textsuperscript{1659} To date, Rodney Thomson has identified 536 books once owned by Reed; “not an extraordinary figure for the number of books owned in fourteenth-century England by a large corporation” (such as Christ Church Canterbury or Durham Cathedral Priory) but “remarkable for a private individual.” Rodney Thomson, “William Reed, Bishop of Chichester (d.1385) – Bibliophile?” (2010): 288.} and Reed’s will of 1382/85\footnote{\textsuperscript{1660} Reed’s will (dated 1 August 1382, proved 4 Nov. 1385) is printed in F.M. Powicke, \textit{The Medieval Books of Merton College} (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1931): 87-90, together with the catalogue of the theological books he gave to New College ([New College, \textit{Registrum Primum}, fol. 3v): 91-2 ["una spissa biblia": 91].} lists around 400 books from his extraordinary collection to be distributed among the colleges of the University of Oxford, his \textit{alma mater}, “in order to enhance the education of the clergy which they offered.”\footnote{\textsuperscript{1661} As Rodney Thomson has painstakingly revealed, Reed dispersed his collection to the following beneficiaries: Reed left 16 books (probably service books) to his successors as bishops of Chichester; to his relative Richard Pestour, fellow of Exeter and Merton Colleges, 100 books “for the use of scholars of his kin at Oxford, after Pestour’s death to be kept and lent out by the heads (rector and warden respectively) of Merton and Exeter”; he gifted 100 books to Merton College; to New College another hundred; 20 to Exeter College; 10 each to Balliol, Oriel, and Queen’s; 13 to Arundel College in Kent and more than 18 single books, mostly unspecified, to persons and churches unconnected with Oxford. Rodney Thomson, “William Reed, Bishop of Chichester (d.1385) – Bibliophile?” (2010): 283-84.} Reed’s particular desire to give his books to those for whom they could be of use and to those who would use them is witnessed in his directed donations of 350 books to swell the
libraries of six Oxford colleges. In the catalogue of the New College library compiled ca.1385, the first entry on the list of the theological books Reed gave to the college is the bible he gave, intriguingly-described as “una spissa biblia,” or ‘a thick bible’.

Winchester College, Oxford

William of Wykeham also left a bible to the other college which he had founded (in 1378), Winchester College, whose gift was recorded in his will (dated 24 July 1404) as: “Item lego Collegio meo Wynton’ aliam mitram meam planam, aurifrigiatam, ac biblia meam usualem” (40). However, when the bible was included in the 15th-century catalogue of the college library, it was distinguished as being anything but ‘usual’, rather distinguished as extremely unusual, as ‘a bible with silver clasps, with gold’, valued at the

---

1662 100 books to Merton and 20 to Exeter College, plus another 100 books “for the use of scholars of his kin at Oxford” of both colleges (via bequest to his relative Richard Pestour, fellow of Exeter and Merton Colleges), in addition to 100 books to New College and 10 each to Balliol, Oriel, and Queen’s Colleges.

1663 Fifty of the hundred books Reed gave to New College, in theology and canon law, had earlier been promised to Chichester Cathedral. Reed’s change of mind seems to have been motivated by his philanthropic desire to endow the college with resources, of which it had a pressing need. Having been founded only recently, in 1379-80, it was really still a very ‘New’ College, and what’s more, potentially quite a large one (its statutes provided for seventy fellows); the College therefore “needed to build up its library resources quickly from scratch.” Rodney Thomson, “William Reed, Bishop of Chichester (d.1385) – Bibliophile?” (2010): 292.


considerable sum of 8 marcs/£5 6s 8d. The bible’s entry in all subsequent catalogues note its decorative binding, along with its august provenance (“de legato domini Fundatoris”); in the 1421/22 inventory of goods, in the inventory of the library, 30 July 1428 - 24 August 1429, and in the inventory of goods, 16 August 1432.

Wykeham’s bible is one of two bibles at Winchester College that were distinguished by virtue of their decorative bindings amongst their fellow bibles in 15th-century documentation of the College’s book holdings. The second bible described as a “biblia cum clapsulis argenti” in Winchester’s early 15th-century collections is the bible gifted to the college by John Campeden, archdeacon of Surrey and canon of Southwell (d. 1410). The bible was still described as ‘a bible with silver clasps’ fifteen years later, in the 1421/22 inventory of goods, in addition to which this document also lists Campeden as its donor (“ex dono magistri Iohannis Campeden”) and records its value at 4 marcs/£2 13s 4d.

Both pieces of information were included in the bible’s entry on the

---

1669 “Item vna biblia cum clapsulis argenteis et deauratis de legato domini Fundatoris que incipit secundo fo. ‘tamen’ prec’ viij marc.” (SC334.117)
1670 “In primis j Bibblia cum clapsulis de argentō deaurato ex legato domini Fundatoris, 2° fo. ‘Tum nowa’. / prec’ viij marc.” (the first item under the section ‘Libri Theologie’/ ‘BIBBLIE’) (SC335.93)
1671 “In primis vna Bibblia cum clapsulis de argentō deaurato, 2° fo. ‘Tamen’” (the first item under the sections ‘Libri Theologie’and ‘Bibblie et doctores’) (SC336.80)
1672 See The Libraries of Collegiate Churches, Ed. J.M.W. Willoughby. CBMLC 15, 2 vols. (London: The British Library in association with The British Academy, 2013); SC329 Bequest by William Wykeham, 24 July 1404; SC330 Inventory of goods, 1 September 1405; SC334 Inventory of goods, 1421/2; SC335 Inventory of the library, 30 July 1428- 24 August 1429; SC336 Inventory of goods, 16 August 1432; SC337 Deed of gift by Robert Heete, 29 September 1432; SC338 Inventory of books chained and unchained, 24 January 1433
1673 Entered in the 1405 inventory of the college’s goods as “Item j biblia cum clapsulis argentis, secundo folio ‘legis respondit’ (SC330.98). Campeden was also rector of Cheriton, Hants., warden of the Hospital of St. Cross in Winchester and a noted assistant to Wykeham in his foundation of the college, later acting as an executor of Wykeham’s will (see BRUO: 343-4; Kirby, Annals: 23, 66; Keene, Survey II: 1184), cf. Cavanaugh (1980): 162.
1674 “Item vna biblia [-cum clapsis argentis] de dono magistri Iohannis Campeden’ que incipit secundo folio ‘legit respondit’ / prec’ iiiij. marc.” (SC334.118)
library inventory for 1428-29, although both are omitted from the 1432 inventory of the college’s goods.

A bible donated by another of Winchester’s fellow, Richard Brackeley (fellow 1398-1410, and bursar of the college for much of this period) first appears in Winchester documentation in the 1421/22 inventory of goods, which records the bible being stored in the choir (“quia iacet choro”), where it seems to have remained for the following decade. However by 1433 it had been relocated; in the inventory of Winchester books made that year (in which it is listed twice), we find it included amongst the college’s chained books, described as ‘the bible that was chained in the church’ (“biblia c hathenata in ecclesia” and “bibliam cathanatam”).

We can only speculate as to why this bible was moved – perhaps in order to serve a new function for readings? A further piece in this puzzle is proved by the fact that uniquely amongst all the college’s bibles during this period – Brackeley’s bible is recorded as ‘priced’ at two very different sums in the 15th-century documents for the college. Although the bible’s entry in the 1421/22 inventory of college goods - which records the book as that bible stored in the choir ex dono Brackeley - lists its value at 40 s./£2, when the bible appears in the 1428/29 inventory of the college library, it is accorded a much higher value at 4 marcs/£2 13s 4d (“prec’ iiij marc’”). Whether this considerable discrepancy in pricing reflects the different natures of these inventories as book lists – the first lists books amongst various goods that were the property of the college, whilst the

---

1675 “Item alia Bibblia ex dono magistri Iohannis Campeden, 2o fo. ‘legis respondit’ / prec’ iiij marc’.” (SC335.94)
1676 “Item alia Bibblia, 2o fo. ‘Legis respondit’” (SC336.81)
1677 Brackeley was admitted as fellow of the college on 28 November 1398 and remained in situ through 1410 when, following three bursarial terms, he vacated his fellowship. Some little time later he is recorded as rector of All Saints’ church in Winchester (in February 1416); see BRUO 240.
1678 “Item vna biblia ex legato domini Ricardi Brakkeley que iacet choro et incipit secundo fo. ‘am filio nabth’ / prec’ xl. s.”, Inventory of goods, 1421/2 (SC334.119)
1679 The bible was chronicled twice over this period - in two inventories of 1428-29 (of the library) and 1432 (of goods) – although neither list specifies the location in which the bible was stored: “Item alia Bibblia ex legato domini Ricardi Brakkeley; 2o fo. ‘am filio’ /prec’ iiij marc’”, Inventory of the library, 30 July 1428 x 24 August 1429 (SC335.95) and “Item alia Bibblia, 2o fo. ‘Am filio’”, Inventory of goods, 16 August 1432 (SC336.82)
1680 Listed twice in the inventory of books chained and unchained at Winchester (dated 24 January 1433): “Item j biblia cathanata in ecclesia, iij fo. ‘am filio’” and “Item j bibliam cathanatam, 2o fo. ‘am filio’.” (SC338.83, 186)
1681 “Item alia Bibblia ex legato domini Ricardi Brakkeley; 2o fo. ‘am filio’ /prec’ iiij marc’”, Inventory of the library, 30 July 1428 x 24 August 1429 (SC335.95)
second lists books exclusively, chronicling the contents of the college library – the fact that the two documents record a doubling of the bible’s monetary value in the space of 7 years is curious and certainly intriguing.

Another bible donated to the college with accompanying instructions detailing the audience by whom it was to be used was that gifted by Robert Heete, scholar of Winchester and fellow of New College, Oxford (d. 1433). He specified that it be made available to all fellows of the College (“ad vsum alicuius socii dum steterit in eodem”) and was valued at £4 in the 1428-29 inventory of the library. The bible’s valuation (and the fact that his gift had taken place) were subsequently confirmed in a deed dated 29 September 1432.

Likewise Richard Crymock (d.1424), previously a fellow of Winchester College (“olim socii Collegii”) bequeathed a bible to the College - albeit through his executors (“ex ordinacione executorum”) – with specific instructions regarding how and by whom it was to be used. Unlike Robert Heete’s benevolent provision of a bible to be generally available, Crymock’s instructions were more cautious and security-conscious (or perhaps simply curmudgeonly), as recorded in the in the 1421/22 and 1428-49 inventories of the College’s goods, which specify that his bible, which was valued at 40 s/£2 in the 1428-29 inventory, may only be loaned to one fellow at a time (“ad vsum vnius socii”) by indentured agreement between the recipient and the warden (“per indenturam inter custodem et recipientem”). The recipient named in the inventory (“predictus Ricardus”) was Richard Boureman, who had been admitted as scholar of the

---

1683 “Item j Bibblia ex dono Robert Hette ad vsum alicuius socii dum steterit in eodem per indenturam inter custodem et recipientem, 2o fo. galas vrbes / prec’ iij li.” in the inventory of the library, 30 July 1428 x 24 August 1429 (SC335.97).
1684 “Item alia Bibblia ex ordinacione executorum magistri Ricardi Crymok olim socii Collegii ad vsum vnius socii ad orandum pro anima eisdem et animabus Iohannis et Iohanne dum steterit in eodem per indenturam inter custodem et recipientem, 2o fo. Qorum / prec’ xl s.”, Inventory of the library, 30 July 1428 x 24 August 1429 (SC335.96).
College in 1405, and following an eight-year stint as a fellow of New College (1408-16), entered into a fellowship at Winchester in 1421, a position that he held until his death in 1465. A decade later Boureman’s name appears again in connection with this same bible,¹⁶⁸⁷ in the 1433 inventory of books chained and unchained, in which it was noted that he had borrowed this very bible (“biblia in manibus domini Ricardii Boureman” [my italics]).¹⁶⁸⁸

New College, Oxford, Ms. 7, a large late 13th-century bible, includes an inscription identifying one of the book’s previous owners as one “Johannis Green”,¹⁶⁸⁹ probably the same John Grene who was a fellow of New College and was previously a scholar at Winchester College (in 1397),¹⁶⁹⁰ and New College Ms. 7 is very probably the bible which Grene bequeathed to William Crowton (“Willelmus Crowton”) in 1434.¹⁶⁹¹

In fact the note which chronicles Grene’s ownership of the book lists Grene as a secondary party in the transaction; the inscription records the bible’s purchase from Grene’s executors (“quem emit de executor domini Johannis Green”) for the sum of £4 6s 8d (“pro iiij. libris vi. s. viii. d.”) (45) by a buyer whose name, but not his title, has been erased (“Liber magistri ……”) thus telling us that this purchaser was a Fellow of the university, probably Oxford.

Merton College, Oxford

Amongst the prices of books purchased by Merton College, Oxford for the college library - recorded in the list of Merton’s Sundry Articles – is chronicled the college’s purchase of a bible in 1344 for the College for the sum of £3 (30).¹⁶⁹² Two further special

¹⁶⁸⁷ A year after Boureman had witnessed the deed for the gift of Robert Heete’s bible to the College on 29 September 1432 (see above; SC337.1)
¹⁶⁸⁸ “Item alia biblia in manibus domini Ricardii Boureman’, iij fo. quorum.”, Inventory of books chained and unchained, 24 January 1433 (SC338.85). The bible also appeared in the inventory of goods made the year before (dated 16 August 1432); “Item alia Biblia, ii fo. Quorum.” (SC336.83)
¹⁶⁸⁹ The inscription (located at the back of the bible) reads “Liber magistri (……) quem emit de executor domini Johannis Green pro iiij. libris vi. s. viii. d.”
¹⁶⁹⁰ For further biographical details on Grene, including a list of his ecclesiastical appointments (e.g. Grene was later the rector of Charing, Kent), see BRUO II: 818; Chichele, 514-15.
¹⁶⁹¹ “Lego magistro Willelmus Crowton’ unam Bibliam secundo folio ‘hec a me’; extracts from Grene’s will (dated 4 June 1434, pro. 29 Dec. of that year) are repro. in Cavanaugh (1980): 390-1 [391]. On New College, Oxford, Ms. 7 see Coxe I, New College; 2-3.
cases concerning the donation of bibles to Merton College, Oxford and to Drax Priory in Yorkshire shed light upon the mechanics of the entailment process.

Simon de Bredon DM (d. 1372) was a noted physician and astronomer and a fellow of Merton College, Oxford 1330-41 (formerly of Balliol College). In his will of 1368 Bredon left cash, plate, vestments, scientific instruments and especially books to a variety of institutions, amongst whom Merton College figured prominently, and amongst his Mertonian bequests may or may not have been included a bible, which he states was worth 40 s/£2 (32). If this sounds uncertain, it is because it is, for rather than leaving instructions for the outright bequeathal of his bible to the College after his death as a gift, what Simon actually records is essentially a ‘sales pitch’ to his College, offering them the opportunity to buy his bible (or rather the opportunity to pay a certain sum to his executors) and no evidence survives to inform us of the College’s decision. What Simon proposes is, at heart, a posthumous business transaction; in proposing that he and the College enter into a benefactual relationship as potential ‘benefactor’ and potential legatee, Simon in fact casts himself and the College in the respective roles of bookseller and book-purchaser or customer. The language of this section of his will relating to the bible is of great interest and its text bears quoting in full:

“Bibliam meam lego prioratu de Merton, sub condicione quod soluant executoribus meis xl.s. eo quod pro tot solidos vel saltem pro vno libro tanti precii accomodarunt dictum librum, vt patet per quoddam scriptum quod iunen in dicta biblia vel in principio vel in fino; quod si dictos xl. solidos soluerint, lego dictam biblia magistro Willelmo de Heghterbury, quia ego veraciter eam emi.”

The proposal opens as one might expect, that ‘I [Simon] leave my bible to Merton’ (“Bibliam meam lego prioratu de Merton”), but this commonplace introductory statement is swiftly followed by the sharp qualification (marked by an audible ‘However…’) that he would do so on the condition that the College pay the executors of his will the sum of 40s (“sub condicione quod soluant executoribus meis xl.s.”).

De Bredon proceeds to explain to his would-be ‘customers’ why this is a reasonable proposal, stating that 40 s is a reasonable price for this book/for a book such as this (“eo quod pro tot solidos vel saltem pro vno libro tanti precii accomodarunt dictum librum”) and if they sought proof that such was indeed the case, then they should consult the notes written at the front or at the back of the bible (“vt patet per quoddam scriptum quod inueni in dicta biblia vel in principio vel in fino”).

It is hard not to read what Simon is suggesting as less of a proposal and more of a persuasive ‘sales pitch’. However his concluding statement reveals that behind his tempting carrot lurks a biting stick, as he switches from persuasion to a passive-aggressive threat, that if the College was unwilling to pay this sum (of 40 s) for the bible he was offering to them, then he would leave the bible to Magister William Heytesbury, the famous Mertonian logician and natural philosopher from whom he had purchased the book (“quod si dictos xl. solidos soluere noluerint, lego dictam bibliam magistro Willelmo de Heghterbury, quia ego veraciter eam emi.”).

So if the College bought the book, and forked over the 40s, what might Simon’s executors have done with this money? Since he is clearly going to a good deal of trouble to obtain this money, it seems reasonable to assume that he must have intended the funds to have been spent in such a way as to have been of some benefit to him (or perhaps to some needy party or parties, such as the poor; although this depends on how altruistic he was!)

What does the ‘price’ at which he offers the book tell us? It tells us that 40 s. was, at that time, considered to be a reasonable sum that one might reasonably expect, or be expected, to pay for this bible, at least according to him. To prove the bible’s worth he directs them to sources that confirm his appraisal of the book’s value; these ‘sources’ are notes at the front and back of the book itself which record the price of sale or of purchase when he acquired it.

---

1695 William Heytesbury (d.1372/3) featured prominently amongst the many individuals to whom Bredon made many bequests bequeathed possessions, especially books, and Bredon also appointed him as one of his executors (see Merton calculators).

1696 A reasonable sum for “dictum librum”; for a bible like this one (i.e. a bible) or for this bible (i.e. a large bible? an illuminated bible?) or for a book ‘of this sort’? (i.e. an illuminated book? a large book?)
If Merton bibliophiles were to have inspected the front and back of de Bredon’s bible to check his ‘proofs’ witnessing the book’s value, what might we expect them to have discovered? These ‘witnesses’ to the bible’s pricing at 40 s. could have been booksellers’ ‘price tags’, however since he informs us that the bible includes two such notes – one at the front and one at the back – then presumably only one would be added by a where he had presumably added notes recording the price for whih he had purchased it; as insurance against just such an eventuality as this?

The very fact that de Bredon directs his ‘customers’ to these sources may simply be read as part of his sales pitch (to convince them, he provides assurances of the veracity of his claim), or it might be taken as demonstrating that he expects his customers to require such ‘credentials’. If so, what might they need convincing of? Does this perhaps suggest that the College would consider this price as rather steep, and if they were to be expected to expend a considerable sum in purchasing this book, they would need convincing that the book was indeed worth what he says it was worthy, and that this was therefore a kosher purchase.

And if the ‘price tag’ proofs included at least one note that he had added himself, recording his purchase for the sum he now proposes, in adding this price upon the occasion of purchasing the book could be viewed as anticipatory; in other words, that he did so when he first acquired the book could be seen as a cautionary action, intended to provide insurance against just such an eventuality as this.

Cf.

Robert Alne, Examiner in the ecclesiastical court of York and a fellow of Peterhouse (w. 1440) bequeathed a large bible to Drax Priory, Yorkshire on the same condition - that his executors receive the sum of 40 s/£2 (27) – although with the additional proviso that the money must be forthcoming within a year following Alne’s death or risk forfeiting the book (“aliter non”).

---

Four bibles containing notes recording the prices for which they were either sold or purchased but do not include details of the persons involved in these transactions. CCCC Ms. 246 was purchased for 4 marcs (or £2 13s 4d) at some point during the 14th century (14) at around the same time (or perhaps slightly earlier) that a late-13th century French ‘lectern’ bible decorated with fine historiated initials (now Queen’s College, Oxford, Ms. 299) cost £10 (15). In comparison, Christ Church, Oxford Ms. 109 (195 x 128 mm) was sold for £2 2s (16) during the following (15th) century, and a 13th-century ‘saddle-bag’ bible, now Emmanuel College, Cambridge Ms. I.2.2 was purchased for 5 marcs (£3 16s 8d) at a similar date. (17)

vii ‘Borrowing prices’ for bibles

Exeter College, Oxford

The Register of Exeter College, Oxford contains five records of priced transactions involving bibles between 1354-74: in Autumn 1354, 60s/£3 paid for redeeming a bible which lay in Langeton chest (33); in the winter of 1357 £3 for a bible pledged in the Chichester chest (34); in Autumn 1358 £3 for a bible redeemed from the Chichester chest and £3 for a bible pledged in the Winton chest (35); and in summer

---

1698 (156 x 102 mm); contains a note recording its price on fol. i.v: “precium iiiij marc”. The bible also contains a caucio note 46s 8d, dated 1479 (on fol. ii.r, partly erased): “Cauicio m. ler ... (or ber ... ) exposita in cista. / W ... embbris. / Anno dni mmvccccclxxix (?). et habet duo supple(?) / (-)menta antonii in metaphisica (?) 2o fo / ilia que et ... stat(uta?) 2o fo. (?) quod et iacet / pro xlvis viijd.”

1699 The bible was copied ca. 1280-90, probably Paris (315 x 215 mm, 444 fols.); decorated historiated initials mostly four-line (initial ‘I’s often considerably taller); cf. Catalogue description ‘pre-published’ on the Queen’s College website here. Inscribed with what appears to be a price of £10 (“p[re]t[ium] x l’’) on p. 870 (inscription added on bottom edge of page, upside down; formerly probably the front flyleaf).

1700 Mid-13th century or second half, France (perhaps England?)(195 x 128 [142 x 86] mm, 457 fols.) contains a bookseller’s price “2...--” (fol. 1). Cf. A Heptateuch copied ca. 1350-75, now Queen’s College, Oxford, Ms. 308 (375 x 290 mm), was priced or sold for 25s; an inscription on the top right of fol. ir reads “Edward est possessor p[retium] xxvs”; cf. Catalogue description ‘pre-published’ on the Queen’s College website here.

1701 (235 x 162 mm; 358 fols.); price recorded on its flyleaf: “Prec. v. marc. Et si contingat quod librarie communi vendetur volo quod habeat infra sumnum suprascriptam pro vis. viiid. ut causam deprecandi valeat habere pro anima nuper possidentis.” At the end, “Biblia M. Willelmi” (15th-century) erased; given to Emmanuel College by Mag. Foxcroft “huius olim Collegii alumnus et scholaris discipulus, Ecclesiae nunc Gothamensis Rector.” M.R. James, *The Western Manuscripts in the Library of Emmanuel College: A Descriptive Catalogue* (Cambridge: CUP, 1904): 19 (James no. 23).
1374, “4 marks [£2 13s 4d] to our barber for a Bible pledged to him in the time of John Dagenet” (36).1702

Pembroke College

Among the entries of purchases of books etc. collected by Matthew Wren from the old account books of Pembroke College, Cambridge and entered in his Register 415, is recorded that John Cowper, who seems to have been a fellow of the college, paid £3 6s 8d. in 1439 ‘for a bible lent for his life’ (28); five years later (1444), his name reappears in the register, although this time Cowper was receiving a payment of £2 13s for ‘a bible’ (29).1703

viii How Do We Read These Prices?1704

First, what kinds of users do we see in possession of Latin bibles whose prices can be discerned? And being used in what kinds of intellectual environment or types of communities? Do these results indicate any significant changes in any of these areas over the centuries?

Who? We find documented instances of ‘priced’ late medieval Latin bibles in the possession of members of the following groups. Members of both major and minor orders of the secular clergy: ten members of the major orders of the secular clergy, including three Archbishops of Canterbury (2, 6 and 20); six bishops, of Rochester (1), London (4), Norwich (11), Exeter (18), S. Asaph (19) and of Hereford (21); and one member of the cathedral clergy (i.e. slightly less senior secular clergy) – a dean (12); five members of the secular clergy in minor orders:1705 a chaplain (at the University of Oxford) (9), and archdeacon/Royal Administrator (22), a canon [→ an archdeacon] (23), a canon residentiary (24) and a rector (25).

1704 See Appendix II.B.
Three at monastic communities, comprising one abbot [→ cleric] (3) and two monks (8 and 10). Twelve members of the Universities, including two founders of Colleges in Oxford, at New College (37) and Winchester College, (40); ten Fellows - three at Cambridge colleges, at Corpus Christi College (26), Peterhouse (27) and at Pembroke (28-29), six at Oxford colleges, two at Merton (31 and 32) and four at Winchester (42, 43, 44 and 41) and one at a London College (13) - and one scholar (of Winchester College, Oxford, 45). Three members of the laity: one member of the nobility (7), one Royal Administrator [who was also rector, archdeacon & canon] (5), and one Barber (associated with the universities, namely Exeter College, Oxford (36)

Where? Sixteen bibles are recorded in nine private libraries;\(^{1706}\) eight bibles were personal purchases, purchased for personal use;\(^{1707}\) one ‘priced’ example of a bible being bequeathed to an individual as a personal bequest\(^{1708}\); seventeen bibles entailed upon or purchased for institutions);\(^{1709}\) in addition to four surviving bibles with prices but without further transaction data\(^{1710}\) and ‘Borrowing Prices’ for six bibles\(^{1711}\)

When? Three from the 13\(^{th}\) century,\(^{1712}\) twenty-six from the 14\(^{th}\) century\(^{1713}\) and twenty-four from the 15\(^{th}\) century.\(^{1714}\)

Second, what light do these results shed on whether prices for Latin bibles were comparatively high or low? I have, I hope, gathered a sufficient number of examples from sources that provide guidelines for positioning the market value of a 13\(^{th}\)-century portable bible at different points and in different circumstances over the course of the late Middle

\(^{1706}\) Priced bibles in private libraries: 4a-c, 6, 7, 18a-c, 19, 20, 21, 23, 24 and 31.

\(^{1707}\) Priced bibles that were personal purchases: 11, 22, 5a, 12, 13, 10, 9 and 8.

\(^{1708}\) Priced bibles bequeathed as personal gifts to individuals: 1

\(^{1709}\) Priced bibles that were bequeathed to institutions: two to Religious Houses (2, 3); ten to University Colleges (25, 26, 26+, 30, 37-39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45); plus two special cases (32, 27)

\(^{1710}\) i.e. Bibles containing notes recording the prices for which they were either sold or purchased but do not include details of the persons involved in these transactions; surviving bibles with prices but without further transaction data: 14, 15, 16 and 17.

\(^{1711}\) Bibles with discernible ‘Borrowing Prices’: 28, 29, 33, 34, 35 and 36.

\(^{1712}\) 1 (Ł2 13s 4d), 2 (Ł?/113 marcs) and 3 (Ł?/200 livres tournois).

\(^{1713}\) 4a (Ł3 6s 8d: large), 4b (Ł3), 4c (Ł1 6s 8d: small), 5a (Ł2: small), 5b (Ł5: large), 6 (Ł?/12 francs), 7a (Ł10: 12-vol. bible), 7b (Ł4), 7c (Ł1: small), 14 (Ł2 13s 4d), 15 (Ł10), 18a (Ł10), 18b (Ł13 14d), 18c (Ł1), 19 (Ł2), 22 (Ł2), 23 (Ł2), 30 (Ł3), 32 (Ł2), 33 (Ł3), 34 (Ł3), 35a (Ł3), 35b (Ł2), 36 (Ł2 13s 4d), 38 (Ł1 6s 8d), 39 (Ł1).

\(^{1714}\) 8 (Ł1), 9 (Ł2), 10 (Ł?/12 florins), 11 (Ł12?/12 crowns), 12 (Ł3 6s 8d), 13 (Ł4 2s 8d), 16 (Ł2 2s), 17 (Ł3 6s 8d), 20 (Ł10), 21 (Ł6 13s 4d), 24 (Ł6 13s 4d), 25 (Ł1), 26 (Ł3 6s 8d), 27 (Ł2), 28 (Ł3 6s 8d), 29 (Ł2 13s), 31 (Ł 6 13d), 37 (Ł2 13s 4d), 40 (Ł5 6s 8d), 41 (Ł2 13s 4d), 42 (Ł2 13s 4d but later 40s/Ł2), 43 (Ł4), 44 (Ł2) and 45 (Ł4 6s 8d).
Ages in England, although any figure suggested as representing the ‘typical price’ or ‘standard value’ of a Latin portable bible – e.g. ‘A 13th-century portable bible would set you back about 20 to 40 shillings in 15th-century Oxford’ – must always be treated cautiously.1715

One bible is under £1, five bibles are £1 (or 20s)1716 and two are £1–£21718; nine bibles are £2 (or 40s)1719 and eight are between £2 and £31720; four bibles are £31721 and five are £3–£41722; two bibles are £41723; five bibles are £4–£61724, three are £6–£91725 and seven bibles are over £10.1726

How do these prices for Latin bibles compare to the extant suggested estimates (e.g. ca. £2–£4)? To begin with, these results demonstrate what a large difference exists within a price range of ‘£2–£4’; in 36 instances, bibles are £4 or less, but of these, only two are £4; a significant portion are £2 or less (17 bibles) but the vast majority (29 bibles) are £3 or less. Therefore these results suggest that Bell’s suggested price range of ‘£2–£4’ is a ‘soft’ category, and that a more accurate ‘typical’ price range for Latin bibles during the late Middle Ages would rather be ‘£2–£3’.

What can we say about the 15 instances in which bibles cost £4 or more? These fifteen include seven examples of bibles costing between £4 and £6, three costing between £6 and £9 and 5 bibles the valued at over £10: two are £4 exactly (7b and 43), five between £4 to £6 (including two at £4 6s 8d [13 and 45], two at £5 [4b and 5b; both large] and one at £5 6s 8d [40]) and three are between £6 and £9 (20, 24 and 31; all £6 13s 4d); and five bibles are over £10, four of which cost £10 exactly (7a, 15, 18a

1715 Since the variable factors that influence an object’s ‘financial worth’ were as many and as varied in the past as they are today, including the type of transaction (i.e. a commissioned or a secondhand purchase), the date and place at which it was taking place, the contents and condition of the bible, who was doing the selling, purchasing or appraising, and the effects of market fluctuation and so on.

1716 18b (13s 14d).
1717 7c (small), 8, 18c, 25 and 39 (all £1).
1718 38 (£1 6s 8d) & 4c (£1 6s 8d: small).
1719 5a (small), 9, 19, 22, 23, 27, 32, 35b and 44 (all £2).
1720 16 (£2 2s), 29 (£2 13s) and 1, 14, 36, 37 & 41 (all £2 13s 4d or 4 marcs) and 42 (also £2 13s 4d/53s 4d [4 marcs] but later 40s/£2).
1721 30, 33, 34 and 35a (all £3).
1722 4a (large), 12, 26 & 28 (all £3 6s 8d) and 17 (£3 16s 8d).
1723 7b and 43 (both £4).
1724 13 & 45 (both £4 6s 8d); 4b & 5b (both £5: large); and 40 (£5 6s 8d)
1725 21, 24 & 31 (all £6 13s 4d).
1726 7a (12-vol. bible), 15, 18a & 20 (all £10) and 11 (£2/12 crowns) plus 2 (113 marcs) and 3 (200 livres tournois).
and 21; and one cost 12 crowns (11); in addition to the two extraordinary bibles costing 113 marcs/£ (2) and 200 livres tournois/£ (3) which both represent institutional purchases of bibles which were undoubtedly large and probably in multiple volumes.

However since all three bibles in the ‘£6-£9’ category cost £6 13s 4d, of the fifteen instances of bibles costing over £4, ten cost between £4 to £6 13s 4d, thus the examples at the high end of our price range really consist of only five bibles that cost over £7 (four at £10 and one at 12 crowns/£).

Next, how did these prices compare to the levels of purchase prices for other kinds of bible? Four of these transactions allow us to compare the different amounts for bibles in comparison to the amounts paid for other kinds of bible within the same purchase/transaction; in other words, these transactions allow us to gauge how ‘expensive’ portable bibles were compared to other kinds of bibles regarding respective sizes, number of volumes and whether they were glossed or unglossed.

Richard de Gravesend, bishop of London 1280-1303, possessed an extensive episcopal library comprising around 80 volumes. Its contents are listed in the inventory of Richard’s effects drawn up in 1313 by the executors of his will,1727 and appraises his books at a total value of £116 14s 6d, demonstrating not only the considerable size of Richard’s library, but also that his was an extremely valuable collection.1728 The inventory reveals that Richard owned three bibles, (4) all stored “in Garderoba” (the wardrobe), one of which is specified as a ‘little bible’ valued at 20 s/£1 (“De xx.s. de una parva biblia vendita”) (4a), not a small sum but nevertheless considerably less than the £4 at which Richard’s second bible (of unspecified size) was valued (“De iv. li. De una biblia vendita”) (4b). The third in 13 volumes (thus probably a set of glossed books of the Bible) is more costly still, having been appraised at of £10 (“De una Biblia in xij. voluminibus pretii x. li. legata ut infra”) (4a),1729 a majestic sum, and one for which – according to the

1727 Or at least the contents of Richard’s library extant in 1313.
inventory - the books had already been purchased, by Richard’s nephew Stephen de Gravesend, later bishop of London 1319-d.1338.\footnote{Cavanaugh (1980): 844-51 [849].}

The inventory of goods belonging to Thomas of Woodstock, Earl of Buckingham and Duke of Gloucester and husband of Eleanor de Bohun, d.1397\footnote{Cf. Viscount Dillon & W.H. St. John Hope, “Inventory of the Goods and Chattels Belonging to Thomas, Duke of Gloucester, and Seized in his Castle at Pleshy, Co. Essex, 21 Richard II (1397); with their Values, as Shown in the Escheator’s Accounts,” Archaeological Journal, 54 (1897): 275-308 [Inventory’s text at 287-308].} seized in his castle at Pleshy after his death in 1397\footnote{The second item on this list may also be a Latin bible, although the ambiguity of the description prohibits a secure identification: “iij larges livres cov[e]3 de blanc quyr[?] ove claspes de laton[?] cont[?] entre eux la bible p’s x.li.”(£10); the list also includes an English bible, “Un bible en Engleys en ij g’nt3 livres cov[e]3 de rouge quyr[?] p’s xl.s.” (now BL, Mss. Egerton 617-18) Cf. Viscount Dillon & W.H. St. John Hope, “Inventory of the Goods and Chattels Belonging to Thomas, Duke of Gloucester, and Seized in his Castle at Pleshy, Co. Essex, 21 Richard II (1397); with their Values, as Shown in the Escheator’s Accounts,” Archaeological Journal, 54 (1897): 298-9.} includes at least three bibles (all included within the list of the books for the Duke’s chapel).\footnote{“Una Biblia bone litere precii x marc.”, “Secunda Biblia precii xiiij.s. iiij.d.”, “Tercia Biblia precii xx.s.”} The first two copies were both larger (each described a ‘a bible in an immense volume’); the second, also with silver clasps, was valued at 66s 8d/£3 6s 8d, (7a) but the third was clearly an extraordinary book, described as ‘well-written’ (“bien escrip[?]”) and bound in gold with two clasps of white enamel, and was therefore appraised accordingly, at 100s/£5 (7b).\footnote{“Un bible de mesne volum ove claspes dargent p’s lxvj.s. viij.d.” / “j bible de mesne volum bien escrip[?]cov[e]3 de drap[?] dor de cipr[?] ove ij claspes dor enamaille3 blanc p’s c.s.”} However the third was a ‘small bible (literally, the bible in a small volume) covered in green cloth with two silver clasps’ which was valued at 26s 8d/£1 6s 8d (7c).\footnote{“Un bible de petit volum cov[e]3 de vert quyr veil ove ij claspes dargent p’s xxvi.s. viij.d.”}

Three bibles valued at considerably different sums are listed in the 1328 inventory made of the books of Walter de Stapeldon, bishop of Exeter 1308-d.1326 \footnote{Stapeldon: BRUO III, 1764-5; Cavanaugh (1980): 811-14 [813]; cf. The Register of Walter de Stapeldon, Bishop of Exeter A.D. 1307-1326, Ed. F.C. Hingeston-Randolph (London: George Bell & Son, 1892): 563-65.} the first, described only as a bible “bone litere”, was valued at £10 (18a), while the second and third bibles, whose entries record no details beyond their valuations, were priced at 13s 14d (18b) and 20s (or £1) (18c) respectively.\footnote{“I Biblia in xijij. Volumnibus pretii x. l magistro Stephano de Gravesend.”; included in the inventory’s concluding section [headed “Inde legati. - Liberat[ur] ex legat[ur]”] which lists those books that had already been sold and purchased at that date that the inventory was made; Milman, “A Catalogue of the Books of R. de Gravesend”: 8.}
To summarize, the three bibles in Richard de Gravesend’s library at the end of the 13th century arguably represent bibles in small (4c), large (4b) and multi-volume glossed (4a) formats, priced at £1, £4 and £10 respectively. Likewise, the sum at which the small bible in Thomas of Woodstock’s library is valued (7c; £1 6s 8d) represents a significant distance between the level at which it can be seen to have been valued and those accorded to the two larger bibles, one being valued at over twice its price (7a; £3 6s 8d) and while the other is appraised at over three times is ‘value’ (7b; £5).

Another comparison can be made in the case of the bibles of William de Walcote, a protégé of Isabella, Queen of King Edward II and daughter of King Philip IV of France (d.1358); and William served as keeper and receiver of the queen’s great wardrobe during the early years of Edward II’s reign. However, despite his professional position as a trustworthy handler of monies and properties, William is recorded ca. 1349 as in debt to the queen, and a number of his books were sold in order to cover this sum. Amongst these books were two bibles; the first a small (“petit”) bible ‘covered with a cloth de soi jehere’, which was purchased for 40 s/£2 by “T. Rous” (5a), and the other a large bible (“graunt bible”) ‘covered in white leather’, valued at 100 s/£5. (5b)

The list also offers us some helpful insights into the relative cost of William’s bible in comparison to his other books, for it notes the titles and prices of the other books Rous purchased from William; thus we see that at 40 s, William’s “petit bible” was four times the price of his *Oculus Sacerdotis* (x s.) but cost the same amount as his “livre decrees” (xl s.), and only slightly less than the price for his copies of the *Decretals* and *Sentences* together (xl s. iiiij d. for the pair). The description of the larger, expensive bible (‘j. graunt bible covre

---

1738 Extracts from various documents recording the books in Isabella’s own collection and her activities as an important patron of the Arts reproduced in Cavanaugh (1980): 456-60. For further details cf. E.A. Bond, “Notices of the last days of Isabella, Queen of Edward II, drawn from an Account of the Expenses of her Household,” *Archaeologia*, 35 (1854): 453-69


1740 This list is recorded in the Hunter Collection of transcripts from Exchequer records (BL, London, Add. Ms. 25459, fols. 207r-v); extracts printed in Cavanaugh (1980): 901-2 [902].

1741 “j. petit bible covre dun drap de soi jehere – s.l.s.” (Cavanaugh 1980: 902)

1742 “j. graunt bible covre de quir blaunk de Robert de Corby per comandement Madame la Royne pris de c.s.” On Robert de Corby, see his identification as testator in Thomas Langley’s will (see Cavanaugh 1980: 499-502 [502]).
de quir blaunk de Robert de Corby per comandement Madame la Royne pris de c.s.”)
is interesting. Particularly intriguing is its inclusion of the phrase “per comandement
Madame la Royne”. Does the reference to the sale of this particular bible ‘by her
command’ perhaps indicate that Isabella had ‘approved’ the transaction - suggesting that
royal authorization was a requirement for its sale; in other words, it was only with her
permission that this bible could be sold - or that this particular book was being sold as she
had expressly directed (i.e. instructed William: ‘You must sell this bible!’). If so, we may
presumable that her choice was guided by the simple fact that as a large luxury bible this
copy would be more likely to sell for a high price, and thus ensure the repayment of the
monies owed her. It is worth noting that, as a life-long bibliophile and
patron/commissioner of the production of dozens of books, Isabella certainly possessed
the knowledge and experience of the relative prices and values of books necessary to
make such a judgement call.\footnote{Isabella also owned a 2-volume bible in French, which she kept in her chamber ("Una biblia in gallicis
in duobus voluminibus") which passed to Joan, Queen of Scotland after her death in 1358 (recorded in
P.R.O. E 101/393/4, fols. 9v-10r; extracts in Cavanaugh 1980:459-60 [459]). For a summary of the
importance of books to Isabella and her ‘career’ as book collector (one particularly fond of books of
romance), see sources listed in her entry in Cavanaugh (1980): 456-60, and for further details and discussion
cf. Hilda Johnstone, “Isabella, the she-wolf of France,” History, NS 21 (1936-37): 208-18;}

And where does Robert de Corby fit in? Is the inclusion
of his name in the larger bible’s description simply a ‘provenance tag’ noting its
ownership prior to its acquisition by William?

Two further transactions offer insights into the different sums paid for bibles
compared to the amounts paid for other books within the same purchase transaction.
Following the death of Simon Langham, Archbishop of Canterbury 13??-d.76 at
Avignon,\footnote{On Langham (previously a monk of Westminster Abbey and subsequently Chancellor of England), see
BRUO II: 1095-97.} seven chests of books were sent to Westminster as part of his legacy to the
Abbey. They were valued before they were committed to the merchants who under took
to transmit them as far as Bruges; happily, the text of this valuation document (headed
“Estimacio librorum bone memorie d[o]m[in]i Cardinalis Cant[uariensis]”) has
survived.\footnote{This document was published in J.A. Robinson & M.R. James, The Manuscripts of Westminster Abbey
(Cambridge: CUP, 1909): 4-7, in which the authors note the document’s survival (albeit “in a mutilated
form”) as Westminster Abbey, Ms. Munim. 9,226 and as an early and complete (though often inaccurate)
copy (now Ms. Munim. 9,225), from which the document’s text was copied into the Liber Niger Quaternus
(“but somewhat carelessly”); the list is also reproduced in full in Cavanaugh (1980): 495-99.}
The valuation is organized by book chest (or “cista”), listing the contents of each of the seven sequentially. Amongst the thirteen entries/books listed in the “Tercia [Third] Cista,” is a “Bi[b]lia i parvo volumine” valued at 12 francs (“xii fr.”) (6). We may reasonably hazard the suggestion that this bible may have been made in France, since its owner was ‘importing’ it (or at least bringing it with him, already purchased) from France. How high is the level of this valuation, for example in comparison to the other books in that chest? The total value of the third cista’s contents was appraised at 172 ½ francs, a sum that represented about a third of the total value of the contents of all seven chests together, which is given as 620 francs, 14s. Nine of the thirteen books were valued at between 1 and 12 francs (of which five valued at under 10 francs - three valued at 1, 4 and 6 francs respectively and two at 2 francs - and four valued at 12 francs), two were valued between 20 and 29 francs (20 and 22 francs respectively) and two were valued at over 30 francs (at 30 and 37 francs). Therefore within the context of its fellow volumes in the third cista - i.e. within the context of the books with which it was stored whilst in transit (and may also have been kept in this chest prior to its journey?) - Langham’s small French bible may be seen as having occupied a mid-level position of cost within this collection, albeit a collection of expensive books.

We have already noted the bible which Thomas Markaunt, Fellow of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, purchased for £3 6s 8d (26) and subsequently gifted to his college as part of his bequest of all his books (a total of 75) around 1439. However Markaunt, his bible and his bequest all merit further attention. Markaunt left his books to Corpus Christi on the condition that his books were to be placed in a chest and


1747 The ‘valuations’ for the books in the “tercia cista” ranged from 1 franc (“passio sancte Thome cum epistolis suis et privatus sancti gregori”) to 37 ½ francs (“secundum volumen lire continens esdras . nemias . ester . Job . tobias . judit . psalterium . proverbia . ecclesiastes . canica . sapiencia . ecclesiasticus”).


maintained as a separate loan collection available for the use of the master and fellows, a most commendable condition of which we are aware thanks to the survival of the Register containing lists of Markaunt’s books and the prices he paid for them, along with a copy of his will, in CCCC Ms. 232 (cf. Fig. 4.2A). This Register therefore offers an exceptionally rich and diverse data set for locating the position and price of a bible within those of the contents of an affluent university man’s library in mid-15th century Cambridge.

Markaunt’s most costly purchase seems to have been a “Liber moralis philosophie” for the huge sum of £10 (surely a compendious volume, since it is listed as including 14 texts/works). However this is an extraordinary feature amongst Thomas’ collection, the majority of whose expensive books were divided into two categories; expensive (approx. £3 to £6 6s) and slightly less expensive (£1 to £3). The volumes in this first group, comprising Markaunt’s most expensive purchases (aside from his anomalous “Liber moralis”) include a copy of the “Moralia Gregorii” which set him back £6, and another “Alia moralia Gregorii” which cost him a little more (£6 6s 8d), whilst he obtained a copy of “Dionisius Ariopagita de celeste ieracha” for £5. Examples in the lowest tier of Markaunt’s ‘expensive books’ (i.e. valued in pounds), comprising books purchased for ca. £1 to £3, include a copy of “Hugo de Vienna” (£3) and a slightly less dear volume containing “Expositio super summas” (£2 6s 8d). Furthermore, at £3 6s 8d, Thomas’ bible cost him rather more than the price he paid for his “Missale” (£2 13s 4d) although he obtained his “Portiferium” for exactly the same price (£3 6s 8d).

How do these prices compare to the purchase prices for other kinds of books in general? In suggesting a ‘typical’ price for a Latin bible of between £2 and £4 (during the

1756 “Registrum magistri Thomae Markaunt de munerositate librorum suorum cum eorum contentis, quos contulit ad utilitatem sociorum collegii Corporis Christi studentium” (CCC, Ms. 232, fol. 5r). Markaunt’s will is the first text in the Register (fols. 1r-2v) and his books are listed on fols. 5r-8v, followed by a second copy of the list on fols. 9r-11v accompanied by the prices for which he had acquired them. The list was printed in full in J.O. Halliwell, “A Catalogue of the Books Bequeathed to Corpus Christi College, Cambridge (A.D. 1439) by Thomas Markaunt, With Their Prices,” Cambridge Antiquarian Society quarto series no. 14 (1848): pt. 1, 15-20; again in M.R. James, “The Sources of Archbishop Parker’s Collection of Manuscripts at Corpus Christi College with a reprint of the Catalogue of Thomas Markaunt’s Library,” Cambridge Antiquarian Society octavo series (London: George Bell, 1889): 76-82; cf. also included in Cavanaugh (1980): 563-70 (bible entries at 568). For further details on – and images of - CCCC Ms. 232, see its entry on the Parker Library on the Web resource here.
period 1300-1530), Bell suggested this price range to be “neither high nor low as the prices of other books went,” arguing that within the wide range of prices of books, bibles tended to be located somewhere between service-books, at the expensive end of the spectrum, and university texts were at the opposite end. Furthermore, Bell observed that the purchase prices for these different kinds of books relative to other groups conformed to the same hierarchy as that visible in the constituent costs incurred during the production of the books in each respective group.

Reasonably clear indications survive chronicling the range of costs and prices of service-books (“the more widely read books of the period”). Relative to their length, service-books were “easily the most expensive volumes in use during the Middle Ages,” although they were also the class “which exhibits the widest variation in price, since so much depended on the way in which they were decorated and bound.” Thus antiphoners ranged from £5 to £10 and graduals ranged between £2 and £4 each. In contrast, There seems to have been little or no uniformity discernable in the range of prices for breviaries and missals, both of which demonstrate “how much depended on the amount of money available when the service-book was originally made”; breviaries could range from under £1 to £20, while missals seem to have been produced in two ‘classes’, the first from £2 to £4 and the second from £4 to £10.

---

1753 Sources such as the pre-Reformation churchwardens’ accounts provide invaluable evidence. Although this level is lower than that suggested by the figures recording their cost of production, Bell notes that “this is no doubt due to the fact that most of the prices available are of what would today be called second-hand volumes.” H.E. Bell, “The Price of Books in Medieval England,” Library 4th ser., 17 (1936-7): 312-32 [327].
1755 Of thirty-nine antiphoners, seventeen were priced from £5 to £10, two were still more expensive, and of the remainder of lower price eight may be excluded as clearly exceptional.
1756 Of 35 graduals, 22 cost between £2 and £4 each.
1757 For example, ranging from the set of *portiphoria antiqua* at Winchester, some of them valued at prices under £1, to the *Portiphorum Magnum* of the same foundation, which was worth £20.
1758 Frustratingly, Bell does not suggest distinguishing characteristics for either ‘class’; nevertheless, the first of the two ‘classes’ of missals, of which there are 13 examples, were priced from £2 to £4, and the second, with the same number of instances (13), cost from over £4 and up to £10.
The price of Books of Hours varied widely, although copies were generally expensive because they were usually illuminated. \(^{1759}\) Nevertheless Eamon Duffy observes that by the early 15\(^{th} \) century, as a result of “a steady growth in accessibility”, copies of “this most chic of devotional fashion accessories” (whose “social cachet sprang from its iconic function”) were routinely owned and used by wealthy townsmen and women. \(^{1760}\)

In contrast, the prices of university texts were low in comparison with those of service-books and bibles. \(^{1761}\) For example, a copy of the Allegories of Petrus Manducator (now BL, Royal Ms. 8.A.VIII) contains a note of its sale for 28 d in the middle of the 13\(^{th} \) century (in June 1246). \(^{1762}\)

Vernacular bibles do not seem to have been significantly cheaper than Bell’s proposed ‘typical’ price for a Latin bible, as Stallybrass has shown: a Wycliffite Bible belonging to Thomas of Gloucester was valued at £2 in 1397, while a London bookseller’s second-hand copy, which had formerly belonged to Henry IV, was valued at £5. Although the expense of these books surely reflects their provenance (as the luxury bibles of aristocrats), not all ‘rich’ books belonged to the wealthy; for example, a copy of the Wycliffite New Testament alone, bought by “my moder” cost £4 6s 8d. \(^{1763}\) By contrast, Elizabeth Solopova has argued that a price of 10 s. for a Wycliffite Psalter in the 15\(^{th} \) century \(^{1764}\) “seems to parallel generally high prices of other Wycliffite Bible

---


\(^{1760}\) Examples supporting this claim include the Primer of Thomas Overdo, a York baker who died in 1444, valued at 9s, the primer “covered with red velvet” belonging to Thomas Morton, canon of York Minster, estimated at 6s 8d, and the primer left by John Collan, a York goldsmith who died in 1490, which was estimated at sixpence and was probably therefore a printed version; Eamon Duffy, *Marking the Hours* (2006): 21-22.


\(^{1764}\) Solopova’s investigation stems from her analysis of a 15\(^{th} \)-century Wycliffite Psalter (now Bodleian Library, Oxford, Ms. Bodley 554) within which she identified a previously unnoticed note in a 15\(^{th} \)-century hand written on the book’s lower pastedown recording its price: “p[re]c[ium] x s” – ‘price 10 shillings’; see Elizabeth Solopova, “Manuscript Evidence for the Patronage, Ownership and Use of Wycliffite Bibles,” in *Form and Function in the Late Medieval Bible*, Eds. Eyal Poleg & Laura Light (Boston; Leiden: Brill, 2013): 333-49 (discussion of the relative expense of Wycliffite biblical manuscripts with particular attention to Ms. Bodley 554 at 344-5 [344]).
manuscripts” whilst being comparable to the more expensive Books of Hours owned by townspeople, a comparison which, considering the fact that such Books of Hours were usually illuminated, demonstrates that the 10 s. paid for her modest Psalter in fact seems a “relatively high” price.

In conclusion, we must note that of course the very high value of money during the late medieval period made the actual cost of books even higher than the recorded prices indicate. It is difficult to get a sense of how medieval prices would translate to modern currency, and any suggested translations must always constitute an inexact calculation. Results obtained using an online comparator offer some suggestions for translating how much 1270 prices would be worth in 2015; thus the relative value of £2 from 1270 would range from ca. £1,542 to £582,500 in 2015, while proportionally, £3 (1270) would translate to ca. £2,312 - £873,700 (2015) and £4 (1270) to ca. £3,083 - £1,165,000 (2015). Writ large, the medieval book was always a

1765 For example, British Library, Ms. Harley 3903, containing just the books of Job and Tobit, is marked by its scribe as priced at 6s. 8d, whereas a copy of the New Testament was bought in 1430 for £2, 16s. 8d.; Anne Hudson, The Premature Reformation: Wycliffite Texts and Lollard History (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1988): 206, 233

1766 Elizabeth Solopova, “Manuscript Evidence for the Patronage, Ownership and Use of Wycliffite Bibles” (2013): 344. However, unless I misunderstand Solpova's reasoning, her argument that an expensive Book of Hours carried a price tag in the region of 10s seems questionable at best; surely this figure is far too low to be considered an 'expensive' price for such a book?

1767 Online Measuring Worth comparator available here [accessed 30 October 2015].

1768 In comparing the value of a £2 Commodity in 1270, in 2014 the relative real price of that commodity is £1,709, the relative labor value of that commodity is £30,150 and the relative income value of that commodity is £71,440; and in comparing the value of a £2 Income or Wealth in 1270, in 2014 the relative historic standard of living value of that income or wealth is £1,709, the relative economic status value of that income or wealth is £71,440 and the relative economic power value of that income or wealth is £582,500.

1769 In comparing the value of a £3 Commodity in 1270, in 2014 the relative real price of that commodity is £2,564, the relative labor value of that commodity is £45,230 and the relative income value of that commodity is £107,200; and in comparing the value of a £3 Income or Wealth, in 1270, in 2014 the relative historic standard of living value of that income or wealth is £2,564, the relative economic status value of that income or wealth is £107,200 and the relative economic power value of that income or wealth is £582,500.

1770 In comparing the value of a £4 Commodity in 1270, in 2014 the relative real price of that commodity is £3,418, the relative labor value of that commodity is £60,310 and the relative income value of that commodity is £142,900; and in comparing the value of a £4 Income or Wealth in 1270, in 2014 the relative historic standard of living value of that income or wealth is £3,418, the relative economic status value of that income or wealth is £142,900, and the relative economic power value of that income or wealth is £1,165,000. Stallybrass suggests an alternative; that £3 in 1300 would be worth £1,850 in 2010 according to the retail price index and £39,000 in terms of average earnings (based on an estimation of a laborer earning a maximum of £2 in 1300 and a chantry priest earning £4 13s 4d in 1379 (cited in Stallybrass 2013: 388 & n.23). Cf. in re: the figure by which a price from, say, the 14th or 15th century must be multiplied to bring it into line with modern standards, in 1936 G.G. Coulton suggested a multiplier of 40 up to 1350 (although Bell commented that “even if a lower figure were taken, book prices would still soar to extraordinary heights.”)
luxury product; in comparison with other commodities, and particularly the necessaries of life, their prices were high indeed.1771

Thus the position of bibles’ price range (neither very high nor very low) within the broader spectrum of book prices may be explained in the light of the various factors that influenced the production costs – and thus price in terms of ‘cash value’ – for all books (i.e. the length of its text, the kind and quality of materials required and the amount of binding required) plus the factors that constituted ‘Optional Extras’ (i.e. the amount and quality of decoration and of illumination added, and whether the text required glossing or the addition of musical notation). Furthermore, of the wide variety of options available to the would-be bible purchasers on the late medieval European book market, portable bibles surely presented attractive prospects. Portable bibles would have been readily available (thanks to the ever-increasing numbers produced) and, crucially, copies would have carried a lower price tag than their market competitors such as ‘lectern’ copies or multi-volume glossed bibles.

3 The Friars

As we have seen, friars occupied a privileged position amongst the users of the ‘new’ portable bible in the 13th century as well as in subsequent centuries. However, given that the nature of the friars’ vocation placed them outside of the economic networks of sale and purchase through which these bibles increasingly circulated, what kind of alternate position did friars occupy? How did friars’ bibles circulate within fraternal networks of book provision, acquisition and exchange? And what kind of alternate economies of ‘expense’, ‘value’ and ‘worth’ do we see the friars associating with portable bibles in terms of their estimation and use of these books?1772

I Where did friars get their bibles from?

i By assignation (of the Provincial or the Warden)

1772 i.e. As units of what kinds of ‘currency’ do we see friars acquiring and exchanging bibles, and within what kinds of fraternal economies of non-monetary ‘value’ do we find friars’ bibles circulating?
A Franciscan friar could not own property, including books, although he might have the use of it, a principle established in Pope Gregory IX’s bull of 1230, *Quo elongat*. In 1255 Pope Alexander IV (reg. 1254-61) expressly declared that books were not the private property of the individual friars, and upon the occasion of a friar’s death his books reverted to the convent or were distributed to others by the Warden ‘with the consent of the convent and license of the minister.’ Soon afterwards, Alexander further emphasized this regulation, decreeing that friars minors promoted to positions such as bishoprics must give up to the General or Provincial Minister “libros et alia quae tempore suae promotionis habent”, as these ultimately belonged to the order (although in fact the books were often practically treated as private property).

Every student friar had books set apart for his special use; these books were obtained by gift or bequest, by purchase or assignment by the Provincial or Warden, or they had been copied out by the friar himself. This is witnessed in surviving inscriptions in portable bibles recording their assignation by the Provincial or the Warden to a particular friar for his personal use during his lifetime, and following his death the bible either reverted to the convent along with the other books which were in his possession at that time or was distributed to another friar by assignment (or both). For example an English ‘saddle-bag’ bible which was copied before 1250 and belonged in the 14th century to the Minorites of St. Edmundsbury (now British

---


1774 See Bodleian Library, Ms. Canonici, Misc. 75, fol. 80v: “cap. x, “de libris donates vel legatis cuivis communitati seu persone ordinis…” (cited in Little 1892: 56 ns.1, 4).


Library, Ms. Burney 5; 255 x 180 mm, 209 fols.)\textsuperscript{1777} retains an inscription testifying to its assignment to fr. Walter de Bukenham “ad vitam.” (Fig. 4.5)\textsuperscript{1778} A portable bible from the Dominican convent in Carlisle (now Edinburgh University Library Ms. 1; 219 x 156 mm, 399 fols.) includes a similar inscription recording that at some time in the 14\textsuperscript{th} century the bible was issued to Fr. Ricardus de Kyrb “ad terminum vite sue,”\textsuperscript{1779} while on the flyleaf of Edinburgh University Library, Ms. 2 we find another variation of the ‘assignation formula’, also added in the 14\textsuperscript{th} century, which can be deciphered (barely) as reading “Ista Biblia est ad usum fratris…”\textsuperscript{1780}

\textbf{ii} By ‘descent’

Nevertheless, bibles also seem to have ‘passed on’ from friar to friar outside of the official channels of bible assignation; in effect, through ‘fraternal descent’. For example, a French ‘pocket’ bible copied during the second or third quarter of the 13\textsuperscript{th} century (now BL, Ms. Royal 1.A.VI; 150 x 105 mm, 604 fols.) contains an inscription on one of its flyleaves (fol. i) which chronicles this bible’s ‘descent’ from friar to friar in this way.\textsuperscript{1781}

The inscription records that the bible was in the possession of Roger Crome, friar in the

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item Text written above top line. Decorated with large puzzle initials in red and blue, with flourishing in the same colours; small initials alternately blue or red, with flourishing in the other colour; one-line initials alternately blue or red (only in red in quires xii-xv; fols. 115-158).
\item Of either English or French origin, ca. 1300 (298 x 197 mm, 2 cols./52 lines, 490 fols.). On Edinburgh University Library, Ms. 2 (D.b.I.1) see Catherine R. Borland, \textit{A Descriptive Catalogue of the Western Medieval Manuscripts in Edinburgh University Library} (Edinburgh: printed for the University of Edinburgh by T. & A. Constable at The University Press, 1916): 2-6 [3].
\item (150 x 105 [100 x 70] mm, 2 cols./48 lines, 604 fols.) The bible was copied in northern or central France during the third quarter of the 13\textsuperscript{th} century; it includes the Psalms (fols. 234v-261v) and the \textit{IHN} (fols. 557-604); see G.F. Warner & J.P. Gilson, \textit{Catalogue of Western Manuscripts in the Old Royal and King’s Collections}, 4 vols (London: British Museum, 1921): I, 3; cf. entry in the British Library’s online \textit{Catalogue of Illuminated Manuscripts} here.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
15th century, and that it was given by him to Richard Franke, a fellow friar.1782

iii By purchase: the sale and purchase of bibles by friars (particularly by Dominicans)

Bibles occupied a uniquely privileged position for the Dominicans, as reflected in the regulations of their Constitutions, which specifically forbade the sale of bibles under any circumstances.1783 Nevertheless, evidence survives of friars violating these regulations restricting the sale of bibles - or their acquisition by dubious methods – and those who did could face disciplinary action or worse, as a certain Franciscan friar named Bartholomew discovered in 1240 when his bible was confiscated for his having obtaining the book in a reprehensible – though unspecified – manner.1784

In 1258, 23 “peciae” (or gatherings) from a bible belonging to John Balsham, OP were found in the Oxford Jewry, in the vicinity of the Dominican priory.1785 How these gatherings were found and what happened next is interesting. The discovery of the Dominicans’ property ‘out of bounds’ in the ‘illegal’ possession of ‘unauthorized’ persons was made as a result of an investigation undertaken by the Sheriff of Oxford.

---

1783 The Constitutions also specifically prohibited the sale of copies of the various works of St. Thomas Aquinas. The 15th-century manual for officers in the Dominican Order authored by Humbert of Romans (fifth master general of the Dominican Order 1254-63, d.1277), included a chapter on the office of librarians (“De officio librarii”), in which Humbert urged these gatekeepers of knowledge to adopt strict rules concerning the use, and more importantly, the misuse of the books: “Truly, if any brothers have disfigured books, or have written or destroyed anything in them on their own authority, or have handled them with negligence or maltreatment, or have offended in any way so far as the librarian’s responsibilities are concerned, the librarian should identify these at a given time and suggest to the superior warnings to be given to the brothers in this matter at his discretion.” Humbertus de Romanis, “Instructiones de officiis ordinis, Capitulum XII. De officio librarii”, Opera de vita regulari, Ed. J.J. Berthier (1956): II, 263-6; reproduced in Robert D. Taylor-Vaisey, “Regulations for the Operation of a Medieval Library,” in The Library 5.33 (1978): 47-50 [50]; See also Humbert de Romanis, De instructione officiialium O.F.P. in K. W. Humphreys, The Book Provisions of the Medieval Friars, 1215-1400 (Amsterdam, 1964): Appendix C (135-136). Humphrey’s 1964 study remains the best general source for the Dominicans’ libraries in the Middle Ages (see esp. 18-46, 90-9, 135-7).
("inquisicionem ab…vicecomite Oxon’") by royal order of Henry III, who directed the sheriff to search for the Dominicans’ missing property, presumably at the Dominicans’ request. It is revealing that, upon discovering the loss of these gatherings, the Dominicans should seek royal assistance in locating their missing property reveals how serious a matter they considered this loss to be, demonstrating how highly they valued these Bible gatherings. Once the gatherings had been found (Balsham having pledged them to the Jews), the king ruled that the sheriff recover and return the missing “peciae” to the priory post haste ("omnes pecias predictas sine dilacione restitue faciat predicto fratri"), but also ordered that the Jews in whose possession the gatherings had been found were to be compensated for the full amount that Balsham had received as pledge ("quantum illi Judeo pro peciis illis ei impignoratis debetur allocari faciet").1786 Alas, this sum is not specified, nor is Balsham’s fate following his transgression described, although I think one may safely say that he would not have been tremendously popular back at the priory.1787

From two inscriptions in a ‘pocket’ bible copied in northern France during the second or third quarter of the 13th century (now BL, Royal Ms. 1.A.V; 150 x 100 mm, 623 fols.)1788 we learn that Peter de Corbie purchased the bible from a friar of the Dominican convent in Rouen (founded 1261),1789 one Guillelmus de Barra, on 17th December 1284 (?).1790


1787 One imagines that ‘Off to bed without supper’ would hardly have covered Balsham’s punishment; it seems probable that he would have been ordered to perform heavy penance at the very least.

1788 (150 x 100 [100 x 70] mm, 2 cols./? lines, 623 fols.) The bible contains notes throughout written in various 13th-, and 14th-century hands (especially on fols. 623-623v), and a 15th-century hand added a list of “Ordo librorum biblicum finis capitulis” on fols. 1v-3. See G.F. Warner & J.P. Gilson, Catalogue of Western Manuscripts in the Old Royal and King’s Collections, 4 vols (London: British Museum, 1921): 1, 2-3; The Lumley Library: The Catalogue of 1609, Eds. Sears Jayne & Francis R. Johnson (London: British Museum, 1956): 52; cf. entry in the British Library’s online Catalogue of Illuminated Manuscripts here.


1790 “Quam ab eod[em] fr[a]t[e gui[c]l[m]i] o / Ego petrus de Corbie / eni xiii die dece[m]bris an[n]o / iii xx et iv (?). Inde solvi sibi / peccuniam sp[o]nte d[omi]no G. / de maretis cap[i]ello (capitulo) Roth[omagensi] / ecclesi[e].” (BL, Royal Ms. 1.A.V, fol. 569v) This inscription thus provides a terminus ante quem for determining the date at which the bible was in Guillelmus’ possession (at some point between 1261 and 1284). Might “Petrus de Corbie” have been the French master-mason of that name who associated
Other legislative measures designed to further safeguard bibles’ security also bear witness to the Dominicans’ privileging their bibles as books of outstanding intellectual and financial value. For example, a friar was only permitted to sell books assigned to him to a person who was not in the Order if he gained a special license, which could only be obtained from a senior official, the provincial prior. The list of books lent to members of the convent of St. Catherine, Barcelona in the mid-13th century records the ‘licensed’ sale of several bibles: friar A. Segerra sold a bible “de licentia” in order to buy other necessary works; fr. B.P. de Bagnariis also sold a bible and in exchange “de licentia” assigned the Gospels of Matthew, Mark and Luke glossed by Thomas Aquinas to Saint Catherine’s convent; and fr. B. Viviani received 100 sol. for a bible sold by another friar, A. de Tluviano.

However the sale of books (including bibles) between preachers was permitted on the condition that the vendor did not ask for more money than that paid for the books. Such a transaction was deemed reasonable since the vendor could thereby purchase books - such as new works - that were more necessary to him, and which would of course pass into the possession of the convent which assigned to him the books he had sold; for example in 1248 fr. Philip of Pistoia sold a bible in order to obtain other works which the Roman provincial chapter at Rome ordered should go back to Philip’s parent convent following his death.


1791 The same regulations applied to books of apostates. This legislative condition echoes the stipulation that before the prior of a convent could sell any of the convent’s books, he also had to obtain special permission from the provincial prior; K.W. Humphreys, The Book Provisions of the Medieval Friars, 1215-1400 (Amsterdam, 1964): 35.


One important exemption to the prohibition against friars selling or purchasing bibles resulted from the fraternal authorities’ obligation to provide their students with books, particularly bibles. The books of deceased friars might also be used for the provision of students or suitable friars, although the ‘recall’ of bibles was the subject of particularly strict monitoring by the friary authorities, and the legislation regulating this process further emphasizes the preachers’ particular valuing of bibles amongst all a friar’s books. In the province of Lombardy, Dominicans’ bibles were passed to the provincial for the provision of students, whereas a regulation made at Bologna in 1272 went further and decreed that if a bible had been sold by a friar during his lifetime the money he had obtained, or the books he had obtained in exchange, were similarly placed at the disposal of the provincial.1795 This regulation was revoked at Ferrara the following year, and was replaced by an act of the provincial chapter which allowed the prior provincial to take the best and most precious book of any friar who had died having no copy of the Bible in his possession (“medietas melioris et preciosioris libri quem habuerint”),1796 effectively positioning bibles as units of bibliographic currency.

The requirement that Dominican lecturers and students be provided with bibles was mandated in the regulations and Constitutions of the order. A lector sent to a province for the rest of his life took with him his bible, his glosses, his postillae and his notebooks, all of which were to be returned to his original province on his death.1797 The Dominicans’ Constitutions also specifically identified a bible as one of the books which students particularly required; the first Constitutions required each provincial to provide any friar

---


1796 “…si qui frates decedentes biblia non habuerint, medietas melioris et preciosioris libri quem habuerint, ad provinciam deveniat, sicut actenus de bibliis exit ordinatum.” Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum, XI (1941): 144, 150, 151, 167 (cited in Humphreys 1964: 23 n.33).

appointed to study outside the province with at least three books - the text of the Bible, with glosses, together with copies of Peter Comestor’s *Historia Scholastica* and the *Sentences* of Peter Lombard.\footnote{1798 “Statuimus autem, ut quelibet provincial fratribus suis missis ad stadium in ystoriis et sentenciis et textu et losis precipue student et intendant” (*Distinct*. 1.28), Archiv für Literatur- und Kirchengeschichte (3: I, 223) (noted in Humphreys 1964: 43, n.177).}

The general provision of students’ books was the responsibility of conventual or provincial priors; the conventual prior would provide books for his students as long as they were attending the convent school, but when they passed outside the province, the students’ ‘pastoral care’ and administrative needs became the responsibility of the provincial prior. Priors might supply students with books and expense-money (pocket books and pocket money?) or they might simply be supplied with the funds necessary to buy the books upon their arrival at university. In 1258 each convent in the Roman province was required to issue a student a bible, fifteen pounds Turin., and copies of the *Summas*, *Quaestiones* and *Postillae* (with the student receiving ten pounds in lieu of a copy of the *Quaestiones* if one could not be supplied).\footnote{1799 “Primo, ut quilibet conventus providere (teneratur) suo student in Bibliam et Sentenciis v. libris Turon., in Questionibus et Postillis, vel in x. libris pro Questionibus.” C. Douias, *Acta capitulorum provincialium Ordinis fratrum Praedicatorum…*(1239-1302) (Toulouse, 1894): 74, para. 1-2 (noted in Humphreys 1964: 37-38, n.140).} The student was to be so fully equipped not only for the sake of ensuring his immediate ability to study, but also so that when he passed to another convent to read theology, his hosts would not need to accommodate his book-needs.\footnote{1800 “Et conventus provideat in Postillis legendis tempore lectionis, ita quod, cum student incepit aedire Theologiam, conventus cui assignatus fuerit teneatur sibi providere de prima Bibliia vacante et alia competenti, loco illius.” C. Douias, *Acta capitulorum provincialium Ordinis fratrum Praedicatorum…*(1239-1302) (Toulouse, 1894): 74, para. 1-2 (noted in Humphreys 1964: 37-38, n.140).}

Sometimes desperate times called for desperate measures on the part of the mendicant authorities to solve institutional cashflow crises, and bibles invariably featured somewhere in the solution devised. It was in order to ensure the annual allocation of student funding in 1264 that the Roman provincial prior passed legislation granting the prior the power to make use of all the text-books belonging to friars who died in his province (‘text-books’ being defined as bibles, glossed books of the Bible, breviaries, missals, Peter Lombard’s *Sentences*, Peter Comestor’s *Historia Scholastica*, *Decreta* and
Decretals and the sale of these books provided the necessary funds with which to permit three students to study at the university of Paris, to the tune of twenty pounds Turon. per student per annum. These funds were allocated with the stern command that students were to use their allowances to buy ‘only useful books’; that is to say, books which would be useful for their home convent. Thus we see the administrative ancestry of the familiar terms, conditions and provisos which accompany student funding today may be readily recognized in those already in place in the 13th century.

The Franciscans were forbidden from writing books; this prohibition was legislated in the General Council of 1260, and also prohibited Franciscan friars from having books copied for sale. Indeed the Franciscan were the only order that did not, over the course of the 13th century, “develop the art of writing to the degree that they could routinely produce professional-looking volumes”; this is witnessed in Roger Bacon’s statement implying that he did not write book-hand.

However we do find evidence of Franciscans in positions of authority purchasing books on behalf of their community. A letter dated ca. 1252-3 survives from the Franciscan Adam Marsh (d. 1259) to the provincial minister, asking him to assign the bible that

---

1806 Adam Marsh (or de Marisco, d. 1259) had inherited his own bible, possibly from his uncle Richard de Marisco, bishop of Durham 1217-26; the bequeathal of Richard’s library (or bible?) to his nephew in 1226 is recorded in an entry in the Close Roll 10 Henry III m.6: “De biblioteca legata. Mandatum est Willelmo de Blockel’ quod bibliotecam que fuit R. quondam Dunelmensis Episcopi et quam legavit Magistro Ade de Marisco nepoti suo et quam habet in custodia sua habere faciat Laurentio clerico ipsius Magistri Ade ad opus suum. Teste ut supra [i.e. Rege apud Wigorniam iij Septembris.” A.G. Little, “The Franciscan School at Oxford in the Thirteenth Century,” Archivum Franciscanum Historicum, 19 (1926): 803-74 [831-2, cf. 831 n.5, 832 n.2]. For further studies of Adam Marsh see: C. H. Lawrence, “The letters of Adam Marsh and the Franciscan school at Oxford,” Journal of Ecclesiastical History, 42 (1991): 218–38; C. H. Lawrence,
had belonged to the late ‘P. of Worcester’ (of blessed memory; “Bibliam carissimi P. de Wygornia piae recordationis”) for the use of Friar Thomas of Docking (d. ca.1270), who was at various times a pupil of, Marsh’s and also of Robert Grosseteste and Roger Bacon. Marsh describes Thomas as ‘distinguished by good morals and pleasant manners, a clear head, great learning and ready eloquence’, and what’s more, Marsh adds, Thomas’ friends were ready to pay handsomely for the book on his behalf. Although no price is proposed, the implication seems to be that a handsome payment would be necessary, and thus we may reasonably assume that the price of purchase would not be inconsiderable.

A 13th-century French ‘pocket’ bible (170 x 120 mm, 380 fols.) which Seymour de Ricci recorded as in the possession of C.L. Ricketts, the great medieval manuscripts collector of Chicago in the late 1930s, was described as having included Dominicans


1808 “acceptissimum fratrem Thomam de Dokkyng, quem et suavissimae conversationis honestas, et claritas ingenii perspicacis, et litteraturae provectioris eminentia, et faciundia prompti sermonis.”


1810 The bible contained illuminated initials, and, unusually, retained its ‘original’ binding of sheepskin over wooden boards.

1811 Seymour de Ricci, Census of Medieval and Renaissance manuscripts in the United States and Canada (New York: American Council of Learned Societies, 1935): I, 618 (no. 5); obtained by Ricketts in 1922 from W.M. Voynich. Amongst Ricketts’ impressive collection of manuscripts (De Ricci listed 274 Ricketts mss. & dozens of fragments) Ricketts possessed four 13th-century bibles (De Ricci Nos. 5, 6, 11, 12) and 2 or 3 selected leaves from 13th-century bibles (Nos. 7, 8, 13); see De Ricci, Census (1935): I, 617-63 [Bibles etc.: Nos. 1-19, No. 5: 618]. The greater part of Ricketts’ collection is now owned by The Lilly Library at Indiana University, Bloomington IN (see C.U. Faye & W.H. Bond, Supplement to the Census of Medieval and Renaissance Manuscripts in the United States and Canada (New York: The Bibliographical Society of America, 1962): 539) with a further 17 at The Newberry Library, Chicago IL (see Faye & Bond, Supplement: 158). The
amongst its early owners, although it seems that the bible had passed into the hands of Carthusians within a century of its production.\textsuperscript{1812} The circumstances in which the Carthusians acquired the bible were narrated in an inscription still visible in the bible: “Hanc Bibliam emi ego Guillelmus Aynaudi in Lugduno pretio 16 flororum pro monasterio Cartusie in Ast.” Thus the bible was purchased by Guillelmus (William) Aynaudi\textsuperscript{1813} (who added the inscription) for 16 florins in Lyon, France on behalf of the Carthusian monastery at Asti.\textsuperscript{1814}

\textit{Collections in the United States and Canada with Pre-1600 Holdings} (The Bibliographical Society of America, Ed. Nov. 2014): 37-38. For discussion of the Ricketts’ collection at the Lilly Library, including the 13th-century bibles, see Christer de Hamel, \textit{Gilding the Lilly: A Hundred Medieval and Illuminated Manuscripts in the Lilly Library} (Bloomington: The Lilly Library & Indiana University, 2010): 3-4 and nos. 31 (Lilly Library, Ms. Ricketts 12; 68-71) and no. 32 (Lilly Library, Ms. Ricketts 15; 72-73).

\textsuperscript{1812} A later note offers a clue to the bible’s later provenance (ca. 1830), reading “Jam (ca. 1830) ex lib. Sacerdotois Vigilione Joacob. Ant., domini S. Albani; et a fratre dulcissimo et dilectissimo Johanni Stagelio, Joseph Pirelli, 1843”; obtained in 1830 by Vojnich, from whom Ricketts purchased the ms. in ???. What may we discern from the fact that the bible’s Carthusian owners neither erased the inscription of its earlier Dominican owners nor removed the page upon which the text had been added? Alas, the bible remains, to date, untraced.

\textsuperscript{1813} Guillaume Aynaudi may possibly be the same as the ‘Guillaume Aynaudi’ to whom, in 1422, the scholar-theologian Jean Gerson (d. 1429) addressed a “lettre-traite” (\textit{De religionis perfectione et moderamine}) in response to three questions principally concerning “la condition a tenir a l’egard des religieux maladies ou fatigues”; G.A. is called, in the manuscript copies of this text, ‘Guillaume Minaudi,’ or ‘Eynaudi’, and was at this time a monk of the Grande Chartreuse, the head monastery of the Carthusian order, and situated just north of Grenoble, only 5 km away from Asti; see Jean Gerson, \textit{Oeuvres completes} [II]: \textit{L’oeuvre épistolaire}, Ed. P. Glorieux (Tournai, 1960): xxv, 232-45; noted in \textit{Dictionnaire biographique des médecins en France au moyen âge} [Vol. I: Supplément], Ed. Danielle Jacquart (Paris/Geneva: Librairie Champion/Librairie Droz, 1979): 98-99; cf. on Jean Gerson, Brian Patrick McGuire, “Shining Forth Like the Dawn: Jean Gerson’s Sermon to the Carthusians,” in \textit{Medieval Monastic Preaching}, Ed. Carolyn Muessig (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 1998): 37-52. One “Guilemms Aymaud” is also mentioned in an entry dated 3 January 1400 in the ecclesiastical registers for the provinces of Aix, Arles and Embrun (all in the right region); see \textit{Pouilléls des provinces d’Aix, d’Arles et d’Embrun}, Ed. Maurice Prou. Recueil des Historiens de la France VIII (Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1923): 97. There are also further references to a “G. Aynaudi de Rupe” in the charters of the monastery of Notre-Dame de Bertaud (again, the right area); “P. Aynaudi,” and “G. Aynaudi” are mentioned in a record entitled “Procuratio hominum Rupis Arnaudorum”, chronicling a gathering at La Roche-des-Arnauds (in southeastern France) on 9 March 1298,\textsuperscript{1811} and “P. filius G. Aynaudi” is mentioned again in a record of another meeting at La Roche-des-Arnauds a year later, on 1 March 1299; see \textit{Chartris de X.-D. de Bertaud, monastère de femmes, de l’ordre des Chartreux, diocèse de Gap}, Ed. l’Abbé Paul Guillaume (Gap: La Société d’Études des Hautes-Alpes, 1888): 170-172 [172], 160.

\textsuperscript{1811} The Asti Carthusians’ ownership of the bible was confirmed through the presence of their \textit{ex libris} on the same folio (“lxxii monasterii Cartusie Ast.”) There were two Carthusian monasteries in Asti (in the Piedmont region of northwestern Italy) which might be that referred to here, the more likely candidate of the two being Certosa d’Asti (Asti Charterhouse), north-west of Asti and near Chartreuse, which was founded as a Carthusian monastery in 1387 (previously a Vallombrosan monastery), and suppressed by Napoleon in 1801 (the other possibility is Certosa di Santa Maria di Casotto [Casotto Charterhouse] at Garessio, near Asti, founded 1170 or 1183). The distance from Asti (NW Italy) to Lyon (S. Central France) is 355 km; the distance from Asti to (NW Italy) to La Roche-des-Arnauds (in southeastern France) is over 250 km – either way, it was a very long journey.
The Franciscan friar Geoffrey Boydin de Rya (also called Gaufridus de Rya) commissioned (‘‘fiat fieri’’) a pocket bible in Paris as a memorial to his father, Henry, although no record survives of for how much.\textsuperscript{1815} Although it is unknown whether Geoffrey needed or obtained permission to enter into this transaction, either way all seems to have been resolved honorably in the end by means of that great excuser of sins, a gift to the appropriate people: an inscription added at the end of the bible (now Ms. 309 in the Marquis of Salisbury’s library at Hatfield House in Hertfordshire) records that the bible was later gifted to the Franciscan convent at Winchelsea, Sussex\textsuperscript{1816} in Geoffrey’s memory by his friend Peter de Swinefeld (provincial minister ca. 1264–72 and founder of the Greyfriars at Oxford).\textsuperscript{1817} In fact this inscription narrates the bible’s early provenance in unusually rich detail.\textsuperscript{1818} Thus we learn that the bible was commissioned in memory of Henry Boydon de Rya, having been by Henry’s son, Geoffrey (“In christo ihesu Memoriale Henrici Boydin de Rya. Requiescat in pace amen. Quod filius suus frater Gaufridus sibim etipsi fiat fieri”) who gave the bible to Peter de Swinefeld, who had been Geoffrey’s tutor at Oxford (“Set fratri petro de swinefeld assignauit qui tutor suus oxoniis...”\textsuperscript{1819})

\textsuperscript{1815} Hatfield House, Cecil Papers Ms. 309 (measures approximately 152 x 102 mm); amongst the mss Branner attributed to the Mathurin Atelier; see Branner (1977): 75-7, Appendix V G 214-15 [214] (Geoffrey’s commissioning of the bible noted at 3 n.8). On Geoffrey, see entry for “Boydin de Rya” (s.XIIIex) in A.B. Emden, A Biographical Register of the University of Oxford to A.D. 1500. 3 vols. (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1957-59), I (1957): 237-8 & III (1959): 1832 cf. N.R. Ker, MLGB, 2nd ed. (1964): 315, 420. Geoffrey’s father, “Henrici Boydin de Rya” is probably the same “Henry de Rya” who gave a copy of the Pauline Epistles, with Peter Lombard’s gloss (copied in France, Paris? 1225-50; now BL, Royal Ms. 3.D.IV) to the Franciscan convent in Canterbury; an inscription inside its front cover records Henry’s gift: “HENR. DE RYA. / D. FF. MIN. / CANT.,” (probably copied from a note formerly inside the manuscript or on the original binding). A copy of Isidore’s Etymologies (s.XIII/early s.XIV, now Trinity College, Cambridge Ms. R.9.10/James no. 814) is also inscribed as having been given “In Christo Ihesu memorial Henrici Boydin de Rya” (fol. 212); James suggests that “The book is most likely from a Kentish house” (see M.R. James, TCC 1901 I, 252-3). N.R. Ker, MLGB (1964): 48, 246, 362.

\textsuperscript{1816} Indeed, this bible is the only book from the library of the Franciscans at Winchelsea which has, thus far, been identified; see N.R. Ker, MLGB (1964): 199 (Ms. 309).

\textsuperscript{1817} “Swinefield” translates to Swingfield, a village near Folkstone in Surrey. Peter de Swinefield may possibly have been a relative of Richard de Swinefield (d. 1317), a member of the household of Thomas de Cantilupe (inc. 1265), and later Thomas’ successor as Bishop of Hereford (from 1282 until his death); cf. A.G. Little, Franciscan Papers, Lists and Documents (Manchester: Manchester UP, 1943); 191 and John R.H. Moorman, Church Life in England in the Thirteenth Century (Cambridge: CUP, 1945): 176-9, 205; On Richard Swinefield see Philippa Hoskin, “Swinefield, Richard (d. 1317)”, Oxford Dictionary of National Biography (OUP, 2004) [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/26843, accessed 29 July 2015]

\textsuperscript{1818} “In christo ihesu Memoriale Henrici Boydin de Rya. Requiescat in pace amen. Quod filius suus frater Gaufridus sibimetipsi fiat fieri. Set fratri petro de swinefeld assignauit qui tutor suus oxoniis fuit. postmodum parisius specialissimis amicus. postremo in fratrum minorum ordine minister tocius anglie. Qui quasi prescius preproperantis sui obitus quarto mense precedente hoc ipsum memoriale resignauit et reddidit predicto fratri G. apud Winchelese.” (fol. ?)
fuit”) afterwards his special friend in Paris (“postmodum parisius specialissimus amicus”) and subsequently provincial master of the whole order of Franciscan friars minor in England (“postremo in fratrum minorum ordine minister tocius anglie”), and finally, that Geoffrey died [at Winchelsea?] four months before the addition of the inscription and the bible’s donation (“Qui quasi prescius preproperantis sui obitus quarto mense precedente hoc ipsum memoriale resignauit et reddidit predicto fratri G. apud Winchelese.”)

One may suggest a further intriguing possibility. Surely this Geoffrey is the same man referred to as “Fratrem G. Boyun” of Oxford (also referred to as “G. Boyōn”) who we have already witnessed being commissioned by Eleanor, Countess of Leicester in 1265 to produce the ‘portforium’ for her daughter, Eleanor de Montfort? If so, we gain an intriguing picture of Geoffrey as a ‘second-generation’ Franciscan friar who seems to have moved in elevated circles; as someone who was educated in Paris and at Oxford, where he was tutored by the future head of the Franciscan order in England, and subsequently involved in the mid-13th-century book trade of that city, in addition to being demonstrably familiar with the book trades of Paris and London, and whose skills as a scribe earned him the patronage of at least one member of the nobility. Geoffrey was clearly a person of considerable abilities with illustrious connections.

Friars could also be permitted to spend money on the maintenance and upkeep of bibles (again, with permission). It was clearly deemed acceptable to purchase the services of a professional for the purpose of bible-maintenance, such as rebinding or re-covering the book itself, as witnessed in a grant of 10 marcs to a friar, apparently a Minorite of Northampton, “ad unam Bibliotecam emendam” in 1230. It seems reasonable to assume that the outlay of funds was considered acceptable in this context, or at least perhaps a ‘necessary evil’, because such expenditure constituted an investment in that it would contribute to prolonging the life of one of the friars’ most valued pieces of property.

---

1819 A record of a purchase of “perchamenti abortivi” at Oxford (“Walingforde”) survives in the accounts rolls recording the household expenses of Eleanor Countess of Leicester for 1265: “Per Dominum W. de Wortham. / In xx. Duodenis parchameni abortivi emptis Londini, per fratrem G. Boyun, ad portiforium Domisellae Alianae, ad Purificationem, x.s.” (Rotulus Hospitii Dominae Alianae Comitissae Leicestriae [A.D. 1265]) in Botfield & Turner, Manners and Household [1841]: 9, 24; discussed in greater detail in Chapter 2.

Although we have seen that the act of purchasing books ‘outright’ was forbidden to friars, books could be purchased on the friars’ behalf in the form of books commissioned or purchased by donors to be gifted to the friars or books bequeathed to them by other patrons and benefactors.

Two bibles that were gifted to the Franciscans at Ipswich in the late 13th-century were included on the convent’s 14th-century list of book donors; one was given by Dominus Willelmus, sometime rector of “Hecham” (Hexham?) and the other was a large two-volume bible which was ‘procured’ (“procurauit”) for the convent by Frater Galfridus de Necotone, to be used in the refectory. Nicholas of Ely, bishop of Winchester (d.1268) left a bible to the Franciscan convent at Worcester, which may be one of the two 13th-century bibles which Neil Ker identified as survivals from the convent’s library: the first is a ‘pocket’ bible copied during the second half of the 13th century in England (now Trinity College, Dublin, Ms. 43; 187 x 120 mm, 368 fols.), with the inscription “Fratrum Minorum Wygorn” on fol. iv; and the second is a ‘lectern’ bible copied in England before 1250 (now British Library, Burney Ms. 1; 315 x 210 mm, 322 fols.) with the inscription “De co[mmun]iate frr[atr]um mi[n]or[um] Wy(erasure) /
Biblia” (fol. 1v; Fig. 4.4) chronicling the bible’s provenance from the library of the Franciscan convent at Worcester in the 14th century. British Library, Ms. Burney 5, the English ‘saddle-bag’ bible (255 x 180 mm) which was assigned to friar Walter de Bukenham “ad vitam” was subsequently gifted to the Franciscan convent of Babwell, Bury St Edmunds in the 14th century by Reginald, priest of that house (“ex dono q[uo]nd[am] Reginaldi sacerdotis / de ead[em] villa.”; Fig. 4.5) Peterhouse, Cambridge acquired the gigantic 13th-century bible now Ms. 46 its library (457 x 324

British Museum, 1834-1840): I.2, 1; cf. online record for BL, Burney Ms. 1 in The British Library’s Catalogue of Illuminated Manuscripts, available here.

1827 See N.R. Ker, MLGB (1964): 215. The inscription visible by ultraviolet light; also the number “13” visible over erasure following ownership inscription. The only indicator of the bible’s later ownership is a 17th century inscription on fol. 1r, “Jo: Browne hunc Librum / Jure tenet”, probably referring to John Browne, fellow of University College, Oxford; the bible was later owned by the classical scholar Charles Burney (1757-1817), D.D.; acquired from his son Charles Parr Burney by the British Museum as part of his father’s library in 1818.

1828 Text written above top line. Decorated with large puzzle initials in red and blue, with flourishing in the same colours; small initials alternately blue or red, with flourishing in the other colour; one-line initials alternately blue or red (only in red in quires xii-xv; fols. 115-158).

1829 “Iste liber est de co[mmun]itate fr[atr]um minor[um] S[an]cti Eadmu[n]di ex dono q[uo]nd[am] Reginaldi sacerdotis / de ead[em] villa.” See N.R. Ker, MLGB (1964): 5, 228. Both inscriptions were written on fol. 1r; the inscription commemorating Reginald’s donation was added above the note recording its earlier loan to Walter.
The catalogue of the Austin Friars's library at York for the period ca. 1372 onwards contains six bibles including two given by Magister Johannis Erghome. The library of the Carmelites at Aylesford contained two “Biblia integra”, as recorded in its 1381 catalogue, one of which was from Bilsington in Kent (“quondam de Bilsinton”) while at around the same date the library of the Carmelites at Hulne, on the outskirts of Alnwick in Northumbria, also contained two bibles, which were entered in their 1366

---


1831 "Magnificently written. The lower margin is nearly six inches deep. / The initials and rubrication have not been inserted: There is a space for a long I at Gen. i.; At Exodus i. is a decorative initial sketched in red, & a pencil sketch of U at Lev. i. The rest are blanks. Each book is preceded by Capitula arranged in two narrow columns, the two occupying the breadth of one ordinary column. There are many marginal notes of s.XIII, chiefly references to other parts of the Bible.”

1832 “Memorandum quid dominus frater Thomas de Insula ordinis predicatorum permissione duina Episcopus elyensis contulit domui sue ac scolaribus suis S. Marie extra portam de Trumpeton Cantebr. commorantibus. xxviii die novembris anno domini Milesimo Tricentesimo et consecracionis sue viii th / The Friars’ Libraries / representing the Friars’ Libraries of the Carmelites at York for the period ca. 1372 onwards contains six bibles including two given by Magister Johannis Erghome. The library of the Carmelites at Aylesford contained two “Biblia integra”, as recorded in its 1381 catalogue, one of which was from Bilsington in Kent (“quondam de Bilsinton”) while at around the same date the library of the Carmelites at Hulne, on the outskirts of Alnwick in Northumbria, also contained two bibles, which were entered in their 1366

---

1833 On the libraries and library regulations of the Carmelites see K. W. Humphreys, The Book Provisions of the Medieval Friars, 1215-1400 (Amsterdam, 1964): 123-128, and on their libraries' regulations, 77-82.


1835 On the libraries and library regulations of the Carmelites see K. W. Humphreys, The Book Provisions of the Medieval Friars, 1215-1400 (Amsterdam, 1964): 123-128, and on their libraries' regulations, 77-82.


1837 On the libraries and library regulations of the Carmelites see K. W. Humphreys, The Book Provisions of the Medieval Friars, 1215-1400 (Amsterdam, 1964): 123-128, and on their libraries' regulations, 77-82.


1840 "Magnificently written. The lower margin is nearly six inches deep. / The initials and rubrication have not been inserted: There is a space for a long I at Gen. i.; At Exodus i. is a decorative initial sketched in red, & a pencil sketch of U at Lev. i. The rest are blanks. Each book is preceded by Capitula arranged in two narrow columns, the two occupying the breadth of one ordinary column. There are many marginal notes of s.XIII, chiefly references to other parts of the Bible.”

1841 “Memorandum quid dominus frater Thomas de Insula ordinis predicatorum permissione duina Episcopus elyensis contulit domui sue ac scolaribus suis S. Marie extra portam de Trumpeton Cantebr. commorantibus. xxviii die novembris anno domini Milesimo Tricentesimo et consecracionis sue viii th

1842 Thomas’ donation is recorded in an inscription at the bottom of the first flyleaf (fol. i.r) written in a large hand, whilst Thomas’ earlier ownership of the bible is inscribed at the top of the page (“Iste liber est fratris Thome de Insula ordinis predicatorum”); see M.R. James, Peterhouse (1899): 55. ‘Thomas de Insula’ is probably Thomas de Lisle/ de Insula, bishop of Ely 1345-61 (Also the author of Thorney Abbey’s Register of Thomas de Insula, published in the Ely Diocesan Register 1894 [Ely, 1894]; see R.H. Snape, English Monastic Finances in the Later Middle Ages (CUP, 1926): 182; possibly the same as the “Thomas de Insula” entered in the Durham Liber Vitae? (in a 13th-century hand on fol. 63r); see Liber Vitae Ecclesiae Dunelmensis; nec non Obituaria Duo Episcopii Elyensis Ecclesiae; Ed. J. Raines. Surtees Society (London: J.B. Nichols & Son, 1841): 101 (recorded on fol. 60r; now fol. 63r). For further details on Peterhouse Ms. 46 see entry in M.R. James A Descriptive Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Library of Peterhouse (Cambridge: CUP, 1899): 64-6. [Ms. 44, ‘Biblia Sacra’ = ex-O.4.5 / O.R.I / James 249].

1843 Thomas’ donation is recorded in an inscription at the bottom of the first flyleaf (fol. i.r) written in a large hand, whilst Thomas’ earlier ownership of the bible is inscribed at the top of the page (“Iste liber est fratris Thome de Insula ordinis predicatorum”). Below this, in a 15th-century hand, “Precium xxvi s. viii th."


1845 On the libraries and library regulations of the Carmelites see K. W. Humphreys, The Book Provisions of the Medieval Friars, 1215-1400 (Amsterdam, 1964): 123-128, and on their libraries’ regulations, 77-82.

1846 (2) “Una Biblia integra in negro corio ligata quondam de Bilsinton” (Bilsington was a small house of Austin Canons about 40 km SE of Aylesford) and (6) “Una biblia integra in asseribus cum antiquo rubico coreo”. (C1.2, 6) Catalogue dated 6 August 1381 (survives as a transcription; CUL, Ms. Add. 7934, p.575); The Friars’ Libraries, Ed. K.W. Humphreys. CBMLC 1 (1990): C1 (157-9)
catalogue as having been donated by the Archdeacon of Northumberland and a friar named Robert of Populton respectively.\textsuperscript{1836}

**III Concerning friars’ use of luxury bibles**

Scholars such as Malcolm Parkes have argued that since mendicant ideals of poverty and purpose stimulated a pragmatic attitude to books, the volumes procured or produced friars were “fat volumes of utilitarian character” within which “the use of decoration was restricted and its execution was austere.”\textsuperscript{1837} However many examples of friars’ bibles survive which could certainly be described as luxury bibles, being highly decorated, sometimes with extensive programs of illumination. The character of these bibles could certainly not be described as ‘utilitarian’ and the degree of decoration they contain is neither ‘restricted’ nor ‘austere’ executed.

Chiara Ruzzier has recently illustrated the connection between mendicant bible use, the size of friars’ bibles and to the extent and type of decoration they contain.\textsuperscript{1838} Ruzzier examined a total of around 360 bibles, 70\% of which included notes of possession or of ownership (252 bibles),\textsuperscript{1839} although the identity or status of their early owners or possessors could reliably be discerned in only a little under half of them (109 bibles).\textsuperscript{1840} Upon examining this group of 109 bibles further,\textsuperscript{1841} Ruzzier found that over half were owned or possessed by friars (51\%; 65 of 109 bibles), and for the 42 of these 65 bibles in which the order that the friar belonged to, most were in the hands of

\textsuperscript{1836} “Biblia magna integra cum interpretationibus in asseribus cum albo coreo. Ex dono Archidiaconi Northumbrie” (no. 1) and “Unam Bibliam ex dono fratris Roberto de Populton in rubeis asseribus precii trium marcarum cum dimidio. Quem habet dominus de Percy ad terminam vite.” (no. 9); catalogue printed in *The Friars’ Libraries*, Ed. K.W. Humphreys. CBMLC 1 (1990): C3 (159-177)


\textsuperscript{1838} C. Ruzzier, Des (2011): 74-111 [86-100].

\textsuperscript{1839} “Pour presque 70\% des manuscrits consultés, nous n’avons aucun indice qui nous permette de remonter aux possesseurs d’époque medieval” (as regards the remaining 30\%, Ruzzier rightly comments that “La perte de toutes les reliures originales et, bien souvent aussi, celle des feuillets de garde anciens, en est sans doute en partie la cause”). Ruzzier (2011): 85 and Tableau 1, ‘Distribution des preuves de possession par date et statut’ (also 85).

\textsuperscript{1840} Ruzzier (2011): 84-5.

\textsuperscript{1841} “Un petit groupe de 109 manuscrits, les seuls de notre corpus pour lesquels il est possible de remonter à l’identité ou au statut du (ou des) possesseur[s].” (Ruzzier 2011: 84-5).
Dominicans (28) or Franciscans (14). Furthermore, Ruzzier found that three-quarters of the bibles used by friars were of portable size, and of these portable friars’ bibles, over half (50.7%) were decorated (the bibles’ decoration comprising the decorative initials of the books and prologues) with a mixture of decorated penwork and pen-flourished initials ("décor mixte orné-filigrané") or with only pen-flourished initials ("filigrané").

Ruzzier’s evidence suggests that bibles of a portable, but not minute, size and containing simple decoration were mostly to be found in friars’ possession. That said, we also see that bibles that were more richly decorated - with illuminated and/or historiated initials – were also to be found in the hands of friars, with luxurious copies more likely to be in the possession of Franciscans than Dominicans. This may be attributed ot the fact that although the value of such a bible could likely sometimes exceed the limit set by the statutes of the Franciscan order, many of these bibles came from

---

1842 Of the 42 friars’ bibles, 28 were owned or possessed by Dominicans, 14 by Franciscans, 2 by Augustinian friars and 1 by a Carmelite friar). “La moitié des preuves de possession concerne des frères mendians. … Les possesseurs des autres types sont en nombre nettement inférieur.” (Ruzzier 2011: 86).

1843 Ruzzier defines bibles of ‘portable’ size as those with a taille measurement of 230-330 mm; see Ruzzier (2011): Tableau 2, ‘Distribution par taille et origine des manuscrits utilisés par des frères mendians’ (97-98). A number which consistsutes 66.1% of the 109 bibles carrying notes of possession and 22.8% of all the 13th-century bibles of portable size in her survey. “Les trois quarts des bibles utilisées par des frères appartiennent indiscutablement à la catégorie « portative », leur taille étant comprise entre 230 et 330 mm. Les manuscrits ayant appartenus aux frères couvrent 22,8% de la production totale relative à cette classe dimensionnelle, et surtout 66,1% des manuscrits de cette classe pourvus de notes de possession.” (Ruzzier 2011: 98).


1845 A number which represents 75% of the total number of bibles in Ruzzier’ survey (i.e. bibles containing notes of possession), and 30% of all the 13th-century bibles of portable size. “Il est également intéressant d’examiner la richesse des ces manuscrits, représentée par le niveau de l’apparat decorative … 50,7% des bibles ayant appartenu aux frères se trouvent dans la classe « 230-330 mm avec décor mixte orné-filigrané ou exclusivement filigrané », ce qui correspond à 75% des bibles avec notes de possession et à 30% de la production totale de cette classe.” (Ruzzier 2011: 98).

1846 “Les bibles portatives, mais non minuscules, et avec une décoration simple constituaient donc une catégorie qui était sans aucun doute destinée en grande partie aux frères.” (Ruzzier 2011: 99)

1847 On observe, néanmoins, que les bibles plutôt riches et dotées d’initiales historiées sont loin d’être absentes.” (Ruzzier 2011: 99)

1848 “De plus, même si les effectifs sont faibles, il semble que les bibles ayant appartenu à des Franciscains soient plus riches que celles des Dominicains.” (Ruzzier 2011: 99-100).
donations or from friars who had entered the order after a secular career. Let us now examine some examples of luxury or richly-illuminated 13th-century portable bibles with early mendicant provenances.

i Dominicans

British Library, Arundel Ms. 303 is an early English pocket bible which was copied between 1228 and 1234 (138 x 93 mm, 484 fols.), most likely for an Oxford Dominican, as witnessed by the table of readings and the Calendar for Dominican use preceding its Bible text (on fols. 1r-2v and 3v-4v). An erased caucio note dated 1432 (?) on fol. 483v also supports the bible’s late medieval provenance in Oxford.

A number of 13th-century bible-missals demonstrate an early mendicant provenance, including Bodleian Library, Oxford, Ms. Lat. bib. e.7, an English ‘pocket’ bible with some masses (168 x 108 mm) copied in Oxford before 1234 with extensively illumination by William de Brailes, probably being the earliest of the bibles chiefly illuminated by him. The bible was probably made for a Dominican, perhaps from the

---

1849 “Il est donc probable que la valeur d’une bible franciscaine pouvait parfois être supérieure à la limite fixée par les statuts de l’ordre dont il a déjà été question. Cela dit, bon nombre de ces bibles pouvaient proviennent de dons ou de personnes qui étaient entrées dans l’ordre après une carrière séculaire.” (Ruzzier 2011: 99-100).


1851 Claire Donovan dates this bible more specifically to “ca. 1234 (or earlier) - 1240” in Donovan, The de Brailes Hours 1991: 203 [no. 16].

Oxford house established in 1221, as suggested by the inclusion of the Mass of St. Dominic in the bible’s missal text (cf. Fig. 3.21), together with the evidence of its Oxford provenance on both liturgical and stylistic grounds, together with the evidence of de Brailes’ involvement; all factors suggesting an origin connected with the early Dominican community in Oxford. However surviving inscriptions of possession and donation in the bible indicate that by the 15th century the book was in the possession of religious and aristocratic owners on the Continent (where it remained through the early 20th century).

### ii Franciscans

Another Oxford pocket bible copied in the second quarter of the 13th-century with an early mendicant provenance – perhaps also a product of the de Brailes Atelier – is British Library, Harley Ms. 2813 (183 x 133 mm), which displays strong links to the Oxford Franciscans. It seems likely that this bible was made for a Franciscan in

---

Includes a Missal, positioned between the Psalter and Proverbs (fols. 199r ff.) and written across the page, unlike the rest of the manuscript which is written in double columns (168 x 108 [119-117 x 74-72] mm, 2 cols./48 lines, 440 fols.; St. Dominic is the only saint named in the missal text (fol. 204r), with an additional office for his Translation inserted in a different hand on the lower margin. Dominic’s presence in the book could indicate that the volume’s production was begun even before that date (St. Dominic died in 1221, his relics were translated in 1233 and he was formally canonized in 1234); see Warner’s Dyson-Perrins catalogue (1920): 25.

The bible includes the following evidence of its late medieval and early modern continental ownership: The name of an anonymous early owner at the end of the Apocalypse has been erased: “Liber hic pertinet michi b...” (fol. 406r); Prior Johannes Linden, presented to Nicholas Boheler of Spira (Speyer in Rhenish Bavaria/ or Spire?), 15th century (on fol. 438v, also erased, can be read “Dominus iohannes linden prior domus huius concessit michi fratri nycolao boheler hunc librum”) and the same owner’s name also appears on fol. 440v (“Frater nycoloa boheler de spira professus monachus, granarius (?) eiusdem”) together with another erased inscription; Isabella Fernandes, presented to the Sodality of the Immaculate Conception, Antwerp, 1647 (on fol. 1r, “Sodal[itati]i Concept. Immac. B. Virg. Gall[icae] Antuerp. 1647 D[ono] D[edit] Isabella Fernandez.”; later belonged to Alfred Pfeiffer - his book-plate of arms (by Stern, Paris) inside front cover and label with monogram A.P. and number 1823; C.W. Dyson Perrins (his Ms. 5), purchased from Olschki, Florence in 1915; Dyson Perrins’ sale 21 January 1959, lot 59; purchased [for/by?] The Bodleian Library, Oxford at Sotheby’s, 5 July 1976, lot 81.


Oxford based on the inclusion of masses for St. Francis in a series of masses situated in the bible between Psalms and Proverbs (cf. Figs. 3.22A-B),\footnote{These begin with masses for the Trinity, the Holy Spirit, the Cross, Angels, and St Francis, and are followed by others for Advent, Christmas, the Purification, and so on. For a list of these see Kidd, “A Franciscan Bible” (2007): 16-20, esp. 17.} and in following prayers (an inclusion which also provides a \textit{terminus ante quem} for the bible’s production.\footnote{In other words, the volume must have been copied after St. Francis’ canonization in 1228 (d. 1226).} Furthermore, passages of the biblical text, including Proverbs, are annotated using marginal indexing symbols of the sort devised by Robert Grosseteste (d. 1253), the famous bishop, scholar and philosopher.\footnote{Further to which, Peter Kidd makes a compelling argument for the identification of Adam Marsh as the bible’s original owner based on indications in the bible that strongly suggest that the bible was made for an Oxford Franciscan during the second quarter of the 13th century who was approved as a preacher, narrowing down the range of possible candidates to a small number, including Marsh. (Peter Kidd, “A Franciscan Bible” 2007: 14-15, 18-19.)} These provide further support for an Oxford Franciscan provenance for this bible since most of the manuscripts that contain Grosseteste’s indexing symbols can be associated with the Oxford Franciscan house.\footnote{As do Grosseteste’s own well-documented Oxford connections, albeit by association (Grosseteste studied at Oxford, later becoming first rector of the Oxford Franciscans, chancellor of the University, and finally bishop of Lincoln (in which diocese Oxford lay) from 1235 until his death in 1253. For discussions and reproductions of Grosseteste’s indexing symbols see: “Tabula,” Ed. Philipp W. Rosemann, in \textit{Opera Roberti Grossetestini Lincolniensis}, I, Corpus Christianorum, Continuatio Mediaevalis, CXXX (Turnhout, 1995): 235–320; S. Harrison Thomson, “Grosseteste’s Topical Concordance of the Bible and the Fathers,” \textit{Speculum} 9 (1934): 139–44; R.W. Hunt, “Manuscripts Containing the Indexing Symbols of Robert Grosseteste,” \textit{Bodleian Library Record} 4 (1952–3): 241–55, and \textit{ibid} “The Library of Robert Grosseteste” in \textit{Robert Grosseteste, Scholar and Bishop: Essays in Commemoration of the Seventh Centenary of his Death}, Ed. D.A. Callus (Oxford, 1955): 121–45, and frontispiece; cf. M.B. Parkes, “Books and Aids to Scholarship of the Oxford Friars,” in \textit{Manuscripts at Oxford: An Exhibition in Memory of Richard William Hunt} (1908–1979), Eds. A.C. de la Mare & B.C. Barker-Benfield (Oxford, 1980): 57–9, no. XIII.2 & fig. 37..}

iii Augustinians (and Franciscans)

Bodleian Library, Oxford, Ms. Auct. D.3.2, an English ‘saddle-bag’ bible (279 x 194 mm) produced in the late 13th century\footnote{(279 x 194 mm, 2 cols./? lines, 481 fols.); see \textit{Summary Catalogue} II.1: no. 2032; Pächt & Alexander, III: no. 473 (44 & pl. XLVI); and Lucy Freeman Sandler, \textit{Survey V} (1986); II, 23-24 & I, ills. 29, 30, 32. See also J. Evans, \textit{English Art} 1307-1461 (1949): 13; Peter Brieger, \textit{English Art,} 1216-1307 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1957): 143 n.3; and Lillian Randall, \textit{Images in the margins of Gothic Manuscripts} (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1966): figs. 147, 297, 609.} with fine miniatures, historiated and other initials with fine penwork borders and initials, contains liturgical evidence for an Augustinian house - probably of friars rather than canons - whose relic day was between
the November 2nd and 6th (see fol. 470v). Further evidence of the bible’s connection with the Augustinian friars is to be found amongst its rear flyleaves, one of which (fol. 481) is an illuminated Latin indulgence of Thomas Winterton, provincial of the Augustinian friars in England in the late 14th century, with blank spaces for the community and date (also with penwork initial). The bible’s scribe may be depicted on the first page of the Psalter, in the historiated ‘B’ initial of ‘Beatus’ with the Virgin and Child (on fol. 198r; Fig. 4.6A). The bible’s Augustinian provenance, although not its fraternal provenance, is complicated by the presence, in the lower margin of one folio (fol. 122r), of an illustration of St. Francis preaching to the birds (Fig. 4.6B).

iv Friars’ 13th-century ‘luxury’ lectern pandect bibles

The six-volume set of glossed books of the Bible which belonged to friars of the Dominican convent in London (founded after 1221), now British Library, Royal Mss. 3.E.I-V and VIII, were the work of English professional scribes, possibly working in Oxford, during the third quarter of the 13th century, and were probably gifted to the convent by an unidentified countess. An inscription at the end of the penultimate volume reveals the identity of their illuminator as one Reginald of Oxford, perhaps the same Reginald, illuminator who lived at 94, High Street with his wife Agnes between ca. 1246-70.

The impressive scale and variety of the decoration and illumination contained in

---

1864 The Bible text (fols. 1-450v?) and the IHV (fols. 451r-468?) are followed by a list of Epistles and Gospels throughout the year (fols. 469-80?). The bible also includes an added list of the contents of each page, according to old divisions of the books into chapters (in the lower margin of fol. 467v).

1865 The second of two ‘B[eatus]’ initials on fol. 198r; in that in the left hand column, David plays the harp.

1866 Although a 16th-century note in BL, Royal Ms. 3.E.I (fol. i.v) describes Royal Mss. 3.E.I-V and Royal Mss. 3.E.VII-VIII as a Bible in seven volumes. “This Bible withe a glosse and Com[m]entaries / bounde in lether contayne Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, / Numbers, Deuteronomie, Josue, Judges, Ruth, / Esdras, Nehmia [added], Tobias, Judith [added], Hester, Machabees, Proverbs / Ecclesiastes, Canticles, Wisedome, Ecclesiasticus / Psalmes, Gospels, parte of Ezechiel and parte / of Daniel heinde in 7 volumes in folio.”

1867 Her gift of these books to the convent is commemorated in a later inscription on their former 18th-century bindings, probably copied from a note on the original bindings, which reads “COMITISSAE / TOM III” and “OLIM. CONVENT./ PRAED. LONDON”.

these books is attested by a series of inscriptions jotted down on the last page of each volume, presumably by the illuminator, recording the number of decorated/pen-flourished initials and capitals (large and small) and paraphs executed per volume, demonstrating that the illuminator was clearly paid by the initial. The inscription in Royal Ms. 3.E.I records the illuminator’s addition of 3,890 small letters and initials and 343 large initials in this volume, and notes in Royal Mss. 3.E.II, III and V list a further 9,016 small initials and paraphs and 1,110 large initials in these three volumes respectively (4,028 small and 347 large in II; 3,206 small and 534 large in III; 1,782 small and 229 large in V). A final note at the end of Royal Ms. 3.E.V (on fol. 102v; Figs. 4.7A-B) collates the combined quantity of illuminations in all five volumes, recording a total of 12,406 small initials and paragraph marks and 1,453 large initials.

The Bible of William of Devon (BL, Royal Ms. 1.D.I) and a number of its fellow bibles attributed to the so-called ‘William of Devon Group’ may have been

---


1870 In Royal Ms. 3.E.I (fol. 220v), 3,890 small letters and initials and 343 large initials (“In isto volumine sunt parve littere et paragrafi / 38c 90. it[em] grosse litter[e] 3c 43”); in Royal Ms. 3.E.II (fol. 227), 4,028 small and 347 large (“In isto volumine sunt parve litter[e] et paragrafi li 40c 28. / it[em] litter[e]e gr[o]sse 3c xlvi”); in Royal Ms. 3.E.III (fol. 239v), 3,206 small and 534 large (“In isto volumine sunt 32c et 6 paragrafi / cum parvis litteris it[em] V c et 34 / grosse litter[e]s”); in Royal Ms. 3.E.V (on fol. 90v) 1,782 small initials and paraphs and 229 large initials (“In isto volumine sunt 17c et 82 paragrafi / et minute littere it[em] 2c et 29 gr[o]sse litter[e]s”).

And a note in Royal Ms. 3.E.VIII (fol. 329) records 7,345 small initials and paraphs and 1,619 large initials in this volume (“In isto volumine sunt parve litter[e] et paragrafi 7(m) 3(c) et 495 it[em] litter[e] / grosse 16c et 19”); including these, the six volumes contain a combined total of 20,251 small initials and paraphs and 3,072 large initials.


Although William has not been identified in other documents, the illumination in his bible can be linked with a group of manuscripts associated with the Oxford region. The [so-called?] ‘William of Devon Group’, comprising a mid-13th century group of nine manuscripts comprising, in addition to this bible: Blackburn,
commissioned by a secular cleric who was a patron of the mendicant friars, perhaps intended as a lavish gift for this benefactor to bestow upon a mendicant house, as Adelaide Bennett demonstrated in 1972 following her attribution of three ‘new’ bibles to the group: BL, Royal Ms. I.E.2 (‘The Lumley Bible’), Bodleian Library, Ms. Auct., D.I.17 and Emmanuel College, Cambridge, Ms. 2.I.6. Bennett demonstrated that all three, plus the William of Devon bible itself, were probably illuminated in a shop headed by the so-called William of Devon Painter, but furthermore, Bennett cast light on problems of date, destination and patronage for at least two of these bibles.

On the Bible of William of Devon’s first page, four pairs of tonsured clerics are represented standing on columns in the margins flanking Jerome’s Epistle to Paulinus (fol. 1r; Fig. 4.8A). By virtue of the color and type of their habits, they may be identified from top left clockwise as Mendicant Friars: Franciscans, Dominicans, Carmelites and possibly

Museum and Art Gallery, Ms. 091.21001, BL, Ms. Egerton 1151 (‘The Egerton Hours’), Pierpont Morgan Library, Ms. M. 756 (the Cuerden Psalter), Cambridge, Emmanuel College, Ms. 116 (2.I.6), Bodleian Library Ms. Auct. D. I. 17, BL, Royal Ms. I. E. II, Corpus Christi College, Oxford, Ms. I, and New College Oxford, Ms. 306. The bibles are BL, Royal Ms. 1.D.I (The Bible of William of Devon) (315 x 205 mm); Cambridge, Emmanuel College, Ms. 116 (2.I.6) (406 x 254 mm); Bodleian Library Ms. Auct. D. I. 17 (378 x 251 mm); BL, Royal Ms. 1.E.II (aka ‘The Lumley Bible’) (395 x 270 mm); and Corpus Christi College, Oxford, Ms. I (275 x 190 mm); other books attributed to the William of Devon Group include a Book of Hours (BL, Ms. Egerton 1151, ‘The Egerton Hours’; 160 x 105 mm) and two Psalters (Pierpont Morgan Library, Ms. M. 756, the Cuerden Psalter; 292 x 197 mm and Blackburn, Museum and Art Gallery, Ms. 091.21001; 212 x 140 mm) and New College Oxford, Ms. 306 (John Chrysostom on St. Matthew? Folio size).

In so doing, Bennett revised and expanded the extant picture of both the William of Devon group’s membership and of the atelier’s scope and life-span; her attributions doubled the number of known manuscripts produced in that style, and as a result, as Bennett herself pointed out, “The now more broadly-based group may be more securely anchored in the history of English illumination than has until now been possible.” A. Bennett, “Additions” (1972): 31. On BL, Royal Ms. I.E.2 (‘The Lumley Bible’) see G.F. Warner & J.P. Gilson, Catalogue of Western Manuscripts in the Old Royal and King’s Collections in the British Museum (London, 1921); I, 19; On Bodleian Library, Ms. Auct., D.I.17 see Summary Catalogue II.2 (1937): 658 and Pacht & Alexander I (1966): no. 543 & pl. XLII (543); and on Emmanuel College, Cambridge, Ms. 2.I.6 see M.R. James, The Western Manuscripts in the Library of Emmanuel College; a Descriptive Catalogue (Cambridge: CUP, 1904): 102-5.

Bennett argues that although divergencies between the codicological and textual features of all four bibles preclude their attribution to a common writing shop, the examples share a number of common textual as well as iconographical features suggesting some liaison between a particular writing shop and the ‘William of Devon’ paint shop, and between these two and the entrepreneurs. Codicological differences between the bibles include dissimilarities in their respective preparation in layout with regard to size of text, number of lines, type of ruling, script and so on, while their textual differences include the kind of psalter each bible contains - two have double psalters, the other two have a single version - while variations in the bibles’ choice of prologues or order of Books “suggest[] different exemplars or reflecting certain outside requests.” (A. Bennett, “Additions” [1972]: 31 n.5).

Namely the Bible of William of Devon (BL, Royal Ms. I.D.1) and Bodleian Library, Ms. Auct. D.1.17; A. Bennett, “Additions” (1972): 37-38.
Pied Friars (Fig. 4.8B). The same pairs of friars also appear in another bible in the same family, Bodleian Library, Ms. Auct. D.1.17 (ol. 1v) in an arrangement which reverses that in the Bible of William of Devon; the right margin contains the Franciscans on a column and the Pied Friars, also in white habits, standing on a decorative bar, while the Carmelites with their striped habits stand atop a podium appear on the left.

These illustrations raise intriguing possibilities for the bibles’ provenance, particularly their date and their patronage. First of all, Bennett suggested that the appearance of the Pied Friars in the two bibles may provide a terminus post quem for their production around 1253 in Norwich, contra the popular assignation of the William of

---

1877 In justifying her suggestion that the figures in white are Pied Friars rather than Cistercians, Bennett argues as follows: that Pied Friars wore white habits, as illustrated in this bible, is attested by the fact that they were known as Blancs-Manteaux in Paris, and although Pied was applied as well to Cistercian monks who also wore white habits, in view of the three other Mendicant orders represented here, it seems logical to identify the brothers as Pied Friars rather than Pied Monks or Cistercians. See R. Emery, “The Friars of the Blessed Mary and the Pied Friars,” Speculum 14 (1949): 228-38 [235] (noted in Bennett, “Additions” 1972: 37 nn.17-18) For a description of habits, see J. Moorman, A History of the Franciscan Order from its Origins to the Year 1517 (Oxford, 1968): 149, 185, 358-59; W. Hinnebusch, The History of the Dominican Order, Origins and Growth to 1500 (Staten Island, 1965): I, 339-43; M. Rickert, Painting in Britain: The Middle Ages, 2nd ed., (Baltimore, 1965): 104, n. 47 (citing the Carmelites’ striped mantles worn until 1287); and R. Emery, “The Friars of the Blessed Mary and the Pied Friars,” Speculum 14 (1949): 228-38 (noted in Bennett, “Additions” 1972: 37 n.15)

1878 Although lacking the Dominicans, an absence which Bennett suggested may be attributed to the possibility that the torn left top of the leaf had once included them. (“Additions” 1972: 37).

1879 In asking “Why are the Friars in pairs standing on columns?” Bennett theorizes as follows: “In their peripatetic vocations to beg, preach and hear confessions, the Friars always traveled in pairs, as was decreed, for instance, in the Dominican Constitutions. Some Friars hold a book. The columns on which they stand can be interpreted to represent the Church. Apposite to this imagery is a Biblical passage found in I Timothy 3:15 (“…ecclesia Dei vivi, columna et firmamentum veritatis”). In this light, the Friars’ task is to spread the teachings of the Church and to dedicate themselves to learning. Bennett notes that “This last identification is tenable at close-hand examination despite the extensive damage due to the wrinkling of the vellum”; Bennett, “Additions” (1972): 37 n.16.

1880 Although Bennett cautioned that ultimately, while “It is indeed tempting to attribute the manuscripts to one of the centers, in particular to Norwich … one must remember that a good many friars wandered from place to place with no special ties to any convent in urban centers.” (Bennett, “Additions” 1972: 37) The Pied Friars formed a very obscure order of brief duration; they settled in England from the mid-1250s through 1274; the earliest recorded existence of the Pied Friars is at Norwich in 1253, and they later established houses in London (1268) and in Cambridge (1273), although their existence at Norwich in 1253 provides a terminus post quem for the bibles. The other three Orders had houses in those towns as well as in many others; the Carmelites had a convent in Norwich by 1256, but the Franciscans and Dominicans preceded them by a number of years, and although the Bible of William of Devon is often assigned to Canterbury, Bennett notes that the Carmelites had no friary in that city. (Bennett, “Additions” 1972: 37 n.20) On the Pied Friars see R. Emery, “The Friars of the Blessed Mary and the Pied Friars,” Speculum 14 (1949): 228-38 [232]; ibid. “The Second Council of Lyons and the Mendicant Orders,” The Catholic Historical Review, 39 (1953): 257-71 (esp. 261 ff.); and D. Knowles & R. Hadcock, Medieval Religious Houses: England and Wales (London, 1953): 196 ff.
Devon bible to Canterbury. Bennett argued that this cumulative evidence indicates that all four bibles were made for particular patrons whose specifications - including requests for illuminations in the ‘French’ manner of style and schema, and to honor the Mendicant Friars through their portrayal on the ‘Frater’ page - were quite extraordinary, and to which the atelier of the William of Devon painter catered. Bennett proposed that at least one of these patrons may well be identified in the Bible of William of Devon, depicted in the figure of

---

1881 The other three Orders had houses in those towns as well as in many others; the Carmelites had a conven in Norwich by 1256, but the Franciscans and Dominicans preceded them by a number of years, and although the Bible of William of Devon is often assigned to Canterbury, Bennett notes that the Carmelites had no friary in that city. See D. Knowles & R. Haddock, Medieval Religious Houses: England and Wales (London, 1953): 196 ff. (Bennett, “Additions” 1972: 37 n.20). Alas, other than William’s name, we have no further evidence of the bible’s medieval provenance until the 16th century when the book entered the Royal Library, witnessed in its inclusion in the 1542 inventory of books in the Upper Library at Westminster (Westminster inventory number “no. 972” on fol. 1). The bible retains the binding it received when it was rebound for Henry VIII (purple velvet with silver-gilt centre pieces and corners, and title on a slip of parchment attached to the cover; gilt and gaufed edges. For discussion see The Libraries of King Henry VIII, Ed. J. P. Carley, CBMLC 7 (2000): H2.972 (178), and for further details on the bible’s institutional provenance see St. Augustine’s Abbey, Canterbury, Ed. B. C. Barker-Benfield, CBMLC 13 (2008): I, cii n.103, 372, III, 1830-1 (explaining why previous attribution of the manuscript to St. Augustine’s is now rejected). The bible passed to the British Library (then Museum) when it was presented by George II 1757 as part of the Old Royal Library.

1882 The group was certainly influenced by Parisian illumination in style and iconography; both Bruce Watson and Robert Branner noted the distinguishing features of these manuscripts as follows: the dry, linear figure style, the flat, shadowless colors, the extensive use of marginalia, and the treatment of rectilinear but interrupted borders especially characterized by disjointed stems frequently terminating in animal or human heads wearing dunce hats. Branner points to Continental, or more precisely Parisian, sources for these characteristics, which may collectively be termed the ‘style of the William of Devon Painter’, as representing a well-defined French intrusion into English illumination, and following Branner’s pioneering article in 1972, the Group’s mss. have been associated with the group of Parisian scribes and artists of the so-called ‘Johannes Grusch Atelier’; See B. Watson, “The Place of the Cuerden Psalter in English Illumination,” Gesta IX (1970): 34-51; and R. Branner, “The Johannes Grusch Atelier and the Continental Origins of the William of Devon Painter,” The Art Bulletin 54.1 (1972): 24-30; Adelaide L. Bennett, “Additions to the William of Devon Group,” The Art Bulletin, 54 (1972): 31-40 [31-33]; and Elzbieta Temple, “Further Additions to the William of Devon Group,” Bodleian Library Record, 11 (1984): 344-8 [344]. Also see Morgan (1984): II, nos. 159-164.

“The implication is that artists from Paris must have come to a center in England (almost certainly Oxford) where they worked and trained others in their particular style. In turn, a large number of English scribes are known to have worked in Europe, notably in Paris, and also in Bologna.” (Michael, 2008: 179). On the Grusch atelier, see Branner (1977) see: 82-6, Appendix V K: 222-23 and Figs. 212-43; cf. Robert Branner, “The Johannes Grusch Atelier and the Continental Origins of the William of Devon Painter,” The Art Bulletin, 54 (1972): 24-30. John Higgitt has suggested that the artists who painted the full-page miniatures bound up with the Murthy Book of Hours seem to have been connected in some way with the William of Devon Group – see John Higgitt, The Murthy Hours: Devotion, Literacy and Luxury in Paris, England and the Gaelic West (London; Toronto: British Library; Toronto UP, 2000): 121, 212-13, 286-7, Fig. 84.

1883 Bennett argues that the requests of these patrons included specific requests concerning the bibles’ textual contents, such as requests for a particular order of Books and set of prologues and the insertion of double psalters complete with illustrations. A. Bennett, “Additions” (1972): 37-38.
the kneeling cleric in a blue tunic beneath the miniature of St. Martin - perhaps his
namesake? on fol. 4v (Fig. 4.8C). If so, this portrait would suggest that the bible was
commissioned by a secular cleric who was a patron and benefactor of the mendicant
friars in particular.

In conclusion, within mendicant communities we repeatedly see bibles being
privileged above all the books that a friar might have in his possession, especially by the
Dominicans. Every friar needed a bible, particularly those student friars engaged in
studies at the universities. Friars either obtained their bibles ‘legitimately’ via official
channels, through being assigned the use of a copy by the Provincial or Warden of their
convent, or through transactions of a ‘semi-legitimate’ nature, as personal gifts or handed
down by ‘fraternal descent’, or via methods and channels that were not ‘above board’,
mainly by purchase. The libraries of the friars’ institutions (convents, houses etc.)
acquired copies themselves either by purchase or as gifts or bequests from patrons, donors
or benefactors.

Bibles were essential tools for friars, used for reference and for sermon
preparation, and thus occupied a privileged position amongst friars’ books as units of
intellectual and bibliographic currency. A bible was considered ‘worth’ a certain amount
of money in terms of being considered equal to a certain number of other books ‘of an
equivalent value’ (more like a bartering system). However the importance that friars
attached to bibles was based on more their high ‘value’ as useful resources; they were
necessary possessions. Friars were required to have access to a bible, and thus bibles were
particularly highly prized as objects of outstanding value in financial terms amongst all a
friar’s possessions, since a bible was almost certainly the most expensive item that a friar
might have in his possession at any one time. It is hardly surprising that the fraternal
authorities would seek the safe and speedy return of a friar’s bible after his death, for the
book constituted an essential item needed by others in the community, and its loss could
compel the convent to either pay a significant sum of money to secure a replacement or
force them to wait for an indeterminate period until such time as they received a new

1884 The kneeling figure was first linked with the miniature by G.F. Warner, who identified him as
Lawrence of St. Martin, Bishop of Rochester (1251-74) and royal adviser to Henry III (see Warner,
Illuminated Manuscripts in the British Museum, ser. I-IV (1903): text following pl. 20 (noted in Bennett,
“Additions” 1972: 37 n.22).
copy gifted by an obliging patron. Neither option would have been appealing; thus the authorities were naturally concerned with protecting such bibles as the property of their house and went to great lengths to recover them, in order to avoid the trouble and expense of securing replacements.
Chapter Five

Locating 13th-Century Portable Bibles in Late Medieval Monastic Libraries and Book Collections

This chapter seeks to position Latin pandect (single-volume) bibles in relation to their late medieval institutional usage, particularly within the collections of medieval religious communities. I consider a range of late medieval documentation chronicling institutional book holdings and engage in close reading of the vocabulary used by late medieval ‘library cataloguers’ in order to evaluate how these bibles were presented in medieval catalogues, interrogating the language of their description and how they were visually represented on the page and distinguished within the catalogues. Writ large, this chapter tries to locate a sense of what these catalogues narrate as ‘valuable’ about the bibles they describe. This methodology is intended to locate the question of bible use in medieval book lists, considering what, if anything, these lists and catalogues can tell us about the modes, peoples and spaces of contemporary bible use. This chapter also considers when and where medieval bible readership and use became personal ownership, especially within medieval religious communities, and the relationship between medieval bible use and collection.

The perspective that these book lists offer on pandect bibles’ position in the premodern history of reusing books as well as the nonuse of bibles will be a crucial area of inquiry. Does a survey of extant medieval institutional lists reveal a lack of pandect bibles recorded in the book collections of such communities, and thus indicate the lack of a late medieval institutional need or use for this kind of bibles? And if late medieval book lists highlight these bibles as conspicuous by their absence from institutional libraries and spaces for bible-reading, how does this complicate our understanding of the spatial and intellectual place of the Bible in late medieval England? Furthermore, might we conclude that the high survival rate of these bibles cannot be attributed to any security offered by late medieval institutional preservation, but rather has been sustained despite it? Did such medieval taxonomies of books, through their function as records of institutional holdings stored in institutional reading spaces, fail to include the kinds of medieval books that are most common today?
Do the medieval catalogues give any indication of the kind of ‘valuing’ pandect bibles as the innovative Scriptural technologies that we recognize them to be today? Does the descriptive terminology used in medieval book lists to describe bibles demonstrate any sense either of a particular place of Latin pandect bibles or convey a sense of a standardization of textual and material implications of what was meant by ‘The Bible’, anticipating what it later came to mean? Before the 16th century establishment of ‘The Vulgate’ as formal and Scriptural Bible-blueprint, theologians made various reference to The Bible as canon, as text and as written object, distinguished by terminology imbued with textual and material implications, such as “Biblia integra,” “diuisa” or “uersificata.” How did such the entries in these catalogues navigate contemporary ideas of the Bible as occupying the simultaneously plural and singular position of a material collection of canonical, ordered Scriptural texts?\footnote{In other words, do the entries in these catalogues for ‘the Bible’ conform to what Stallybrass and Chartier call “A material sense of the Christian bible as a single canonical work” and what Christopher de Hamel foregrounds as The Bible’s unique status as a sacred object that makes it infinitely divisible without making it less holy? See Peter Stallybrass & Roger Chartier. “What is a book?” The Cambridge Companion to Textual Scholarship Eds. Neil Fraistat & Julia Flanders (Cambridge: CUP, May 2013): 13 proofs and De Hamel (2005A): 16.}

Thus by questioning how one may locate the methods and motives of medievals’ use and reuse of pandect bibles, this chapter participates in my project’s broader investment in complicating our understanding of the Bible as a useful book. The chapter will also ask whether medieval catalogues navigate questions of the nonusage of pandect bibles in relation to their high survival rate today, for if these books were not being used, and were not being read for their Scriptural texts, then for what reasons were they being produced over the medieval period, and for whose use?

What position in medieval intellectual life and particularly within religious communities is legible from medieval descriptions of “biblia integra” over time? What can this kind of language and these kinds of lists tell us about how these bible volumes were used and how does the descriptive language of the catalogues’ treatment of bibles reflect the usage of those book lists themselves? What do these catalogue entries reveal with regards to contemporary practices of bible-ownership, donation and institutional acquisition?
I shall address these questions by first offering case studies of two Benedictine communities in late medieval England, Durham Cathedral Priory and St. Augustine’s Abbey, Canterbury, following which I shall contextualize these case studies within the broader context of other late medieval institutions through a survey of the corpus of surviving book lists and catalogues from the libraries of late medieval communities.

1 The Late Medieval Use of Pandect Bibles/‘Biblia integra’ in Two Benedictine Communities

1 Durham Cathedral Priory

The medieval book collections of the Benedictine cathedral priory of St Cuthbert at Durham, now Durham Cathedral, in the North-East of England, are world-famous. More books survive from the medieval libraries of Durham than from any other pre-Reformation foundation in Britain, and, extraordinarily, the greater part of these books remain in the cathedral to this today. Over the course of its 450 year medieval life, the collections of Durham Cathedral priory probably numbered between 1500 and 2000 books (one of, if not the, largest collections of a medieval English institution), and there are ca. 350 medieval manuscripts and early printed books demonstrably from the medieval libraries of Durham still in the possession of the cathedral, and 270 volumes recorded elsewhere. These numbers are revealed as truly outstanding when compared to the collections of other medieval institutions: in stark contrast to Durham’s 350 medieval books still in situ, there remain only 8 medieval books from St. Swithun’s in Winchester still there, 5 still in the possession of York Minster, 3 at St. Paul’s Cathedral, London, 3 at Rochester Cathedral and none remaining at St. Alban’s or at Bury St. Edmunds. In fact, there are roughly as many documented dispersed books from Durham as there are extant books from Bury St. Edmunds in total, and far more survive altogether from many of the most prolific survivals from English medieval libraries (230 extant volumes from Exeter, 225 from Norwich, 215 from Salisbury and ca. 120 from Hereford Cathedral). Thus, outside of the Cathedral, there are still significantly more surviving books from medieval Durham than from any of the English monastic houses, save only for Worcester, the two Benedictine communities at Canterbury (St. Augustine’s and Christ Church) and Bury St. Edmunds. See entries in N.R. Ker, *MLGB* (1964) as follows: Durham Cathedral Priory, 60-79 (& Durham College, Oxford, 145-6); St. Swithun’s, Winchester, 199-201; York Minster, 216-17; St. Paul’s Cathedral, London, 195-7; Rochester Cathedral, 160-4; St. Alban’s, 164-8; Bury St. Edmunds, 16-22; Exeter Cathedral, 81-5; Norwich, 135-9; Salisbury, 171-6; Hereford Cathedral, 96-99; Worcester, 205-15; St. Augustine’s, Canterbury, 40-47; and Christ Church, Canterbury, 29-40. Also see following entries in A.G. Watson, *MLGB: Supplement* (1987): Durham Cathedral Priory, 16-29 (& Durham College, Oxford 54); St. Swithun’s, Winchester, 68; York Minster, 70; St. Paul’s Cathedral, London, 67; Rochester Cathedral, 58-9; St. Alban’s, 59-60; Bury St. Edmunds, 5-7; Exeter Cathedral, 36; Norwich, 50-51; Salisbury, 60-1; Hereford Cathedral, 39; Worcester, 69; St. Augustine’s, Canterbury, 12-13; and Christ Church, Canterbury (*MLGB*: 29-40, *MLGB+:* 10-12)
further distinguished amongst the religious communities of medieval England for the survival of a number of the medieval inventories serving as catalogues of Durham’s collections, including the Spendement inventories of 1392 and 1395 and the Cloister inventory of 1395, now preserved together as DCL, Ms. B.IV.46. These materials offer exceptionally detailed insight into the ways - some of them unique - in which Durham’s collections were organized and used by its late medieval community.

Durham’s Benedictine priory was founded and Durham’s existing community converted in 1083 by William of Saint-Calais (or Carilef), the man who also initiated the construction of Durham’s awe-inspiring Romanesque cathedral a decade later. William’s influence also extended to enlarging Durham’s book collections: his donation of 50 titles to the community remains inscribed at the front of his treasured two-volume bible, which he also gifted to his community, and which remains in Durham Cathedral Library almost a 1000 years later (now DCL, Ms. A.II.4). Durham’s collections were augmented by an even larger gift of books (accompanied by an even bigger bible) from Bishop Hugh of le Puisset (d.1195); his gift of 75 titles to the cathedral represented the medieval priory’s largest donation to date, over a quarter of which were glossed books of


1888 Durham was one of the nine English Benedictine Cathedral Priories founded in the century following the Norman Conquest, alongside Christ Church, Canterbury and the communities at Winchester, Worcester, Bath, Coventry, Ely, Norwich and Rochester; see Joan Greatrex. The English Benedictine Cathedral Priories: Rule and Practice, c. 1270-1420 (Oxford; OUP, 2011).

1889 William’s donation also included a number of service books, an important contemporary copy of Bede’s Ecclesiastical History (B.II.35) and a number of Patristic writings, including the second volume of Augustin’s Enarrationes in Psalmos (B.II.13).
Scripture, but including two complete bibles. One of these is a luxuriously grand lectern bible of 12th-century English origin; the four-volume bible known today by its donor’s name as The Le Puiset Bible, which, like William’s bible, also remains at Durham (DCL, Ms. A.II.1).\textsuperscript{1890} Le Puiset’s gigantic bible weighs over 100 lbs, contains almost 7 miles of writing and comprises more than 130m\textsuperscript{2} of parchment; its magnitude symbolizes the speed and scale of the scribal innovations in Scriptural technological that had been implemented by the time that the same quantity of Scriptural text was being copied in complete ‘pocket’-sized format bibles only a few decades later.\textsuperscript{1891}

These weighty donations were foundational to the establishment of the rapidly growing book collections at Durham. The medieval community’s holdings book continued to swell rapidly throughout the second half of the 12th century, Durham’s most productive century of book-making, mostly as a result of in-house copying.\textsuperscript{1892} Documentation of this growth survives in two 12th-century catalogues, of which the earliest survives only as a roll fragment, but which, in its cataloguing the textual contents within the community’s books, demonstrates an unusual attention to detail for a book-list of so early a date.\textsuperscript{1893} The second list, written ca. 1160 (now DCL, Ms. B.IV.24, see Fig. 5.1A-B), notes only each volume’s main text, but offers insight into the community’s collection of nearly 400 books, a huge number for its time. Together, these book-lists emphasize Durham’s unrivalled position as the premier center of learning in the north of England.\textsuperscript{1894}

A lack of documentation precludes a detailed description of the collections’ growth in the 13th century, although we do know that in-house production remained a

\textsuperscript{1890} See \textit{MTODC} (2010): no. 18.
\textsuperscript{1891} Such as Durham Cathedral Library, Ms. A.IV.37, discussed in Gameson (2013).
\textsuperscript{1893} See \textit{Cat. vet. Dunelm} (1838): i-iv, 1-10.
\textsuperscript{1894} This elevated status is confirmed by the documented use of its exemplars at other northern houses. Surviving examples of this practice include MS B.II.35, the copy of Bede donated by Bishop Saint-Calais, whose eight direct manuscript descendants are readily identifiable; they include British Library Ms. Harley 4142 and Add. 25014, Cambridge, Pembroke College 82 (all of the 12th century), and the 13th-century Vatican Library, MS Reg. lat. 694, of Workop, Tynemouth, Newminster and Cupar provenance respectively, see \textit{Manuscript Treasures of Durham Cathedral}, Ed. Richard Gameson (Durham: Durham Cathedral & Third Millennium Publishing, 2010): 60.
key source of growth for Durham’s collections, and that this remained the case into the 14th century. However, by the 13th century, Durham’s in-house production of manuscripts was being supplemented (and eventually surpassed) by the monks’ acquisition of books from outside sources. Durham gained access to the increasingly professionalized book trade of southern England in the 13th century as a result of its foundation of Durham College in Oxford (ca. 1286). Durham’s connection with Oxford catalyzed the flow of books to (and from) Durham’s collections over the following centuries, substantially increasing the cathedral priory’s holdings. Many volumes were sent north to Durham by designated book-acquisitors in Oxford, such as Thomas Westoe, whose purchase, in the 1280s and 1290s, of 26 titles for the priory was recorded in the College’s 1315 inventory. However, Durham College also served to seriously deplete the contents of Durham’s libraries. A two-part inventory dated ca. 1390-1400 records a collection of 109 books - especially works of logic, philosophy and theology, and including glossed Scriptures and commentaries - sent down to Oxford by the chancellor, John Wessington (prior, 1416-46) at the end of the 14th century to supply the reading

---

1895 Although an innovation in Durham’s acquisition method came in the 14th century through the hiring of professional scribes such as the Breton scribe William le Stiphel, whose work for the community remains visible in Durham’s copy of Nicholas of Lyra’s Postilla litteralis in libros historiales Testamenti veteris copied in the final quarter of the 14th century (see DCL, Ms. A.I.3).

1896 Durham College (now Trinity College) was founded to support 8 monks studying philosophy and theology, and 8 laymen studying grammar and philosophy; see Richard Gameson, The Old Library, Trinity College, Oxford (Oxford: Trinity College, 1988) and ibid., “The medieval library (to c.1450)” in CHLBI I (CUP, 2008): 13-50.


needs of Durham monks studying in the community’s Oxford college. Few of these books returned; Durham’s Oxford cell became one of the main destinations – if not the main exit route - for the irrecoverable dispersal of Durham’s books that left the environs of the cathedral, never to return.

However, at the time of the 1392/5 Durham inventories, the majority of Durham’s books were to be found in three distinct locations within the community: first, the ‘Spendement’ Room (or The Chancery, separate from the adjoining Treasury Room) which functioned as a reserve depository for secure storage of books; second, the cathedral cloister, which housed the community’s working collections, including the books required for reading in the Refectory and for the use of the Novices. However, these physical spaces for keeping books at Durham were later supplemented then replaced by a third location: a purpose-built libraria room. By 1406 a new project to rebuild the whole cloister was under way, and between 1414 and 1418, during the Chancellorship, then priorship of John Wessington, a new libraria room was constructed over the parlor between the South Transept of the cathedral and the Chapter House, dramatically enhancing the community’s facilities for accessing its collections (see Fig. 5.2).

Crucially, unlike the Spendement (store)room, where books were deposited

---


1900 H.E.D. Blakiston published a number of important sources documenting the transmission of books from Durham to Durham College, Oxford in “Some Durham College Rolls,” Collectanea III, Ed. M. Burrows. O.H.S., n.s. 32 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1896): 1-55, including ‘Libri Missi Oxoniam, c.1400’ [38-40] and ‘Libri Missi Oxoniam, 1409’ [40-1], in addition to sources relating to the legislative administration of the college: Responsiones Contra Priorum Studentium, 1422 [27-35]; and the Status Collegii for 1315 [35-6], 1428 [41-9] and 1456 [49-55].

1901 See Cat. vet. Dunelm (1838): vii-viii. Lists recording the books used by these respective groups are printed in Cath. Vet. Dunelm (1838): “A List of Books used in the Refectory during the hour of dinner” (80-1) and “A List of Books in the case of the Novices in 1395” (81-4).

1902 For a map showing of the location of books in Durham Cathedral Priory see A.J. Piper, “The libraries of the monks of Durham” (1978); Fig. 2 (222).

1903 The Rites of Durham, an account of the Durham community’s pre- Dissolution muniments, customs and traditions, written in 1597, almost 60 years after the Priory’s surrender, provides an invaluable systematic survey of the Cathedral’s medieval architecture and the devotional and intellectual habits and ceremonies practiced by Durham’s Benedictine community through the centuries, albeit a notoriously rose-tinted one. The work includes a description of the almeries’ position within the cloisters of medieval Durham as part of
rather than kept available for use, this new reference *libraria* was a space in which books were accessible for reading, as well as safely secure.\(^{1904}\) The physical layout of the *libraria* room and its new furniture demonstrated this novel attitude to consulting as well as storing knowledge; the *libraria* contained ten large reading desks (8 double-sided, 2 single-sided) on which books were kept (and, possibly, although it is unlikely from the outset, chained).\(^{1905}\) Initially around 150 volumes were transferred to the new library room (two-thirds of which came from the cloister collection) but the number there ultimately doubled. The volumes' spatial relocation required a new classificatory system of class and shelf-marks for updated book identification reflecting the books’ reorganization and re-shelving within their new spaces and collections.\(^{1906}\) Continued growth of the priory’s collections is visible throughout the 15th century, reflecting the provision of even more storage space, including a new cloister ‘cupboard’ and new study

---

\(^{1904}\) Durham was one of the first monastic communities to construct such a dedicated ‘reference library’ space; Worcester did not construct one until the middle of the 15th-century, whilst the Abbey of St. Albans constructed its library room at around the same time as Durham, whilst work on the new library room at Christ Church, Canterbury was under way 20 years after Durham had completed hers, which completed, CCC furnished its new room, like St. Albans and Durham, with a small but choice collection of books; on Worcester see Thomson (2001), on St. Albans see Hunt (1978) and on Christ Church see De Hamel (1997). On these late 14th-century changes in library architecture and furnishings, see Paul Saenger. *Space Between Words: The Origins of Silent Reading* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1997): 35-8.

\(^{1905}\) Desks I-III held glossed books of the Bible and patristics, and Desks IV-VI held scholastic theology, while Desk VII held history and hagiography on one side and Latin Classics and medical works on the other, and Desks VIII-IX presented Canon and Civil Law and Desk X held philosophy (mainly Aristotle). On book-chaining at Durham and the lack thereof, see Alan Piper (1978): 226-7.

\(^{1906}\) In this, Durham is similar to Bury St. Edmunds, where Henry of Kirkestede’s class-marks were never superseded, even after a new library was built in the 1420s with a very different regime for book storage and access (Sharpe, “Library Catalogues and Indexes”: 234-5).
carrells during the time of Priors John Auckland (1484-94) and Thomas Swaldwell (d.1539; see Fig. 5.3).\textsuperscript{1907}

This spatial division imposed by the Durham community on where their books were housed, keeping their largest collections in the Spendement and the cloisters, is a unique division, and one that Alan Piper argued “has no clear parallel elsewhere.”\textsuperscript{1908} The catalogues of Durham’s Spendement and Cloister collections demonstrate the monks’ negotiation of this diversity of book locations, using multiple series of shelf-mark letters within subject classes to identify those books listed, further classified by the recording of numbers entered in both the catalogue and within the book, the volume’s dicta probatoria and occasionally, the name of the book’s donor.\textsuperscript{1909} Most importantly (and further distinguishing Durham) the catalogues record the books’ current locations, reflecting the variety of physical spaces inside and outside the cathedral community at Durham within which Durham books were being used in the late 14\textsuperscript{th} through early 15\textsuperscript{th} centuries. Together, they demonstrate the community’s concern for ordering its collections and for precise classification of its books and their whereabouts.

However, in addition to the locations of book-use and storage of Durham books privileged by these catalogues’ taxonomies, there were also many more books distributed over multiple locations within the medieval priory community’s grounds that went unrecorded in these inventories. In addition to the large number of books that must have been on indefinite loan to Durham College, Oxford, as well as to the priory’s other dependent cells, one must also take into account the scores of books that were never kept under lock and key or systematically catalogueed, including the chancery archives in the


\textsuperscript{1909} For another similar example of a religious institution’s numbering its catalogue and books in a similar fashion, see Peterborough Abbey’s Matricularium or ‘register’ made at the end of the 14\textsuperscript{th}-century, listing 348 entries (now CUL Peterborough Cathedral, Ms. 15); see CBMLC 8 [Peterborough Abbey, Eds. Karsten Friis-Jensen & James M. W. Willoughby] (2001): Cat. BP21 (49-177); cf. Sharpe, “Library Catalogues and Indexes,” CHBB II (2008): 197-218 [208-9].
prior’s lodgings, in the prior’s chapel, at each of the cathedral’s nine altars, in the infirmary, those kept at St. Cuthbert’s shrine (supervised by the Feretrar, including, for a time, the Stonyhurst Gospel) and in cupboards, on lecterns, on the monks’ carrells and in their cells, in the personal collections of the prior and the bishop and, of course, the great number of service books and prayer books kept for daily worship where they were needed, in the choir. These are the books that went unrecorded on Durham’s late-14th-century inventories of their Spendement (1392/5) and Cloister (1395) collections, whose nature as inventories of books whose number and location were worthy of registration. Thus in their compilation, the lists of books included in these catalogues also highlight the books these taxonomies exclude; those volumes whose number, locations or existence these documents were not purposed to chronicle.

The inventories of Durham’s Spendement collections made in 1392 and 1395 (Figs. 5.4A-B) and of the priory’s cloister collection made in 1395 have, unlike many of the titles they record, remained in Durham Cathedral’s Library, and, in the two lists’ material union, now bound together as DCL, Ms. B.IV.46, they testify to the importance placed by the Durham community over time on the documentation of the history of its collections, and by extension, Durham’s valuing of its books. The survival of these records distinguishes Durham amongst the small number of England’s medieval religious houses whose medieval collections are documented in their surviving medieval catalogues - including Peterborough, Bury St. Edmunds, Dover and Canterbury.

Together, the two inventory documents from Durham are rich examples of the methodological innovations in institutions’ recording of their books that evolved from the


1912 For further discussion and editions of medieval catalogues from Peterborough see CBMLC 8 (2001), and for Dover see CBMLC 5 (1999), for Bury St. Edmunds see M.R. James (1895) and for the Benedictine houses at Canterbury (St. Augustine’s and Christ Church) see M.R. James, *Ancient Libraries* (1903).
12th to the 14th centuries, charting the evolution of how medieval institutional collections were indexed and catalogued in libraries, spatially and systematically. Durham’s inventories show the changes that had come about in books’ institutional status by the late 14th-century. In their schematization of Durham’s books, these lists exemplify the transformation in books’ status from possessions simply to be recorded for their financial value by monkish accountants compiling lists that were later copied into other books, to being described as tools within self-standing catalogue booklets that were designed to serve as location registers for the use of both reader and librarian. Early book-lists, like that compiled at Durham in the 12th century (DCL, Ms. B.IV.24; cf. Figs. 5.1A-B), focused primarily on books’ contents using author/title formulations arranged within the Cassiodorian ‘hierarchy of learning’, rather than on how works were combined in a volume or on how to identify a particular volume. Durham’s 12th-century book list (compiled ca. 1160) bears the simple titular inscription: “Vetus catalogus librorum qui in Armariolo Ecclesiae Cath. Dunelm. olim habebantur” (fol. 1r; Fig. 5.1B). Unlike its late-14th century descendents, this list created with the uncomplicated classificatory purpose of simply identifying rather than describing the priory’s books, and thus providing a means of checking them. The book-list has survived not for its own documentary or historiographical value, but for the historical value which the community accorded to the volume in which the list was written, namely a collection of works relating to the monastery, the volume being used chiefly for its Martyrologium (fol. 12-39) and its text of the Rule of St. Benedict (fol. 74-9).

---

1914 The ‘hierarchy of learning’, already well-established by the 12th-century: first and foremost amongst classificational schema of knowledge must come The Bible (later followed by glossed books of the Bible); then came the leading fathers or doctors of the Church; other ecclesiastical books followed, pastoral works, sermons, and, from the late 12th-century, sententiae, summae and commentaries on Peter Lombard’s Sentences; next was positioned philosophical texts, especially commentaries on Aristotle, and discussions of logic, natural philosophy and metaphysics; finally were situated secular subjects, canon law, civil law, medicine, history and geography, with school texts, including grammar and poetry at the end (Sharpe, “Library Catalogues and Indexes”: 202).
1916 The “Vetus Catalogus” is written on the first two folios of the volume (at fol. 1-2r). DCL, Ms. B.IV.24 has also been known as ‘The Durham Cantor’s Book’, and the volume seems to have been in the possession of the precentor contemporary to the book’s creation. Further examples of basic book-lists providing little more than author/title lists that survive within other works include the book-lists of St. Augustine’s Abbey,
However from the end of the 11th century onwards the functional approach to collection cataloguing witnessed in such earlier medieval book lists was, through necessity, superseded in medieval library inventories following the campaigns of accession to build up monastic collections, that resulted in larger collections that needed to be catalogued more thoroughly and more efficiently. By the end of the 12th century, book ‘catalogues’ (like the figure of the medieval ‘librarian’, a particularly elusive concept) were beginning to be organized with numbers and letter-marks in attempts to locate books rather than just record their existence as part of an institution’s collection (e.g. the catalogues of Bury St Edmunds at the end of the 12th century and the 1326 catalogue of Christ Church, Canterbury’s books recorded in the register of Prior Henry of Eastry). Such catalogues begin to experiment with using alphabetization as an organizational principle in the aid of indexing books’ location with the physical arrangement of the library. The second half of the 14th century saw the production of ever more sophisticated and detailed systems for organizing collections’ books and their storage. These catalogues (so-called, although strictly speaking they are more accurately to be

Canterbury, added to a mid-10th century copy of Isidore’s De natura rerum, the list of Peterborough Abbey’s books, ca.1111-19 and that of Rochester Cathedral Priory, ca.1122, copied into a cartulary.

The medieval ‘librarian’ is a particularly elusive figure, defying convenient labeling, as Richard Sharpe has demonstrated (see Sharpe [2006] and also ibid. [2008]). Initially the duties of ‘library management’ was something of a ‘second job’ for the precentor or the prior in monastic communities, although later such tasks were the responsibility of a specific armarius, although Sharpe reminds us that their role was very different in different libraries, and ‘The diversity and inconsistency of their activities must warn against easy generalization’ (Sharpe [2006]: 218, 241). At Durham, for example, the care of the community’s books was the responsibility of not only the precentor, but also, by the 13th-century, a librarius figure also, a position further supported by the creation, in the 14th-century, of a dedicated cancellarius (Piper [1978]: 217). The medieval ‘library catalogue’ is equally resistant to straightforward categories of definition; known by many names, and varying greatly in form and function, the medieval ‘library catalogue’, as Sharpe has again demonstrated, is best conceived of as a category of medieval booklists that include property lists, inventories and audit documentation from the 12th century through to the highly systematized and detailed catalogues of the 14th-century (see Sharpe [2008]).

See Inventory in Prior Eastry’s register, 1331 (CBMLC ? [?]: BC5); cf. Prior Eastry’s catalogue, ca. 1331 (CBMLC ? [?]: BC 4).

Richard Sharpe is absolutely right, I think, to propose Henry of Kirkestede as the first late medieval ‘cataloguer’ whose innovative use of the ‘new’ alphabetical arrangement of ecclesiastical authors and subjects - in the mid-14th century at Bury St Edmunds, in both his Catalogus de libris autenticis et apocrifis (c.1360s onwards) and in his cataloguing of the Bury library for which he was responsible when he was made prior (as of 1361) - proved most consequential for the changes in cataloguing systems and methodology during the following centuries. Henry’s use of letter-marks in books and in his bibliographical tools, along with his alphabetical arrangement of the authors he cited were truly innovative in both their form and the functions they encouraged: see CBMLC 11 [Henry of Kirkestede Catalogus de Libris Autenticis et Apocrifis, Eds. Richard H. & Mary A. Rouse] (2004) and Richard H. Rouse. ‘Bostonus Buriensis and the Author of the Catalogus Scriptorum Ecclesiae’, Speculum 41:3 (1966): 471-99.
named ‘inventories’) combined the descriptive features of its predecessors with a precise indicator that permitted a reader to quickly confirm the match of a book and its entry in the catalogue, even where there were multiple copies of the same work.\textsuperscript{1920} This indicator took the form of \textit{dicta probatoria}, which consisted of the first two or three words from the beginning of the book’s second folio.\textsuperscript{1921} Such a marker permitted the exact identification of a particular book, extremely useful for a librarian loaning out books in a manuscript culture.\textsuperscript{1922} Not only did markers such as \textit{dicta probatoria} come to be widely used for the swifter, more accurate identification of a particular volume’s contents, but catalogues of this period began more systematically to record the names of donors. Those in charge of chronicling collections’ contents were demonstrably becoming more concerned with recording not only how many books their institutions possessed, but what they contained, how they had been acquired, and how one could efficiently retrieve a particular book \textit{post haste}.

Durham’s 1392 Spendement inventory employs all these novel cataloguing methods for organizing its books on the page and negotiating the spaces of their physical storage. The prefatory text at the top of the inventory’s first folio (see Fig. 5.4A) announces the purpose and function of the document:

\begin{quote}
Isti libri infra scripti inventi fuerunt in communi armariolo dunelmi infra spendimentum, in recessu fratris domini Roberti de Langchester ab officio librarie ad officium feretrariae, et liberati fratri Willielmo de Appelby circa festum purificationis beatae virginis mariae, anno domini millesimo ccc nonogesimo primo.
\end{quote}

This prefatory text thus records that this is a list of those of Durham’s books – “in communi armariolo dunelmi” – which were kept (or in truth, were stored) in the Spendment (“infra spendimentum”), the list having been compiled as a result of the collection’s inventory taken by brother Robert de Lanchester in his official position as librarian and Feretrar (“ab officio librarie ad officium feretrariae”) and having been ‘delivered’ (“liberati) by brother William de Appelby. The date of the inventory’s

\textsuperscript{1921} This device is first used at the university of Paris towards the end of the 13\textsuperscript{th}-century (on this see M.A. \& R.H. Rouse. Authentic Witnesses [1991]: chapter 9). The first English catalogue to use \textit{dicta probatoria} was that of Merton College, Oxford ca.1318-34, and again in 1349 [see CBMLC ed. [forthcoming]: Cats. UO46-47], whilst the first recorded use in a Cambridge college library was in 1376, in the very wordy booklist of Corpus Christi College (CBMLC 10 [2002]: Cat. UC18).
\textsuperscript{1922} For the texts of the Locations-Register and Index see CBMLC 13 (2008): I, 106-66, 167-371.
compilation is recorded in its concluding lines as having taken place around 2 February 1391 ("circa festu[m] purific[ationis?] beate virgi[nis] marie. Anno d[o]m[ini] Mill[es]i[mo]. CCC. Nonogesimo primo"), a date supplemented by a second chronological marker added directly after this, in another hand - just to the left of the inventory’s shelfmark, “B.IV.46”, which is inscribed in the top right corner of the folio – which records a date of the 15th regnal year of Richard II, or 1392 ("A[nn]o Regni Regis Rich: II. decimo quinto”).

The list’s entries organize the books by alphabetical system under subject headings, systematically recording each book’s Title, [Author] and dicta probatoria (and possibly the donor’s name). The inventory starts with bibles situated in prime position amongst its books inventoried (see “Biblia” marked in the right hand margin beside the end of the entry for Bible C), according to the contemporary cataloguing practice for ordering books within the hierarchy of learning. The first bible recorded is identifiable as the four-volume bible given by Bishop Hugh le Puisset: “Biblia d[o]m[ini] Hug[onis?] Ep[iscop]i Dunel[m]n in quatuor magnis volu[m]inibus diuisa.” Although this bible is now identified by the shelf-mark Ms. A.II.1 in Durham Cathedral’s library, the bible is never recorded under an alphabetical shelf-mark in Durham’s medieval inventories. Since such designator-letters were assigned to books to ensure their correct identification on the shelf and in circulation, we may plausibly interpret this absence as a clear sign that this bible was never intended to circulate or even to leave the confines of the Spendement. It was to remain on Permanent Reserve in the cathedral’s strong-room ad infinitum, its record describing an impressive bible of august patronage, but its lack of shelf-mark loudly registering its inaccessibility.

The list records a further seven bibles and part-bibles, differentiated from each other by the letter-marks A, C, d, D, P, R and O:

Biblia Domini Hugonis Episcopi Dunelmensis, in quatuor magnis Voluminibus

---

1923 At Durham, of course, donations and benefactions were commemorated in other books than the library inventories or inscribed within the books themselves; Durham’s Liber Vitae also fulfilled this purpose (amongst others); for its published text see Liber Vitae Ecclesiae Dunelmensis, Ed. J. Raine. Surtees Society 10 (London: J.B. Nichols & Son, 1841); for further details and discussion see essays in The Durham Liber vitae and its context, Ed. David Rollason (Woodbridge, Suffolk, UK; Rochester, NY, USA: D.S. Brewer, 2004) and The Durham Liber vitae: London, British Library, MS Cotton Domitian A.VII: Edition and Digital Facsimile with Introduction, Codicological, Prosopographical and Linguistic Commentary, and Indexes, Eds. David and Lynda Rollason (London: British Library, 2007).
diuisa.

A Una Biblia integra. ij. fo. tement claro. [est vetus liber]

C Una Biblia integra, cum Interpretatione nominum Ebraeorum. ij. fo. recte intel.

Biblie

Oxon

D Una Biblia integra. ij. fo. longius spaciabatur.

Diversi libri Biblie. ij. fo. chanorum domini. [Beryngton]

In libraría


O Biblia versificata, seu liber Petri in Aurora, cum aliis pluribus libris versificatis. ij. fo. Cristianorum cum ferro. Et in eodem libro continentur Nova Poetria Galfridi Anglici qui vocatur Papa Stupor mundi.

The list doubles as an inventory of the respective collections over time, charting their locations at different times on the single document. The only codex recorded as being kept “in libraria” is Bible P, a “Biblia versificata” (d.p.: “Genesis nec vero”), whose location was recorded (and thus kept ‘up to date’) in a note added in the margin to the left of its entry (see Fig. 5.4A). Following this record of the community’s bibles are chronicled its volumes containing glosses on Genesis, such as “Glosa sup[er] Genesim” (entries B and C, d.p.: “fforme” [B] and “gi[n]gnasia” [C]), whilst a later hand has marked the first book, letter-mark A, (d.p.: “Genesis et exodus glo.”) as having been sent to the Durham community in Oxford (“Mittit[ur] Oxon”). Thus, from the inventory’s opening page alone, we may deduce that the storage and use of Durham books (or even Durham bibles and Glosses) in three distinct, distinguishable locations was being diligently recorded at the end of the 14th century: in the Spendement; “in libraria”; and at Durham College, Oxford.

Three years later a second inventory of the Spendement collection was made (DCL, Ms. B.IV.46, fol. 34r; Fig. 5.4B). By comparing this 1395 Spendement inventory with its predecessor, these booklists offer dynamic documentation mapping Durham’s practices of book-use over time:

- Biblia Domini Hugonis Episcopi Dunelmensis, in quatuor magnis voluminibus diuisa.
- A Una biblia integra. ii. fo. tement claro. [est vetus liber]
- C Una biblia integra, cum Interpretatione nominum Ebraeorum. ii. fo. recte intel.

---

Una biblia integra. ii. fo. longius spaciabatur.

D Divarsi libri biblie. ii. fo. chanorum domini. [Beryngton]

P biblia versificata. ii. fo. Genesis nec vero. [Ponitur in Claustro]

R biblia versificata. liber de Miseria Condidionis Humanae. Meditationes Bernardi cum pluribus aliis Libris. ii. fo. arida dividitur.

O biblia versificata, seu Liber Petri in Aurora, cum aliis pluribus Libris versificatis. ii. fo. Cristianorum cum ferro.

B Biblia quondam Roberti Bolton Monachi. ii. fo. tur a Philippo.

An immediately noticeable difference in this inventory compared to its predecessor is its use of rubricated underlining to visually distinguish components of entries on the page. These include the “section” headings (see “Biblie” and below it “Gen[es]is” in the right hand margin) and the books’ “titles” in addition to the rubrication of their opening capitals. The first entry on the list of Bibles is once again the Le Puiset Bible, the wording of its description unaltered, whilst volume P, the “biblia versificata” with the “Genesis nec vero” dicta probatoria is still labeled as being housed “In libraria.”

However, this record reflects changes within the collections over the intervening years. Bible O has also been moved “in Claustro,” and the entry for bible C, “una biblia integ[ra]” containing the IHN, has been annotated (in the left margin) by a later hand as having joined Bible D (still registered as on loan to Br. Beryngton) in “Oxon”, along with those codices chronicled as “Mittit[ur] Oxon” in the 1392 inventory.1925 This chronicling of Bible C’s relocation from Durham to Oxford may be corroborated by cross-referencing the 1395 Spendement inventory with the catalogue of the books of Durham College, Oxford ca. 1390-1400 (“Libri theologie pertinentes collegio monachorum Dunelm’ Oxon’ studencium sunt isti”; now Durham Cathedral Treasury, Ms. 2a 6e Ebor. No. 5),1926 which lists two bibles. The first is entered as the first two entries at the top of the catalogue’s

1925 Thus, from this catalogue alone, we may deduce that, at the end of the 14th century, Durham books were being stored and used in three distinct, distinguishable locations: the Spendement; the “librar[i]” (or, as designated in this inventory, the cloisters); and Durham (now Trinity) College, Oxford.

opening section (“In primis due biblie in duobus voluminibus”, entries 1-2). However the second bible recorded in the catalogue is to be found at the end of the document, entered first of 17 items added to the catalogue in a different hand directly beneath the catalogue’s fifth and final section (‘Libri de diccionibus difficilibus,’ Entries 86-92): “Item una bibli” (entry 93). Given that this additional list of 17 items was almost certainly appended to the original catalogue at a later date – closer to 1400 than to 1390 – in addition to the identification of the second bible’s identification, like Bible C on the 1395 Spendement catalogue, as a single-volume bible (“Una biblia”), I would suggest that Bible 93’s addition to the Durham College, Oxford catalogue at the end of the 14th century confirms that the 1395 Spendement Bible C reached its destination in the South of England safely.

Like the late-14th century catalogue of list of Durham books issued ‘on loan’ to Durham College in Oxford, Durham’s 1395 Spendement inventory also records its own re-usage over time; the dots marking certain entries in the gutter of the left margin note those books as present in the Spendement during the 1417 inventory, almost twenty years after the main list was compiled; the monks conducting the 1417 inventory of the Spendement simply re-used the extant 1395 inventory and marked-up acquisitions to and loans from the collection during that time while registering which bibles remained, unused, in storage (the Le Puiset Bible and Bibles A and D). This practice highlights the interim accession of a bible letter-marked B (“Biblia quondam Rob[ertus] Boston[us] mo[ni]chi”), presumably a bequest made by a community member at some time between the original list’s creation in 1395 and the 1417 inventory, since it was added to the 1395 record at the end of the ‘Bibles’ section by a later hand, but its lack of a ‘registering’ dot marks the bible as absent from the collection by 1417.

1929 Although, alas, the absence of ‘secundo folio’ identifiers for any of the volumes listed in the Durham College, Oxford catalogue precludes a definitive identification.
1930 Two separate sub-sections of this 1395 Spendement catalogue also record: 17 titles to be withdrawn from the cloister collection to be kept in a cupboard by the entrance to the Infirmary for use at lections in the Refectory; and an inventory of those books kept in the ‘novices’ cupboard’, mainly consisting of
A further inventory, also made in 1395, chronicled those books being kept and used in the “Libraria Claustrialis Dunelm”, or in the cloister (now DCL, Ms. B.IV.46, fol. 19r-v; Figs. 5.5A-C). Their location is indicated by the annotations in the left margin, describing these entries as to be found ‘In librarii’:

Libri Bibliae:
A Biblia glo. ij° fo. ostendit significans.
B Biblia integra, non glo. cum interpretacione nominum hebraeorum. ij° fo. discensione.
C Biblia integra, non glo. ij° fo. indocti.
D Biblia integra, non glo: cum interpretacione nominum hebraeorum. ij° fo. sanctior sum.

In librarii
E Biblia, non glo: cum interpretacione nominum hebraeorum. ij° fo. nate racionem.
F Biblia integra, non glo: cum interpretacione nominum hebraeorum. ij° fo. piencia Christus.
G Prima pars bibliæ Willielmi de Carilepho, Dunelmensis Episcopi, cum quodam Tractatu de Accentu in principio Libri. ij° fo. sementem secundum.
H Secunda pars bibliæ ejusdem Willielmi, cum glosa super Librum Apocalipsis usque ad Capitulum viij. ij° fo. recordiam a facie.
J Secunda pars Bibliac. ij° fo. si ergo omni.

This inventory of the ‘libraria Claustrialis Dunelm’ details the books forming the heart of the monks’ ‘working collection’ for study, and were therefore housed accordingly, not in the Spendement, but in diverse locations throughout the cloister, as described in the heading: “Isti libri subscripti inventi fuerunt in communi armariolo Dunelmensi, in diversis locis infra claustrum.” A clear distinction is thus distinguished within the Cathedral Priory’s collections that determined a book’s location by its usage: the cloister/ libraria (for use), and the Spendement (for storage). The organization of entries recorded on this Cloister list also arguably reflects the lesser importance of unglossed bibles within the hierarchization of those books constituting the monks’ working collection. On this list, unlike on the inventories of the Spendement books, bibles are not positioned first, but

grammatical works with a couple of devotional compilations and a copy of the gospels and homilies in French. Lists included in Cat. vet. Dunelm (1838): 80-1, 81-4.


1932 Bibles G, H and I are also registered on the “Libri pro refectorio” (“Libri subscripti jacent in almariolo juxta ixtroitem ad infirmarium, pro lectura in refectorio; et ponuntur sparsim inter alios libros in inventario praecedenti”), their catalogue entries duplicated verbatim from the Cloister list.
rather fourth, ‘Libri Bibliae’ being preceded by ‘Libri Decretorum,’ ‘Libri Decretalium’ and ‘Libri Gramaticae.’

Cross-referenced and considered, the three examples of bible-cataloguing offered in Durham’s 1392/5 Spendement and Cloister inventories paint a revealing picture of contemporary bible-use at Durham. The Spendement is credited with eight bibles in 1392: three “biblia integra” (A, C and d), three “biblia versificata” (P, R and O), one part-bible of “Diversi libri Biblie” (D) and the four-volume Le Puiset Bible. Of this number, only one bible is listed as having been relocated outside of the Spendement room for use (Bible P, “in libraria”). However we see a very different picture on the 1395/1417 Spendement inventory, which still records a collection of three “biblia integra” (A, C and d), three “biblia versificata” (P, R and O) alongside the “Diversi libri Biblie” volume (D) and the Le Puiset Bible, but this number has been supplemented by the addition of a “Biblia” (B). By 1417, only five of this total of nine bibles are now recorded as present in the Spendement (Le Puiset, A, d, R and B). Bible C has joined its brother D in Oxford, Bible P is still “in libraria”, and Bible O has been sent “in Claustro”. This list catalogues nine Cloister bibles: one “biblia glo.” (A), five “biblia integra: non glo” (B, C, D, E and F) – of which four are supplemented “cum Interpretacione Nominum Hebraeorum” (B, D, E and F) - and finally the two-volume bible of William Carileph (G and H) with a further copy of the “secunda pars” of an unspecified bible (J).

However, one Durham bible that was (and remains) distinguished amongst its peers is the Bible marked ‘E’ in the 1395 Cloister inventory (“Biblia, non glo: cum Interpretacione Nominum Hebraeorum. II° fo. nate racionem [In librarii”), which is now DCL, Ms. A.II.3. DCL, Ms. A.II.3 is a pandect bible of northern French origin, most probably copied during the second half of the 13th century (see Fig. 5.6). From its


1934 Although Bible O is not documented on the 1395 Cloister list.

1935 The bible disappeared from Durham under unknown circumstances around the time of the Reformation (although it was not alone in that respect), and only recently returned to its medieval home in Durham. For a detailed study of the text, decoration and provenance of DCL, Ms. A.II.3 see Gameson (2013): 69-84.

1936 Although Richard Gameson previously suggested that the bible was copied either during the second quarter or around the middle of the 13th century (MTDC [2010]: 104), he has since revised his opinion to “a date in the second half of the century; one might more tentatively suggest the 1260s or 70s” (Gameson
entry in Durham’s 1395 Cloister catalogue we may discern two things. From this bible’s inclusion amongst those books kept in the Cloister which represented the community’s ‘working collection’, we may first deduce that this was a bible whose function for the Durham monks at this time was to be used primarily as a study tool. Second, from the language of its entry in the catalogue, we may deduce what it was in this volume that the monks valued in such a bible and thus chose this copy as being particularly well suited to such use: the catalogue identifies this bible by its textual contents, which are described as being textually ‘complete (“integra”), whilst the volume’s inclusion of the extrabiblical IHN (which, in so doing, identifies it as a copy of what is now referred to as a ‘Paris’ Bible) further emphasizes the value of such a supplementary tool for purposes of study. Finally, the bible’s size confirms the purpose to which this copy was particularly well suited. DCL, Ms. A.II.3 is a majestic lectern copy measuring 415 x 265 mm, and would therefore have been far more suitable for use as a communal reference text than any of Durham’s ‘pocket’ bibles, such as DCL, Ms. A.IV.37 (The Auckland Bible), which also contained supplementary study texts, including the IHN, but whose small size made it better suited to private, personal use by individuals.

Indeed, it seems that this bible was copied specially to serve this purpose (as Richard Gameson has recently argued. This bible was acquired specially by the Durham community motivated by the desire to obtain a pandect copy of the new ‘Paris Bible’ in a larger size to serve exactly the kind of function which DCL, Ms. A.II.3 was used; for a specific use (for reference) in a specific location (the Cloister). It is for this function that this bible is distinguished amongst our examples and amongst its fellow Durham bibles of the 13th and 14th centuries. And this bible most certainly was used; it served the reference needs of the community for scores of years, acquiring many

---

1937 See Laura Light’s publications listed in Bibliography.
1938 The monumental size and stature of DCL, Ms. A.II.3 (415 x 265 mm) is emphasized through comparison with Durham’s majestic 12th-century bibles, the Carilef Bible (DCL, Ms. A.II.?), which measures 488 x 310 mm) and the Le Puiset Bible (DCL, Ms. A.II.?), whose largest volume measures 478 x 335 mm.
1939 Christie’s, London (Sale 7088, 16 November 2005, lot 15).
1940 See Gameson (2013).
revisions, re-workings and updates. It represents a unique example of such bible use at Durham: although A.II.3 was listed in the 1395 Cloister collections’ list along with four further identical copies of the Bible with IHN (Bibles B, C, D and F), Bible A.II.3 (E) was distinguished on the list as the only one labeled as in use “in libraria” and was thus the only bible to be transferred to the new library room - as part of the priory community’s working collections - when it was built at the beginning of the 15th century. It is also the only one of its Cloister list fellows extant. The long-term use of DCL, Ms. A.II.3 is thus recorded on the pages of Durham’s inventory lists and remains visible throughout its folios today.

Thus the bible that was known to, and consulted by, the largest number of Durham monks in the 15th and early 16th centuries was this fine, large-format, late 13th-century ‘Paris’ bible (now DCL, Ms. A.II.3), the only copy to have been transferred to the library room. However, the bible that was in front of the daily reader in the refectory was that given by William of Saint Calais (now DCL, Ms. A.II.4), a late 11th-century copy of Norman origin. Moreover, the more intellectual (or proprietorial) monks doubtless possessed bibles which were, to all intents and purposes, their own, such as the small-format 13th-century copy that was gifted to John Auckland, prior of Durham 1484-94 by Richard Bell (prior 1464-78).

Another book of Durham’s medieval collections that bears the marks of having been ‘updated’ to suit a new function is A.I.10, a copy of works by Anselm, Berengandus and Cassiodorus made in the first quarter of the 12th century that was re-indexed in the century before the dissolution to be used as a lectionary, with foliation added throughout and the original contents list on fol.1 indexed with folio numbers and the book’s margins marked-up with liturgical rubrics (Gameson, MTODC [2010]: 67).

Today, Durham Cathedral’s Library contains ten medieval bibles (DCL, Mss. A.II.1-7, A.IV.30, A.IV.37 and C.III.22) seven of which are of the 13th century (Mss. A.II.3, A.II.5-7, A.IV.30, A.IV.37 and C.III.22) but only three of these are pandect bibles (Mss. A.II.3, A.IV.30 and A.II.37), and only two of which are of the smaller format (Mss. A.IV.30 and 37). On Durham’s manuscripts see A. J. Piper. A Descriptive Catalogue of The Libraries of Durham Cathedral (CBMLC, Forthcoming) and Manuscript Treasures of Durham Cathedral, Ed. Richard Gameson (Durham Cathedral & Third Millennium Publishing, 2010).

Gameson argues that “we can be confident of this”, citing The Rites of Durham’s statement that, in addition to private reading in their carrels, the Durham monks had access to the 15th-century library room “at all tymes”; Rites of Durham, Being a Description or Brief Declaration of All the Ancient Monuments, Rites and Customs Belonging or Being within the Monastical Church of Durham before the Suppression, Ed. J.T. Fowler. Surtees Society 107 (1903): 83 (cited in Gameson [2013]: 96 n.70); cf. ibid.: figs. 1-6.

For further discussion of the Carilef Bible’s use in the refectory for daily readings, including a collation of the textual contents of Durham’s Carilef and ‘Paris’ Bibles (DCL, Mss. A.II.4 and A.II.3), see Gameson (2013): 96 & figs. 11-12 and Appendix (100-04).

Prior Bell’s gift to John Auckland is chronicled in an inscription at the front of the bible (now erased, although partly legible under ultra-violet light), which declares: “liber iohannis Aukland monachi Dunelmie ex dono venerabilis in christo patris (? ) ricardi Bell prioris eiusdem loci” (fol. 2v); see Gameson (2013): 95
This bible, which is now DCL, Ms. A.IV.37, also known as ‘The Auckland Bible’ (235 x 147 mm, 376 fols.\textsuperscript{1946}) is a portable bible copied in the first half of the 13\textsuperscript{th} century, most likely around the beginning of the second quarter, extensively and lavishly decorated throughout.\textsuperscript{1947} Both the contents of the volume and their organization indicate that this bible saw long-term use as a tool for private study. Although the text follows most of the conventions of the ‘Paris’ bibles,\textsuperscript{1948} the bible’s script and illumination suggest an English rather than a French provenance,\textsuperscript{1949} a hypothesis further supported by the English calendar which immediately follows the Bible text (at fols. 360v-61r), although liturgical evidence therein suggests that the book is unlikely to have been written specifically for Durham, but rather is more likely to have originated in East Anglia,\textsuperscript{1950} possibly at Barnwell Priory, a house of Augustinian Canons on the outskirts of Cambridge.\textsuperscript{1951} The bible’s late medieval provenance from the Benedictine Priory at

\textsuperscript{1946} The bible’s text is arranged in two columns of 30 lines within a textblock measuring 156 x 46-7 mm; the text is written in black ink in a Gothic bookhand between four verticals and 31 horizontals ruled in metalpoint, with additional verticals in the center and outer margins and a double horizontal in the upper margin above; running headings in letters alternately of red and blue (first line of Genesis similarly lettered).\textsuperscript{1947} The bible’s decoration includes 68 large illuminated initials with staves of burnished gold on divided grounds of pink and blue patterned with white, including a Genesis initial (fol. 5) with scenes of the Creation in colors and gold; 11 large initials with foliage, beasts and beast-heads, all on grounds of burnished gold (on fols. 3, 4v, 112v, 150, 160v, 173v, 178, 300v, 323, 342, 353v); chapter initials (two to four lines) alternately red and blue with flourishing extending into margin, chapter numbers in margins in red and blue.

\textsuperscript{1948} The ordering of the books and prologues, as well as the numbering of chapters in this volume’s biblical text (fols. 3-359v) essentially follows the ‘Paris’ order.

\textsuperscript{1949} The 2005 Christie’s catalogue entry suggests that the bible’s script and illumination “look” more likely to be English than French (Catalogue entry for Christie’s auction [Sale 7088], 16 November 2005, lot 15), in addition to which the English calendar is decorated in a similar style and apparently contemporary with the main text.

\textsuperscript{1950} Although both the feast of St. Cuthbert and the translation of his relics are recorded (20 March, 3 September), they are not in red. However, the feasts of St. Sexburga (6 July) and her sister Etheldreda (23 June) are included in red; both were abbesses at Ely and were especially venerated in East Anglia, and it therefore seems probable that the Calendar at least was written in that diocese.

\textsuperscript{1951} A partly erased inscription in a 13\textsuperscript{th}-century hand at the end of the Apocalypse (which appears to read “Biblia d[omi]ni … barnwell”) suggests that the bible’s early home was likely at Barnwell Priory, which was, at one time, one of the largest religious houses in medieval England. The list of manuscripts from Barnwell which Leland recorded ca. 1536-40 is printed in CBMLC 6 (1998): Cat. A2. For a list of the surviving manuscripts from Barnwell Priory see N.R. Ker, \textit{MLGB} (1964): 7 and Andrew G. Watson, \textit{MLGB}:
Durham is discernible from a 15th-century ownership inscription at the head of fol. 3r ("Liber sancti Cuthberti de Dunelmia") and is further confirmed by a series of inscriptions containing the names of Durham monks including Robert Graystanes and Thomas Launcell (both 14th century), while a partly erased inscription in a 15th-century hand on fol. 2v records the gift of the bible to John Auckland, monk of Durham by the prior Richard Bell ("Liber Johannis Aukland monachi Dunelm ex dono ... Ricardi Bell prioris eiusdem loci").

Furthermore, the bible was equipped with a series of supplementary ‘study texts’ at the end of the book, including capitula lists (fols. 362-72), a concordance to the New Testament (fols. 372-74v) and a vocabulary list (fols. 376v-77). These additions, together with the various annotations which were fill the margins throughout - added consistently from the 13th to the 15th century - show that the volume was certainly well used. The bible’s use for study would have been further assisted by its rotating bookmarker, presumably once fastened to the volume, the disk of which has been pasted onto the bottom margin of fol. 271r.

Perversely, the importance of DCL, Ms. A.II.3 to the contemporary Dunelmian community as a bible in use, highlights the unimportance and lack of use that the community had for the Bible as a single book. DCL, Ms. A.II.3 survives as a record of the Durham community’s internal chronology, reflecting the needs and practices of Biblical usage (or, in Durham’s case, the lack thereof). Since this bible satisfied the community’s reference needs over a period of decades, we must ask both what it meant to the monks to

---


1952 A set of verses added in a mid-14th century hand read “Presul Robertus de graystans; doctor apertus subprior ...”; cf. Middleton deposit LM 5 at Nottingham University Library.

1953 Richard Bell was prior of Durham between 1464 and 1478, and John Auckland was prior between 1484 and 1494; the names of both men occur in several other Durham manuscripts; see N.R. Ker, *MLGB* (1964): ? and Watson, *MLGB: Supplement* (1987): 85.

1954 This additional material was added to the Auckland Bible in two stages: capitula lists were early additions (fols. 362-72), further supplemented at a slightly later date by the addition of a concordance to the New Testament (fols. 372-74v) and a vocabulary list (fols. 376v-77).

choose or to need to update an old book like A.II.3, and how these practices narrate the community’s minimal need for and use of pandect bibles as study tools. The updating of A.II.3 reflects a continuous re-authorizing of this particular bible as the community’s go-to authorized reference pandect bible. DCL, Ms. A.II.3 was never (to our knowledge) supplemented in Durham’s ‘working’ collections by additional pandect bible copies, despite the repository of four potential candidates “in communi armariolo Dunelmensi” (Bibles B, C, D and F). Or perhaps the availability of that quartet of “biblia integra” meant that further copies were not needed “in libraria”?

Ultimately, these documents chronicling Durham’s books and their storage locations, as well as the exceptionalism of DCL, Ms. A.II.3/Cloister Bible E within them, reveals a complicated picture of the need for and use of bibles by the Durham monks. Like most medieval religious communities, the Benedictine monks of Durham certainly seem to have had more day-to-day use for works of Scriptural commentary, individually bound books of the glossed Bible and prayer books than for pandect bibles of whatever size.\footnote{See Gameson (2013): passim. Another book of Durham’s medieval collections that bears the marks of having been ‘updated’ to suit a new function is DCL, Ms. A.I.10, a copy of works by Anselm, Berengandus and Cassiodorus made in the first quarter of the 12th century that was re-indexed in the century before the dissolution to be used as a lectionary, with foliation added throughout and the original contents list on fol.1 indexed with folio numbers and the book’s margins marked-up with liturgical rubrics (MTODC [2010]: 67).} However, the late 15th-century catalogue of the library at St. Augustine’s, Canterbury narrates a very different kind of bible-use by a contemporary religious community.

II St. Augustine’s Abbey, Canterbury

Like those of Durham Cathedral Priory, the contents and use of the medieval book collections of St. Augustine’s Abbey are unusually well documented. In addition to the list of the Abbey’s books preserved in the late 12th to early 13th century Martyrology of St. Augustine’s,\footnote{British Library, Ms. Cotton Vitellius C.XII, fols. 114-156 (CBMLC 13 [2008]: Cat. BA2).} the contents of the medieval library of St. Augustine’s and the life of its collections are witnessed in a number of other surviving medieval book lists, catalogues and inventories, including the list of books noted in the Chronicles of Thomas Sprot and...
William Thorne in the early and late 14th century, as well as a list of books borrowed by a monk in the late-14th century, and the record of books noted in the *Speculum Augustinianum* of Thomas Elmham, 1414. Together, these resources offer rich insights – from multiple perspectives - into the intellectual life of the monks of St. Augustine’s in the later Middle Ages.

In particular, the Abbey’s surviving 15th-century catalogue, now Trinity College Dublin, Ms. 360, provides an invaluable resource for studying the monks’ practices of book-use and book storage. The St. Augustine’s catalogue was first compiled ca. 1375-1420 but survives only in a later copy transcribed at the end of the 15th century, not before 1491. The catalogue stands out in the history of medieval library documentation for its outstandingly detailed descriptions not only of the books themselves, but of their location and use. The volume, a small folio book of paper written mainly by two scribes, consists of three interrelated lists: the Register of the community’s books and records of their current locations, e.g. on loan, in the ‘library’, in the vestry and so on (fols. 1r-12v); the original alphabetical Index of the collections’ contents (fols. 13r-27v), and the main catalogue (fols. 27r-96). The material separation within the St. Augustine’s catalogue of books, their locations and the tool facilitating their retrieval represents a very different attitude to the formal management materials compared to the

---

1959 CUL, Ms. FF.4.40, fol. 172v (CBMLC 13 [2008]: Cat. BA4)
1960 Trinity Hall, Cambridge, Ms. 1 (CBMLC 13 [2008]: Cat. BA5).
I follow the numbering of the books within the catalogue utilized in both the James and Barker-Benfield editions; for clarity and brevity of reference, I shall refer to entries in the catalogue using the formula “Cat. no. X” and entries in the Locations Register as “Reg. no. X”.
system that guided the written form of Durham’s book-inventories, in which books’ loans – together with notes of the location of some - are registered beside their respective entries on the same catalogue page.

Together, through their recording the contents, storage locations and users of the library of St. Augustine’s in the late 15th-century, the Register, Index and catalogue testify to a library whose range of holdings was clearly remarkably wide, extending considerably beyond unsurprisingly substantial holdings in patristic, theological and devotional works to encompass science, medicine, philosophy, classical literature, and history. The catalogue also records the assemblage and use of one of medieval England’s oldest and largest libraries: the list records in excess of 1,800 books, of which nearly 300 can now be securely identified as surviving. By late medieval standards, this is a very high total, although it is still less than half of Durham’s extant manuscript total (indeed the total number of dispersed books from St. Augustine’s is still less than the number of Durham’s books that survive in situ). In its panoramic survey of the bibliographic landscape of St. Augustine’s extensive collections, the catalogue permits an unusually thorough insight into the intellectual life of a distinguished medieval religious community.

Following the same organizational schema that ordered Durham’s inventories, the St. Augustine’s catalogue organizes its books alphabetically within the Cassiodorian hierarchy. Books of “Biblical Studies” comprise the first 309 items of the total collection, (entries 1-309) internally subdivided as follows: bibles (1-44); Peter Comestor and works of biblical scholarship (45-70); psalters, mostly glossed (71-94); individual books of The

1965 The BA1 catalogue orders and sub-divides the collections into: Biblical Studies (entries 1-309); Theology (310-634); Sacramental, Homiletic and Devotional Works (638-810.5); Moral Theology, Natural and Moral Philosophy, Miscellaneous (811-876.5); Prognostics and Prophecies (877-879.2); History (880-938.2); Latin Prose Writing (939-1023); Aristotle and commentators (1024-1104); Trivium and Quadrivium Subjects, etc. (1103-1174); Medicine (1175-1278.1); Logic (1279-1336); Grammar and Latin Poetry (1337-1484); Miscellaneous [including Vernacular Texts, Hagiography and Alchemy] (1485-1547); Collectiones (1550-1613A); Misc. Additions (1614-16); Law [Canon and Civil] (1617-1841).


1967 It seems entirely fitting that the catalogue manuscript should later have passed into the hands of a 16th-century private collector of comparable intellectual vision and bibliophilic passion, John Dee. Following the manuscript’s departure from Canterbury at an unknown date during the 16th century, Dee is the only person that we know possessed the volume until it was given to Trinity College in Dublin, by Archbishop Ussher. In the catalogue of Dee’s manuscripts, the St. Augustine’s catalogue is described as “Matricula siue catalogus bibliothecae Cantuariensis, papyro folio.” See Diary of Dr. John Dee, Ed. J.O. Haliwell. Camden Society (1842): 65 ff., cited in M.R. James, Ancient Libraries (1903): lvii.
Bible, mostly glossed copies (95-225); biblical scholarship, by category (226-98), including *Postillae, Notulae, Tractatus, Allegoriae, Concordances, Expositiones*, etc.; and works on biblical names and vocabulary (299-309). The majority of the 44 “bible” entries are discernable as complete Latin bibles, totaling 38 bibles in 41 volumes, consisting of 35 single-volume copies and 3 two-volume bibles, of which 8 [+2?] survive, all of which are early to late 13th-century copies.1968 This total number of bibles, together with the great quantity of books listed in the collection, is extraordinary for one single institution, albeit a flagship location.

The Register and catalogue portray a collection in use, and show the privileged place accorded to complete Latin bibles within a community that demonstrably required and valued bibles and that had multiple distinctive uses for them in various locations. The catalogue was organized to function as a searchable finding-list of St. Augustine’s collections; indeed, in its use of alphabetization as an organizational principle in the indexing books’ location, the St. Augustine’s catalogues is one of the most sophisticated and detailed systems of organizing and indexing collections produced in the period.1969 The bibles listed in the catalogue are not only differentiated from their companions by descriptive features, but also (as in the case of the Durham inventories) by their *dicta probatoria* identificatory textual marker.1970 They are also physically locatable within the physical space of the Library Room by an alphabetized/numerical system of press and

---

1968 Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, Ms. 49 (Cat. no. 9), BL Burney Ms. 3 (no. 10), All Souls College, Oxford, Ms. 1 (no. 12), Pierpont Morgan Library, NY, Ms. G.18 (no. 14), Canterbury Cathedral Library, Ms. Lit. B.6(4) (no. 17), Gonville & Caius College, Cambridge Ms. 361/442 (no. 25), Pierpont Morgan Library, NY, Ms. M.970 (no. 29) and BL Burney MS. 11 (no. 44), in addition to two uncertain identifications: BL, Royal Ms. I A.VII (no. 31?) and Bristol, Parish Church of St. Thomas the Martyr, S.N.: Bristol Record Office P/St. T/PB/1 (no. 32?) (CBMLC 13 [2008]: 372).


1970 Such a marker permitted the exact identification of a particular book, extremely useful for a librarian requiring an exact book-identifier for the purposes of loaning books out. In addition to the use of markers such as *dicta probatoria* as of the early-med 14th-century, the more accurately to identify a particular volume’s contents, catalogues of this period began to record more systematically the names of donors: those in charge of chronicling collections were demonstrably more concerned with recording not only how many books their institutions possessed, but what they contained, how they had been obtained, and how one was to retrieve a particular book as swiftly and as accurately as possible. This device is first used at the university of Paris towards the end of the 13th-century (on this see M.A. & R.H. Rouse. *Authentic Witnesses: Approaches to Medieval Texts and Manuscripts* (Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1991), chapter 9). The first English catalogue to use *dicta probatoria* was that of Merton College, Oxford (c.1318-34 and again in 1349), whilst the first recorded use in a Cambridge college library was in that of Corpus Christi College, in its very wordy booklist of 1376.
shelf-marks that accompany each bible’s ‘title’ in ‘Distinctio’/‘Gradus’ (press/shelf) format.1971

Within the Register catalogue, short-title entries are formulated by itemizing text(s), the donor’s name (in the genitive), the volume’s *dicta probatoria* and finally the “D[istinctio]”/“G[radus]” shelf-mark formula.1972 Bibles listed in the catalogue are almost all identified by the name of the donor from whom the abbey acquired the book, who was sometimes also the bible’s previous owner (e.g. “Biblia Ricardi sholdon” [no. 14] and “Biblia Ricardi Westegate” [no. 16]), occasionally supplemented by a record of that donor’s position in the community (e.g. “Biblia thome *Novicy*” [no. 18]) or providing supplementary details concerning the bible’s earlier provenance (e.g. “Biblia Roberti louente *quam redemit dominus Johannes Louell’ Rector ecclesie Sancti Georgij in Cantuaria.*” [no. 40])1973

The community’s practice of recording a bible’s provenance and details of its donation are foregrounded in the records chronicling the community’s 14th-15th-century ownership of its most treasured bible - the two-volume “Biblia Gregoriana” – in three catalogues. Its earliest documentation is as the first two entries in the catalogue as “Prima pars biblie sancti Gregorii. 2o. fo in prohemio in doctrina” (Cat. no. 1) and “Secunda pars Sancti Gregorij 2o. fo. non feram.” (Cat. no. 2) The bible is recorded in the Locations Register as stored in the abbey vestry (“Vest’”), where its continued presence was proudly chronicled on two further occasions after that date.

The ‘Gregoriana’ Bible features in prized position amongst the books noted in the early-14th century Chronicles of Thomas Sprot and William Thorne,1974 in which the two volumes are jointly entered as a single record, “Bibliam Sancti Gregorii”, listed first amongst Pope Gregory I’s donations to the abbey. The fact that the bible occupies only a single entry in these Chronicles (no. 1) rather than as two (as in the 15th-century catalogue; Cat. nos. 1-2) indicates Sprot and Thorne’s Chronicles privileging of the

---

1971 From BA1.1 to 39; from BA1.40 onwards the cataloguer enters the “D’ Ga” formula for recording these bibliographic markers, but fail to identify their letters and numbers: *St Augustine’s Abbey, Canterbury*, Ed. B. C. Barker-Benfield (CBML, 2008): lxxviii-cii, esp. cii.
1973 My italics. BA1. 5-38, 40-44 (+1-22).
bible’s patron over its material features as two objects. This list was compiled to chronicle the benefaction of an august donor, and so provenance takes precedence over codicological characteristics; it is recorded as a single ‘item’ as “Pope Gregory’s Bible; Being the Bible That Gregory Donated To Our House” rather than as “A Bible In Two Volumes [From Gregory’s Donation].” The bible is similarly elevated amongst the books listed in Thomas Elmham’s 1414 *Speculum Augustinianum*,¹⁹⁷⁵ positioned at the opening of the community’s book donations, although this chronicler does not privilege the bible’s provenance over its materiality and appearance in his description; rather Elmham’s record of the “Biblia Gregoriana” uniquely combines textual and codicological taxonomizings of these codices’ contents as Scriptural texts whilst celebrating their privileged status as venerated sacred relic. The terms of Elmham’s bible-biography are as noteworthy as the books he describes:

In primis habetur in librario biblia gregoriana in duobus uolumnibus, quorum primum habet rubricam in primo folio, de capitulis libri genesis. Secundum uolumen incipit a prologo beati Jeronimi super ysiaam prophetam. In principio uero librorum in eisdem uolumnibus inseruntur quedam folia quorum aliqua purpurei aliqua rosei sunt coloris, que contra lucem extensa mirabilem reflexionem ostendunt. (BA5 nos. 1-2)¹⁹⁷⁶

What is immediately striking about this description is the sensuality of its language. Elmham classifies the two books by their location (“in librario”), their provenance (“gregoriana”) and by their material form (“in duobus uolumnibus”). He also notes their textual contents, recording the copy’s textual division of The Bible imposed by its material division into two volumes (the second starting with Jerome’s prologue to Isaiah). However it is Elmham’s descriptions of the volumes’ decoration and material composition that are particularly noteworthy, both in the language used to record them and in their itemization as distinguishing bibliographic features. Elmham notes not only the presence of color in both volumes – the rubricated capital letters at the beginning of Genesis, (“duobus uolumnibus, quorum primum habet rubricam in primo folio, de capitulis libri genesis”) and the purple leaves introducing the second volume (“In principio uero librorum quedam folia quorum aliqua purpurei aliqua rosei sunt coloris”) – but, memorably, the translucent texture of that parchment (“que contra lucem extensa

¹⁹⁷⁵ Printed in CBMLC 13 (2008): Cat. BA5
mirabilem reflexionem ostendunt”). This record thus chronicles a bible accorded particular significance by both its recorder and its community not only for the completeness of its preservation of the Scriptures, but also for its immense aesthetic value as a luxuriously-beautiful and delicate bible. It is recorded and respected as venerated Holy Text and treasured as luminous, illuminating sacred relic.

A characteristic of the ‘Biblia Gregoriana’ not recorded is its size. It would have been large, similar to other celebrated great two-volume ‘Romanesque’ bibles of the 12th century, such as the Bury or Dover Bibles, of the proportions later categorized as belonging to “lectern bibles”. However, volumes’ size is only quantified in these catalogues as a descriptive tool for identifying the book(s) in relation to its’ fellow volumes on the list – as a method of negative definition. The entries in St. Augustine’s 15th-century catalogue for the two bibles of Geoffrey of Langley emphasize this. Geoffrey’s bibles are classified simply by their size as “Biblia Galfredi de langle maior” (Cat. no. 8) and “Biblia Galfredi de langle minor” (Cat. no. 9). However, here the use of the terms “maior” and “minor” are used not as designation of book size, but as comparative terms used to distinguish each of the pair from the other; thus the description of Bible no. 9 as a “Biblia… minor” does not mean that the book is itself a ‘small’ one, but rather simply that it is simply smaller than its companion, Bible no. 8, the “maior” (‘bigger’) bible. This smaller bible is now Corpus Christi College, Cambridge Ms. 49, a bible of high quality, and, measuring 336-41 x 220-32 mm, by no means diminutive in stature; it is in fact the largest of St. Augustine’s surviving bibles. This being so, Geoffrey’s “maior” bible (no. 8) must have been gigantic, and, if a complete pandect bible, as indicated by the catalogue, extremely heavy. Another bible distinguished by its physical size in the same catalogue is the 36th item on the list, “Bibla parua thome Abbatis” (no. 36) and once again, the bible’s identification as “parua” implies not that is not that this is “A Small Bible That Once Belonged To Abbot Thomas,” but rather that, as with Geoffrey of Langley’s

1977 Discussed further below. Both bibles are now in the Parker Library at Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, shelfmarks CCCM Ms. 2-1-III (The Bury Bible) and CCCM Ms. 3-4 (The Dover Bible); see their respective entries in M.R. James, (1912): I, 3-10.

1978 For discussion of CCCM Ms. 49 see below (and Fig. 5.9); cf. discussion of the bible’s Canterbury provenance in M.R. James, (1912): I, 98 and CBMLC 13 (2008): I, 374-5.

1979 The other bible specifically described in the catalogue as of small size (“parua”) is no. 12 (“Biblia parua cum A / 2° fo. in texta filias / D. I. G. 1”) although no donor is recorded.
bibles, this was “Abbot Thomas’ Small Bible,” implying that the abbot also owned a larger copy, although it is not listed in this catalogue.\textsuperscript{1980}

Thomas Elmham’s enumeration of the Scriptural texts contained in each of the Biblia Gregoriana’s two volumes (BA5 nos. 1-2) was not unparalleled amongst late medieval cataloguing practices, but it is unusual in comparison to the treatment of complete Latin bibles in St. Augustine’s 15\textsuperscript{th}-century catalogue. One bible that is distinguished by its provenance but also by its textual contents is the “Biblia Nicholai Abbatis correcta parisius” (Cat. no. 7), which is the copy given by Nicholas Thorne, abbot of St. Augustine’s 1273-83.\textsuperscript{1981} Abbot Nicholas’ bible is distinguished not by its material form but by the version of Scriptural text it contained, which is highlighted as having been, like Durham’s A.II.3 bible, “corrected” according to contemporary Parisian conventions. The descriptive language employed in this bible’s entry on the catalogue thus implies a textual updating and a material reformatting of this bible, its existing Scriptural ordering and paratext “corrected” through ‘editorial’ annotation, addition and rewriting to reflect contemporary Parisian standardizations of The Scriptural Canon.\textsuperscript{1982} This record thus offers insight into the intellectual life of St. Augustine’s, providing evidence of a community in which readers were conscious of current contemporary opinion regarding which texts The Bible should contain, and their organization. It also reveals a community of readers who demonstrate a need for the ‘latest official version’ of The Bible. The language in which [BA1] no. 7 was described was phrased to ensure its locatability and thus shows that this was a bible that was expected to be needed, and by extension, was expected to be used.

A similar kind of contemporary ‘text-awareness’ is visible in the record of the bible given by Prior William of Wilmington (Cat. no. 20), which is revealing in its itemizing of a wealth of extrabiblical texts supplementing the main Bible text.\textsuperscript{1983} William’s “Biblia” is described as being supplemented (“et in eadem”) with over eight extrabiblical texts,\textsuperscript{1984} On the elusive Abbot Thomas, see CBMLC 13 (2008): III, Appendix 6 (1863-70) and A.B. Emden (1968): 3-4.


\textsuperscript{1982} See Light (2011A): 228-246.

including works by Augustine, Bernard, Anselm and Innocent. Thus not only does this record narrate how one monk was reading The Bible, but through its identification of which texts were materially situated alongside the biblical text in a pandect bible, also provides a revealing indication of how the catalogue was used. The recording of these extrabiblical texts within Prior William’s bible demonstrates that these were texts that the monks of St. Augustine's needed access to, and thus their availability is identified and their location indexed.

Another entry towards the end of the catalogue lists a volume whose contents are described as “Summa Raymundi. non hic. quia in biblia Willelmi Wylmyngton” (Cat. no. 1780); such a cross-reference, spanning nearly the whole length of the catalogue, provides insight into the cataloguer’s methods, the unity of the original catalogue and the chronology of its transcription.

The revisions, re-workings and updates to Abbot Thorne’s “correcta parisius” bible along with the cataloguer’s act of listing the interpretational texts supplementing Prior William’s Bible text embody a bibliographic reuse reflecting the monks’ investment in staying up to speed with contemporary theological practices of organizing knowledge and conceptualizing the Scriptures. This enthusiasm for the right reading of The Scriptures is also manifested in St. Augustine’s community-wide use of their bibles. In addition to recording evidence of a desire for using these bibles for private reading, the

1984 Namely Augustine’s “De spiritu et anima” and “De disciplina Christina”, “Meditaciones” by both Bernard and Anselm and Innocent's “De miseria condicionis humane”, in addition to two “Summa” texts - one attributed to “Reymundi” and the other described as “viciorum abbreuiata” - plus a text simply described as “Magister sententiarium”, presumably referring to Peter Lombard’s Sentences.

1985 However, whilst the contents and the organizational systems of both institutional catalogue and Locations- Register seem engineered to expedite readers’ access to St. Augustine’s bibles, consultation of the catalogue’s original index would not have provided great assistance to monks hoping to locate a particular bible. Whilst the index systematically catalogued scholarly texts and their authors, the only directive offered to bible-seekers is to point them towards the ‘Bibles section’ on the catalogue’s first folio: “Biblie fo primo A.” (BA1.223) However, this lack of discrimination ought not be interpreted as a communal lack of interest in or use for these books at St. Augustine’s. The institution acquired multiple bible copies through donation and bequest, but this duplication of texts already at St. Augustine’s does not seem to have been viewed as it was at certain other institutions, as an undesirable over-inundation of unneeded, and unwanted duplicate books (a problem whose reality is visible in Henry V’s stipulation that the newly-founded houses at Syon and Sheen should not receive from his bequest any volumes that duplicated existing holdings).

The index’s paucity of details relating to individual bible copies is also symptomatic of its function as a finding-list; like the Registrum Anglie de libris doctorum et auctorum veterum or its progeny, Henry of Kirkstede’s Catalogus…, St. Augustine’s Index is a reference tool and a bibliography privileging scholars’ needs for texts and for the works of Authors. On such a list, bibles were entered as subjects, as ‘titles’ and as material objects. See CBMLC 13 (2008): 194 and CBMLC 9 [Syon Abbey with the Libraries of the Carthusians, Ed. Vincent Gillespie] (2002); xl.

catalogue also specifically records certain bibles as intended for communal use: the third and fourth items of the catalogue’s “Bibles” section are recorded as “Prima” and “Secunda pars biblie mensalis magne” (Cat. nos. 3-4), designating the two volumes of a large format bible probably for public use for mealtime readings.1987 This use is made still more likely by the two-volume bible’s marked assignation to the cloister (“Claust’”) in the Locations-Register.1988

A study of St. Augustine’s Locations-Register (Trinity College, Dublin, Ms. 360, fols. 1r-12v) reveals that the community’s complete Latin bibles were demonstrably books in demand. The first page of the Locations Register shows the formal organization by which the books’ locations were recorded - in table form - each page subdivided by grid, ruled for six columns,1989 with 36 numbered lines itemizing one catalogue entry per line. The bibles’ locations are recorded in the table’s first two columns (col. 1: Bibles 1-36 and col. 2: 1-8 Bibles 37-44). What does this Locations Register tell us about the location of the community’s stores of Latin pandect bibles at that time? In particular, what {does the Register reveal} / {can we learn from the Register} concerning the community’s practices of bible-storage, the identity of those who had borrowed bibles and the availability and accessibility of bibles with regards to the proportion of bibles – out of the total number bibles ‘on site’ - that could not be borrowed (either ‘in storage’ or kept in fixed locations for communal reference purposes) compared to the number of bibles – of the total - that could be borrowed and that were recorded as ‘out’/issued on personal loan?

The St. Augustine’s catalogue allows us to identify monkish use of complete Latin bibles as opposed to institutional bible-storage. Thus we see that of the 44 complete Latin bibles recorded in the catalogue, 21 are not on loan; of these, only nine copies - previously eleven - are recorded as available for consultation in three different assigned ‘fixed locations’; two are marked as located in the vestry (“Vest”: nos. 1, 2), five are in the cloister (“Claust’ “/ “C”: nos. 3, 4, 5, 6, 8), and two are in the libraria room.


1988 Barker-Benfield has suggested that this bible’s Cloister-location may be explained by the positioning of the Refectory’s entrance on the north-west corner of St. Augustine’s Great Cloister (CBMLC 13 [2008]: ?)

1989 Cols. 1-6 referring to the first six folios of the catalogue, now TCD Ms. 360, fols. 27-32.
("librar"ia"/"libra": nos. 17, 20), and twelve are missing; one is lost ("p[er]di{t}[ur]": no. 10), two are missing but not yet officially 'lost' (nos. 31-32: the notes recording their earlier assignation to the libraeria room ["librar"ia"/"libra"] having been erased but lacking 'updated' details of the locations to which they were subsequently re-assigned) and no location is recorded for nine (entries are blank for nos. 13, 16, 18, 19, 21, 38, 39, 40 and 42).

However the Locations-Register also records 23 of the catalogues’s 44 ‘complete’ pandect Latin bibles as issued on personal loan to 21 named borrowers:


The list records that of these twenty-one borrowers of pandect bibles, eleven monks borrowed only that single bible1990, while the other twelve bible-borrowers were repeat borrowers of other books as well,1991 and two of whom borrowed more than one bible: personal loans of two bibles apiece are recorded to both the Lord Abbot and Clement Canterbury.1992 This total of twenty-three copies loaned to twenty-one borrowers for

1990 For discussion of individuals who donated books to St. Augustine’s, Canterbury and their donations see A.B. Emden, Donors of Books to St. Augustine’s Abbey, Canterbury (Oxford: Bodleian Library; Oxford Bibliographical Society, 1968); cf. list of donors in M.R. James, Ancient Libraries (1903): 538-42.
1991 The other 12 borrowers were repeat borrowers: The Lord Abbot (3+1 lost); William Mongeham (1+1 returned); John Dygon I (11+5 returned); Prior William Shrewsbury (6); Matthew Bury (1); Clement Canterbury (23+1); William Westgate (2); Robert Winchelsea (6+1 returned?); Walter Yonge (2); Thomas Hampton (7); H. Burton: 4+2 returned; Patrick Grey (2); [The Duke of Gloucester, 1 lost]. (CBMLC 13 [2008]: I, 69 Table 7: “Borrowers of single bibles only” & 109-165 passim).
individual consultation, compared to only nine copies being available for communal consultation and reference testifies to the privileged value that the monks of St. Augustine’s attributed to reading the Bible privately, but more significantly, it demonstrates their valuing of the Bible as a single book, surely in no small part because such a copy of The Scriptures is eminently suitable for this kind of reading practice. Furthermore, when one factors in the twelve bibles whose whereabouts were unknown, or whose locations could not be discerned, the Register demonstrates the mobility – and thus use - of the vast majority of these bibles within the community (35 of total 44 on loan or missing, either borrowed and not returned or lost in transit whilst being re-assigned new locations or ‘de-accessioned’ from the reference to borrowing collections). What is clear is that the Register narrates an intimate linking of bible form with bible use within the late medieval St. Augustine’s community.

Furthermore, the catalogue reveals that the St. Augustine’s monks’ access to complete Latin bibles – for which the catalogue indicates a demonstrable need for copies to use - was not restricted to individual use through personal loans, but rather reveals that copies were made available for general access to the whole community. The Locations-Register within St. Augustine’s 15th-century catalogue provides further evidence of monks’ working needs for study-copy bibles in its [the Register’s] chronicling of three further complete Latin bibles having been assigned to the Cloister, including the two-volume bible of Philip of Westgate (Cat. nos. 5-6) and the larger of Geoffrey of Langley’s two bibles, (Cat. no. 8) both reminiscent of Durham’s Ms. A.II.3 bible and both works entirely credible as having been designated for use as study tools.1993 Similarly, the bibles that the St. Augustine’s Register locates in the “libraria/ [-libra?]” are the abbey’s two bibles whose Scriptural text is catalogued as having been supplemented by extrabiblical works, i.e. those of Thomas of Bransester, with its added “Tractatus moralis super genesim” (Cat. no. 17) and Prior William of Wilmington’s

1993 See also the second bible in Reading Abbey’s 1192 catalogue for an instance of a three-volume bible at Reading Abbey chronicled as stored “In claustro” but as having been relocated “In communi loco dormitorii semper parati pro lectore mense in Refectorio per totum Annum” as part of their 14th-century catalogue of books located in the monks’ Dormitory (CBMLC 4 [1996]: Cats. B71 & B74).
interpretational Swiss Army knife-bible (Cat. no. 20). From their descriptions, both volumes seem well-suited to scholarly use in the community’s “working” collection.

This demand for such pandect bibles at St. Augustine’s also corresponds with a provision of the abbey’s 14th-century Customary that the younger monks (“fratres juniores”) should study Holy Scripture for the whole year (“tocius anni”), with special emphasis on the epistles and gospels (“epistolas et evangelia”). However, if the identification of bible-borrowers on the Locations-Register makes visible the younger monks’ diligent scholarship (or at least its appearance, for after all, then as today, the borrowing of a book is no sure guarantee of its consultation) in their recorded borrowing of these bibles, so too does it record the book-borrowing habits of senior members of the St. Augustine’s community, including the Abbot (Cat. no. 7) and the prior (Cat. no. 25). This broad demand for complete Latin bibles across the community’s hierarchy required and ensured a uniquely plentiful supply of at least 38 such bibles, with the result that the community had ample resources to distribute a bible to every monk who needed one. The catalogue descriptions of the bibles given by Richard of Sholdon and William Hileghe (Cat. nos. 14 and 31) demonstrate observation of the Customary’s stipulation in the tables of liturgical readings appended to each respective codex. A single pandect copy of the Bible seems to have satisfied all the Scriptural needs of these readers, for whom the reading of the Bible was a one-book activity, at least some of the time. Ultimately, proof of these bibles’ popularity for monks’ private use could have been most definitively obtained from an inspection of the first two shelves (“G.1-2”) of the first book case (“D.I”) in the Library Room, whose contents would presumably have been conspicuous by their absence.

This valuing of pandect bibles amongst the medieval monks of St. Augustine’s abbey continued in their consistent use after the community’s dissolution, as reflected in their number whose whereabouts can be identified today. The locations of eight of the

forty-four St. Augustine’s bibles recorded in the abbey’s 15th-century catalogue are currently known: six have remained in the United Kingdom - two are now in Cambridge college libraries, at Corpus Christi College (Ms. 49 / no. 9) and at Gonville & Caius (Ms. 361/442 / no. 25), and a third is in Oxford, at All Souls College (Ms. 1 / no. 12); two further bibles are in London, both in The British Library (Burney Mss. 3 and 11 / nos. 10 and 44) while one remains in Canterbury, in the Cathedral Library (Ms. Lit. B.6[4] / no. 17) - and two have crossed the Atlantic to the U.S., both now in the Pierpont Morgan Library, New York (Mss. G.18 and M.970 / nos. 14 and 29).

With the sole exception of Geoffrey of Langley’s “Biblia minor” (which is, ironically enough, a ‘lectern’ bible),1997 all these bibles are portable size copies: five are of ‘saddle-bag’ size1998 and two are pocket size.1999 It is worth briefly considering the two bibles from St. Augustine’s now in the British Library (Mss. Burney 3 and 11: nos. 10 and 44) as their pages provide illuminating examples of the kind of bible-use that I have sought to demonstrate.

The bible entered in the St. Augustine’s 15th-century catalogue as “Biblia robberti abbatis” (Cat. no. 10) is now British Library, Ms. Burney 3 (273 x 205 mm, 517 fols.).2000 It belonged to Robert of Battle, Abbot of St. Augustine’s 1225–53,2001 and was most likely copied between 1240 and 1253 (no earlier than 1230 and probably after 1240).2002 Its text is arranged in two columns of 40 lines within a written space measuring 170 x 117 mm. For a bibliographical description of BL, Ms. Burney 3 see its entry in the British Library’s online Catalogue of Illuminated Manuscripts here.

1997 Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, Ms. 49 (no. 9: “Biblia Galfredi de langle minor”), measuring 345 x 225 mm (444 fols.).
1999 Gonville & Caius College, Cambridge, Ms. 361/442 (no. 25: “Biblia Henrici de Cokeryng”) measures 197 x 140 mm (543 fols.) and BL, Ms. Burney 11 (no. 44: “Biblia Clementis Cantuari”) measures 130 x 90 mm (528 fols.)
2000 Its text is arranged in two columns of 40 lines within a written space measuring 170 x 117 mm. For a bibliographical description of BL, Ms. Burney 3 see its entry in the British Library’s online Catalogue of Illuminated Manuscripts here.
2001 The bible is entered in the Locations Register as “lost” (Reg. no. 10), and is the first of two entries in the catalogue commemorating books Robert donated to the community; the second of the two books donated by Robert included in the St. Augustine’s 15th-century catalogue is Cat. no. 1745 (“Casus bernardi super decretales Roberti Abbatis. 2° fo. ditibus prouideri”), also evidently new at the time when Robert acquired the book (CBMLC 13 [2008]: II, 64, 67). See CBMLC 13 (2008): II, 1577. For discussion of Abbot Robert as donor see A.B. Emden, Donors of Books to S. Augustine’s Abbey Canterbury, Oxford Bibliographical Society, Occasional Publications, 4 (Oxford: Bodleian Library, 1968): 3; cf. N.R. Ker, MLGB (1964): 243.
2002 The bible can be dated to ca. 1230 onwards by the fact that the first line of text at the top of each page
the South-East of England, perhaps at Canterbury, but almost certainly directly for Abbot Robert himself2004 as witnessed in the incorporation of his name into the historiated ‘F’ initial at the beginning of Ambrose’s Prologue (“Frater Ambrosi[us] in munus...”, fol. 2r; Figs. 5.7A-B) and in a panel below a peacock in the lower-bar border (“Abbe: bollo / Robe Augi”’ (Fig. 5.7C). Abbot Robert’s ownership is also inscribed at both the front of the book (“Biblia Roberti Abbatis de librario sancti August[ini Cant’]”, fol. 2r (Fig. 5.7B) and at the rear of the volume (“bono robe. Abb.”, fol. 506v). The same folios of Robert’s bible (fols. 2r – see Fig. 5.7D - and 506v) also shows examples of the cataloguing inscriptions added by Clement of Canterbury (d. after 1495),2005 St. Augustine’s de facto librarian at that time, in his official position as precentor (a position which encompassed the role of librarian)2006 added with the intention of ‘authenticating’ St. Augustine’s institutional ex libris.2007

is copied below the top line, a scribal practice only witnessed as of ca. 1230; see N.R. Ker, “From ‘Above Top Line’ to ‘Below Top Line’: A Change in Scribal Practice,” Celteca 5 (1960): 13-16 (cf. Ker’s comments on BL, Ms. Royal 1.B.XII/The Bible of William of Salisbury, copied 1254 [16]). Furthermore, the large decorative extensions in the bible’s lower margins are of a type which are found in English manuscripts from about the 1230s; it is upon this basis that Nigel Morgan dates the manuscript to between 1230 and 1240: “A date in the 1230s would seem...likely in view of the stylistic and ornamental connections.” (N. Morgan, Survey IV.1 [1982]: no. 63 [109-110] & Ills. 219-222).

The bible may be dated to after ca. 1240 based on the fact that its chapters start on new lines with the chapter numbers inset into the text area, a feature only witnessed commonly in English Bibles after about this time.

Some scholars have argued for the bible’s production at Canterbury (see Eric G. Millar, English Illuminated Manuscripts from the Xth to the XIIIth Century [Paris: Van Oest, 1926]: pl. 76), although the attribution is far from certain. Nevertheless, it is widely agreed that the book was produced in the South-East of England (see N. Morgan, Survey IV.1 [1982]: 110).


This “Biblia Roberti Abbatis...” provenance formula is repeated verbatim on the facing page (fol. 1v) - ending “Cantuarie” but without the initials – written in blacker ink and in a more formal style (although still probably by Clement). The first three words of this ownership inscription appear again below (on fol. 1r) and at fol. iv (15th century?). However, Barker-Benfield argues that these inscriptions may be interpreted as indicators of the bible’s safe recovery and return to St. Augustine’s, since this bible’s first owner following
Clement’s own portable bible is the second of the two bibles from the medieval library of St. Augustine’s now in The British Library; Burney Ms. 11 (130 x 90 mm, 528 fols.). The various ways in which the bible witnesses Clement’s ownership are particularly noteworthy for our purposes. Thus we find inscribed “Biblia .D. Cleme[n]tis Cantyrbury de libra-/rio s[an]c[t]i Augustini ext[ra] muros C[iu]t[asi] Cant[yrbury]” at the foot of fol. 54r with the initials “.C. .C.” in ornate penwork capitals below (Fig. 5.8), alongside the St. Augustine’s coat of arms, a device which he also added on the IHN’s opening page at the front of the book (fol. 5); Clement added these, as he did to Robert of Battle’s bible, for similar purposes of recording institutional ownership; in other words, in order to announce this book’s status as the property of St. Augustine’s Abbey.

In addition to ‘labelling’ this bible as being, at different times, a personal possession and a piece of institutional property through his addition of these inscriptions, Clement recorded further details of the bible’s provenance on the facing folio (fol. 4v) and, in so doing, memorialized his own role in its history. Here, Clement recorded details of his purchase of the bible and of his subsequent gift of the book to St. Augustine’s:


the Dissolution was Sir Anthony St. Leger (d.1559), an agent of Thomas Cromwell in suppressing the abbey’s (his ownership inscription is on fol. iiir, “This boke perteynethe to the right worshipfull sir Anthonye Seintleger knight of […]”, and on fol. 180v, “God save the [sic] Anthonie St Leger. for ever and ever q[uod] J G”). The bible was subsequently purchased by the antiquary Sir Roger Twysden (d.1672) on 29 Nov. 1631 (recorded on fol. iiir) and then belonged to one unknown owner (his number “61” added fol. iiir UR corner), followed by Sir John Saunders Sebright (d.1846), politician and agriculturist. The Ms. was bought at auction by the classical scholar Charles Burney (1757-1817) for £6, 6s at the sale of Sebright’s library (Sotheby’s, 6 April 1807, lot 1186), and was acquired by The British Museum from Burney’s son Charles after his father’s death in 1818.


Cf. Clement’s addition of his own initials (“C.C.”) at the foot of fol. 2r in Robert’s Bible (Fig. 5.7D).

ac solucione præsens erat dominius Willielmus Westgate monachus ac scolaris prædicti monasterij.
/ Et hunc librum dedit d. Clemens Cantybury monasterio sancti Augustini extra muros ciuitatis Canteburj. Anno predicto ultimo die mensis februarij.

This is a very rare instance of the economic details of such transactions in the 15th century. Clement, describing himself as “monk and scholar of St. Augustine’s” records how he purchased the book for the sum of 20 shillings in Oxford on 24 July 1473 from the university bookbinder and stationer Thomas Hunt (d.1492) in the presence of a fellow monk-scholar, William Westgate.\footnote{Westgate himself is recorded in the St. Augustine’s 15th-century catalogue as a bible-borrower (of Cat. no. 37). On William Westgate, see CBMLC 13 (2008): 111, 386 and A.B. Emden, Donors of Books (1968): 18-19.}\footnote{See CBMLC 13 (2008): 70, 111 (in Locations Register) and 385, 388 (and in Catalogue); and A. B. Emden, Donors of Books to S. Augustine’s Abbey Canterbury, Oxford Bibliographical Society, Occasional Publications, 4 (Oxford: Bodleian Library, 1968); 8 and Pl. II: 37. For discussion of Clement’s handwriting and the ‘hierarchy of scripts’ he used (the locus classicus for which is preserved in Bodleian Library, Ms. Wood empt. 13) see B.C. Barker-Benfield, “Clement Canterbury, librarian of St. Augustine’s Abbey, Canterbury,” in A.C. de la Mare & B.C. Barker-Benfield, Manuscripts at Oxford, An Exhibition in Memory of Richard William Hunt. Exhibition catalogue (Oxford: Bodleian Library 1980): 88-92 [no. XXI.4 & Fig. 61: 91]. On the spiritual economy of individuals’ donating books to medieval religious institutions in exchange for prayers for their souls after their death, see Richard Gameson, “The medieval library (to c. 1450),” in CHB II (2008): 13-50.\footnote{Clement’s inscription of the last surviving page of his personal commonplace book (now Corpus Christi College, Oxford Ms. 261, at fol. 115v) shows that he was still alive at St. Augustine’s after 11 May 1495 (CBMLC 13 [2008]: III, 1839).} Clement later supplemented this record with the further note (written in a smaller script and a slightly paler ink) recording his gift of the bible to St. Augustine’s on 28 February 1474, although his recorded borrowing of the bible (whose Locations Register entry [Reg. no. 44] notes its loan to “Clement Canterbury”, along with a second single-vol. bible [Cat. no. 34]) indicates that he retained a proprietary interest in his investment and confirms his personal use of the book.\footnote{Clement was ordained acolyte and subdeacon at St. Augustine’s in April 1463 and was made deacon in June of the same year and priest in March 1467. The following year he began his studies in Oxford as a novice (in 1468-9) and was still there in 1473 when he bought his bible. Not only was Clement the active curator of the community’s library and book collections, he was also the community’s most voracious}
reader during his lifetime, being the most-listed borrower of books of the St. Augustine’s community.2014

In addition to their respective marks of ownership, both bibles bear marks of scholarly use, although these are more numerous in Clement’s bible. At the time when Clement acquired his bible – which contains the biblical text with prologues (fols. 54r-522v) preceded by the IHV (fols. 5r-53r) - much of its text had already been supplemented with the markings of earlier 13th- and 14th-century readers.2015 Nevertheless, Clement filled the volume with his own annotations, ranging from added marginal notes and symbols intended to function as indexical tools (to assist his navigation of his bible) and study aids (to assist his use and interpretation of its text),2016 to inserting whole new texts.2017 Although Robert of Battle’s is the grander and more luxuriously illuminated of the two bibles,2018 it also retains evidence of scholarly use although it differs somewhat from Clement’s copy in its textual contents. Robert’s bible, like Clement’s, omits the

2014 However this bible is the only of Clement’s books to give his full name; cf. CBMLC 13 (2008): BA1.1376 & 1442. Clement also gifted two further volumes to the St. Augustine’s library which are not recorded in the catalogue, a Computus and a collection of sermons of Alexander Nequam; see N.R. Ker, MMBL III (1974): 43.

2015 Although the precise identity of the bible’s earlier owners is unknown, the book displays signs of academic use by an unidentified Oxford owner (13th-century marginalia from fol. 95v onwards refers to the Glossa Ordinaria ["Glossa ordinaria"], and a table headed “Modus p[re]dicandi” added on fol. 523v attests to its ownership by an unidentified preacher in the 15th century. After Clement gifted the bible to St. Augustine’s, the book’s known provenance history is short: an ownership inscription on fol. 53v records that the bible was in the possession of Thomas Norton, a lawyer and writer (d.1584) shortly after the community’s dissolution but no further owners are known until the bible came into the possession of Charles Burney (d.1817), from whose son – also named Charles - The British Museum acquired the bible in 1818 (alongside Robert of Battle’s bible, now BL, Ms. Burney 3).

2016 Examples of Clement’s additions, to aid his scholarly use of the bible, include: an elaborate synoptic divisio of biblical books (fols. 1v-2); a numbered list of incipits of the Psalms (which are not included in the Bible text) and the incipits of the ferial canticles (fols. 2r-v); a ‘modern’ (post-13th century) list of the books of the Bible and the number of chapters in each, concluding with a set of mnemonic verses (fols. 3v-4), with a second mnemonic verse listing the biblical books on fol. 525v; and a series of mnemonic verses (“Versus de decem plagis egipti. Sanguis, rana, culex…”, fol. 81v).

2017 As witnessed in his addition of the prologue to Baruch (fol. 322v) and markings in red in the Book of Job correlating its text against Gregory’s Moralia (fols. 233v-43v).

2018 Robert’s bible (now BL, Ms. Burney 3) contains numerous large historiated initials, in colors and in gold, at the beginning of biblical books, and some prologues (fols. 3, 5v, 27v, 45v, etc.), executed by at least two artists (evidence of whose work on the bible survive in the form of numerous guide- letters and – numerals). The bible is also includes large and small inhabited (or foliate) initials, in colors and gold at the start of prologues, as well as hundreds of small initials alternately in red or blue (with predominantly blue or red flourishing and marginal extensions, respectively), and is decorated further with line-fillers in red and blue (sometimes in the form of fish), and the coloring of chapter numbers and running titles in alternate red and blue characters with flourishes.
Psalms, but does not include the supplementary IHN text. However the marginal annotations, found throughout the volume, bear witness to an extensive scholarly program of cross-referencing and comparison with the text of another bible, together with added study tools (e.g. diagram on fol. 1v), attest to the bible’s scholarly use.

A third surviving 13th-century bible from St. Augustine’s Canterbury that also includes surviving medieval study tools, although of a physical rather than a textual nature, is Geoffrey of Langley’s “Biblia minor” (Cat. No. 9), now Corpus Christi College, Cambridge Ms. 49. We know nothing of the circumstances under which Geoffrey’s of Langley’s “Smaller Bible” was transferred from Canterbury to Cambridge, we know that the bible remained in use at St. Augustine’s until at least the late 15th century, and that the bible had already completed its journey from St. Augustine’s to Corpus Christi College by 1574, for it was itemized in the Register chronicling the contents of Archbishop Matthew Parker’s celebrated collection at the time of its donation by him to the college (now CCCC Ms. 582). We may speculate that the bible’s relocation was the result of either donation (by the Abbey), or, more likely, by request (on the part of Archbishop Parker or the college).

The bible’s flyleaves also retain inscriptions chronicling details of the bible’s medieval provenance at Canterbury and and subsequent life in Cambridge including the inscription of Geoffrey’s name on a front flyleaf (“Biblia G. de Langele minor” on fol. iv.v; Fig. 5.9) and, on a flyleaf at the rear of the volume is written “Sancte augustine ora pro nobis” with the same sketch of the Abbey’s coat of arms (a shield bearing a cross) witnessed in Clement of Canterbury’s bible (BL, Ms. Burney 11, fol. 54r).

---

2020 Many quires are marked “em[en]dat[us]” (e.g. fols. 42, 54, 78, 282).
2021 “Biblia Galfridi de Langele minor / 2 fo. phantur / D. I. G. 1” (Cat. no. 9).”
2022 If the bible was sent in response to a specific request made by Archbishop Parker, it seems probable that he valued the book for its distinguished provenance (St. Augustine’s being the oldest religious community in England) rather than that he would have prized the bible as a book of extraordinary beauty, or that he should have found the contents of its biblical text to have been of particular interest.
2023 Further inscriptions, recording the bible’s ownership by Corpus Christi College, include “Benett Colledge / E:2” on fol. i.v (Ben’et College was the name by which Corpus Christi was known, and another inscription added by Thomas Elnam on the same folio reads: “Mem. quod dominus Thomas elnam (?) habet 4 (or x) s. viz. sed consummatum est. hec scripta sunt in libro / Ihesus exiiuit de templo et corroborauit templum.” (fol. i.v)
Like Durham’s ‘Paris’ Bible (DCL, Ms. A.II.3), Corpus Christi College, Cambridge Ms. 49 is remarkable for its size, being a lectern-sized pandect copy measuring 345 x 225 mm, 450⁷ fols.), and like the Durham bible, it is a beautiful book, filled with a great many richly decorated and sumptuously illuminated initials, both ornamented and historiated, with its text beautifully written in three hands, arranged in double columns of 54 lines per page, with wide, inviting margins. Although the bible may, again like DCL Ms. A.II.3, have been of French origin (as M.R. James believed²⁰²⁴), Nigel Morgan has suggested that the bible may have been made at Canterbury ca. 1270-80.²⁰²⁵

However, unlike Durham’s ‘Paris’ Bible, this surviving lectern copy from St. Augustine’s shows very few signs of having been much used at all, much less having served for decades as a communal reference copy.²⁰²⁶ However CCCC Ms. 49, like Durham’s ‘Auckland Bible’ (DCL, Ms. A.IV.37), also retains a rare surviving volvelle book-marker, contemporary to the book’s production.²⁰²⁷ This marker consists of a small rotating parchment disc, measuring 61 mm in diameter,²⁰²⁸ inscribed with “linea” and “columna i/iii” horizontally and vertically on its recto and in the same arrangement on the verso, only with “columna iii/iv”.²⁰²⁹ This disc is stitched around a length of thread (although others were attached to a strip of parchment), so that it revolves between two other pieces in such a way that only half of the disc is exposed.²⁰³⁰ Thus its reader would

²⁰²⁴ M.R. James (1912): I, 98-100 [99].
²⁰²⁶ Although the bible’s margins are largely free from annotation in the main text, we do find some annotations in lead on its 8 flyleaves, some of them scholarly notes, added between the 13th through 15th centuries.
²⁰²⁸ With regards to the size of the volvelle, variations in their size probably depended on what scraps of parchment were available to the scribe concerned (Emms [2001]: 180).
²⁰³⁰ Graham Pollard described the late medieval bookbinder’s practice of adding a bookmarker to a codex either by sewing the marker to the headband of the binding or by securing the marker to the upper tab of the binding, tabs being semi-circular or square-shaped pieces of leather – either part of the binding's covering or sewn onto it – projecting beyond the head and tail of the book’s spine. The marker was either
slide the marker up or down the thread to the exact level of the verse to be marked and would then rotate the disc to indicate the column across the double opening.

The form of such volvelle bookmarks reflects the function for which these tools were intended, namely for scholarly rather than liturgical use (although they also helped scribes not lose their place while copying).\textsuperscript{2031} The design of this particular kind of bookmark meant that a reader or copyist could find column and line quickly, by sliding the marker up or down the thread to the exact level of the verse to be marked and then rotating the disc to indicate the column across the double opening. In this design, they differed from liturgical bookmarks, which usually took the form of multiple strips of silk designed to enable quick cross-referencing among several openings, whereas scholarly volvelle bookmarks identify not the page but rather “the opening as the critical semantic unit.”\textsuperscript{2032} Although the strip itself marks an opening, the volvelle, which slides up and down the strip, marks a spot along the vertical axis plotted out by line after line of script, whilst the rotating circle permitted its user to indicate column I, II, III or IV.

Not only are the bookmarks in CCCC Ms. 49 and in DCL, Ms. A.IV.37 extraordinary as a kind of medieval reader’s interpretational tool which rarely survives—“primarily because they were lost as soon as books were rebound”—\textsuperscript{2033} but furthermore, having been made and used in medieval England, they are doubly rare, for English survivors are extremely rare.\textsuperscript{2034} Graham Pollard commented that examples of “more

---


\textsuperscript{2034} The rarity of surviving English examples is witnessed by the fact that a medieval English volvelle revolving bookmark sold for £7,200 (est. £1,000-1,500) at Sotheby’s, London on 5 July 2005, Lot 16).
elaborate” type of bookmark such as this are more likely French than English, as the surviving examples reflect. However, Geoffrey’s “Biblia minor”, now CCCC Ms. 49, is distinguished still further within its twin canons of surviving 13th-century bibles and of medieval books retaining in-tact medieval bookmarkers by the fact that it contains not one, but two such markers.

Today, these bibles offering rare portraits of book-use, acquisition and donation by the late medieval monks of St. Augustine’s. However, rarer still are the opportunities these bibles offer for cross-referencing the entries in the 15th-century catalogue with the same books that these entries record. Through such comparison of medieval records with their medieval subjects we learn much about medieval cataloguing practice, as much from the witnessing of those features these catalogues do not taxonomize as from the books’ corroboration or resistance of their medieval descriptions. Such examination provides invaluable insight into the book, its record and their interrelated functions at a particular time within a particular community and allows us to extend our findings to those lost books that do not survive to be studied.

By “more elaborate”, Pollard refers to markers “in which there is a rotating disc to indicate which of the four columns in an opening is required, and which can be moved up and down the marker to show which line in the column is wanted” (Graham Pollard, “Describing Medieval Bookbindings” [1976]: 62, n.2).

A late-12th century German medieval volvelle bookmark survives in a copy of Gilbert de la Porée’s Commentary on the Pauline Epistles (Germany, ca. 1160-1200), now Harvard University, Houghton Library, Ms. Richardson 39, pf Ms. Typ. 277, fols. 115v-116r; discussed in Jeffrey F. Hamburger, “Openings,” in Imagination, Books & Community in Medieval Europe. Papers of a conference held at The State Library of Victoria, Melbourne, Australia, 29-31 May 2008, Ed. Gregory Kratzmann (Melbourne, Australia: Macmillan & State Library of Victoria,, 2009): 50-129 [88, Fig. 49].

Around thirty such rotating bookmarks have been recorded in continental libraries (see J. Destrez [1935]) compared to only about half a dozen from England (see R. Emms [2002]) including two surviving examples in 12th-century books from libraries in medieval Hereford. One indicator is in a copy of Gregory the Great's Moralia in Job, written in the early 12th century which remains in Hereford Cathedral Library [Ms. P.VI.11]; this indicator has column numbers on both sides and measuring ca. 51-54 mm. The other indicator is located in a copy of Gregory the Great's Cura Pastoralis written around 1200, which was in the medieval library of the Franciscans in Hereford, and is now in the library of St. John's College, Cambridge (Ms. D.I 5). The rotator in this volume includes a rotating column-indicator marked on one side only (I, II, III, IV) and is smaller than the indicator in the Hereford Cathedral Library book, measuring ca. 30-33 mm (Emms [2001]: 180).

It was only in 2001 that Richard Emms drew attention to the second bookmark; which had hitherto gone undocumented (Emms [2001]), having eluding even the eagle eye of M.R. James, who noted one of the bible’s markers in his 1912 catalogue of the CCCC manuscripts but not the second example [James [1912]: I, 98]. Although Graham Pollard noted that a single medieval book could sometimes be equipped with as many as four bookmarkers (Pollard [1976]: 62).
Both the St. Augustine’s catalogues and the surviving manuscripts attest to the desirability of these books within the community. The catalogue commemorates the significant number in which bibles were donated or bequeathed to the community by its bretheren, while the Locations-Register reveals the great demand for copies to be borrowed on personal loan. The diligent chronicling of the bibles’ loans and locations narrates an institutional anxiety to preserve their continued availability and to guard against their disappearance, in order to ensure that the community be able to match its supply of bibles to the monks’ ongoing demand for them. These Latin pandect bibles were demonstrably in demand for communal and personal, private use, and together constituted a collection of bibles in regular, consistent use by monks of all levels of seniority within the community, both in and out of the abbey’s ‘study-spaces’ of cloister and Library Room. They were books whose loss would certainly be felt.

2 *Biblia Integra* in Other Religious Communities; A Survey of Late Medieval Institutional Book Lists

To what degree do we see these case studies of Durham Cathedral Priory and St. Augustine’s Abbey, Canterbury as representing characteristic or atypical examples of late medieval communities’ recording of and need for pandect bibles? Through a survey of the surviving medieval catalogues and book lists, it may be possible to discern similar patterns of bibles’ cataloguing and use and to determine whether these medieval lists of books available to their communities reflect the theory that medieval religious communities had less day-to-day use for pandect bibles of whatever size than they did for prayer books, works of Scriptural commentary, or individually-bound glossed books of The Bible. In what kinds of ways can we see medieval use or non-use of pandect bibles documented in contemporary catalogues, in which terms, in what form and by whom?

---

2039 My methodology for approaching this research was simple: I researched the most detailed archive of printed sources available as thoroughly as possible. The published volumes of the Corpus of Medieval Library Catalogues series, Series Ed. Richard Sharpe (London: The British Library in assoc. with the British Academy, 1990-ongoing) seemed the obvious place to start, as its editions encompass an encyclopedic range of the documentary sources that recorded the locations, ownership, use and circulation of the books affiliated with hundreds of religious and secular institutions throughout medieval England and Scotland. My research yielded too great a volume of material for me to attempt a comprehensive account of my findings (research covering in excess of 125 booklists), so what are presented here are, through necessity, representative examples.
Late medieval institutional booklists, and the language through which bibles are distinguished within them, variously narrate the late medieval understanding of the Bible in terms of Scriptural/ textual and material ‘(in)completeness’. These organizational systems reveal a sense of the Bible as a single “integra” or “intact” unit, most often itemized simply as “Biblia”, or with its singularity emphasized, e.g. “unam bibl iam.” (UC165.2) The other term used frequently to designate the Bible as book is a variety of forms of the name “Bibliot[h]eca[e]”, as witnessed for example, in entries A16.1-3, 5-8, 13, 487 of the library catalogue from the Augustinian priory of Lanthony, Gloucester, compiled ca. 1360–70 (BL, Harley Ms. 460).2040 However, medieval cataloguers used many ways to qualify a bible’s “intactness”. When materially split into multiple volumes, the division is described in titles such as “Biblothecam in duobus codicibus” (B11.1) or in titles that make implicit the process of fission that emphasizes its parts in order to confirm its ‘wholeness’: “De una biblioteca noua in duobus uoluminibus diuisa.” (B17.9)2041 This dynamic of ‘a biblical whole’ was also applied in reverse, qualifying the materiality of a Scriptural unit’s sub-division and thus emphasizing a copy’s division of the Bible through distinguishing the number of volumes in which it was copied: “ij libri cont’ j bibliothecam.” (SH118.3)2042 It was common to describe a bible as whole in terms of whether it contained merely one or both Testaments (e.g. “Vetus et nouum testamentum in uno uolumine”, BP3.1), the implication being that a ‘complete’ bible was defined by its number of Testaments rather than [by] its materiality, and thus the number of volumes it occupied required no further definition.2043 Similarly, a small late 12th or early 13th-century bible of Waltham Cross Abbey (now London, Newham Museum Service, Ms. LD PEM AD/AY 0001) contains a catalogue of 132 entries on what was most likely once the final leaf of its first volume (of two), and the first item in the collection it records is the bible itself, offering its self-description as a “Biblotheca tota id est uetus testamentum et nouum.” (A38.1)2044 Its material division into twin volumes is unrecorded; instead, the

2040 A16: Lanthony catalogue, late 14th century.
2041 B11: Burton catalogue, ca. 1175 | B17: Carisbrooke status, 1260.
2042 SH118: Winchester, hospital of St. Cross, Inventory of goods, 4 April 1383.
qualifying characteristic of its completeness (making it a “Bibliotheca tota”) is highlighted as its contents’ Scriptural inclusiveness.

Just as bibles were sometimes classified primarily by their materiality, so too could they be referred to in a language of textual absence, *vis-a-vis* the degree of their contents’ canonical “intactness”. Thus, by referring to items in terms of their omissions, and their lack of something, these booklists offer valuable perspective on contemporary opinions regarding what “The Bible” was *supposed* to contain in a particular time and place. Two of the seventeen bibles listed in the extensive late 15th-century library catalogue of the Augustinian monks of Leicester’s Abbey are defined primarily as “Biblia defectuia.” (A20.18-19) For the Benedictine monks of Carisbrooke (in the Isle of Wight) in 1260, the first item on the list recording the books housed at their cell at the time is first described as a single entity, supplemented by a definition in material terms, but finally in terms of its textual lack: “Vnam bibliotecam. In uno uolumine exceptis Actibus apostolorum.” (B17.1)

Likewise, in the library catalogue made of the Premonstratensian Abbey of St. Mary and St. John the Evangelist in Titchfield, Hampshire, dated 29 September 1400, the first of the community’s trio of “biblia integra” is chronicled as distinctive for its textual lack of the Psalter: “Biblia integra preter Psalterium.” (P6.1)

Sometimes “biblia” were categorized ambiguously in their “completeness”. There is reference to neither textual nor artifactual definition in the descriptions of a “Biblia perpulcra et completa” (SS1.1041) or a “Vna biblia…non completa” (S1.3, 4 and 5; later S2.1-4). Similarly, when a cataloguer vaguely placed titular emphasis on an item’s status as “a portion”, e.g. “Parte bibliotece” (S19.7) the whole bible, that which the cataloguer is classifying this volume in relation to, was fore-grounded, but there is little sense of how that whole would be defined. One title could describe multiple bibles (e.g. “.ij. biblias, quarum .j. gallice scripta” [BP14.1]), a practice that distinguished each “biblia” as an independent object by comparative (linguistic) definition within the

---

2045 A20: See below for further reference to the taxonomic practices of this community’s list.
2046 B17: Carisbrooke status, 1260.
2047 P6: Premonstratensian Abbey of Titchfield, Catalogue, Michaelmas 1400.
2048 SS1: Syon Abbey, Registrum of the library of the Brethren, ca. 1500- ca. 1524 | S1: Aberdeen cathedral, Catalogue, 1436 | S2: Aberdeen cathedral, Catalogue, 12 March 1465.
2049 S19:
record. Two booklists of Cambridge’s University Library offer insight into how the same bible could be described in different ways; the third item in the library’s register of benefactors (ca. 1424-40) is described as a unit contained in its entirety and deemed as being of secondary importance, but still noteworthy, is its materiality as a single book—“Alia biblia in uno volumine.” (UC2.3) Decades later, the same bible is chronicled as part of the CUL Library Register; on this list references to the book’s form or contents are unnecessary, and the volume is listed briefly, but tellingly, as “Biblia”. (UC3.167)

The Scriptural inclusivity implied in both CUL records is often explicitly specified in medieval institutional records which refer to a textual whole as synonymous with the name “Bible”. Thus entries list items variously as a “Textus Biblie” (H1.13; cf. B122.2 et al.) or emphasize the material singularity of a copy (“Unus textus” [S8.11]) or contrast a sense of form imposed onto textual comprehensiveness (“Textus biblie volumen vnnum” [S20.18]). The canonical contents of a “Textus” are arguably becoming standardized when it is referenced in terms of its reproduction in multiple copies (“iij Textus” [SH123.23]) although this could also be interpreted as devaluing a sense of a unified text of the Scriptural canon, since the entry may be read as referring to biblical text as Not Commentary, and therefore unlikely to be searched for in the list.

These booklists also reveal that (how) medieval religious taxonomized their bibles according to many other categories beyond simply cataloguing them in relation to contemporary ideas of Scriptural/ material compactness. Bibles were defined in terms of their material quality (or lack thereof). Thus we find bibles’ high quality proudly recorded, as in the cases of “Meliorem biblia” (B21.5) and “Biblia optima in duobus voluminibus” (B68.44). Equally, the poor condition of bible volumes could be worthy of recording, as in the late 14th-century catalogue from Lanthony (A16), in which three

---

2051 UC2: University of Cambridge, Register of benefactors, ca. 1424 – ca. 1440.
2052 UC3: University of Cambridge, Register, 1473.
2053 H1: Richmond Palace, Inventory of books, February 1535 | B122: York St. Mary’s Rumburgh, Inventory, 1439 | S8: Coldingham, Benedictine priory, Inventory of sacristy, 1371 | S20: St. Andrews, Dominican convent, Books in the possession of John Grierson, ca. 1522.
2054 SH123: Writtle, church or hospital, Inventory of goods, 1 March 1344.
2055 B21: Chester, From the will of Richard of Chester, 1347 | B68: Ramsey Abbey, catalogue roll, late 14th century.
bibles are described as being volumes of “mediocri” quality. However, like the “biblia minor” of Geoffrey of Langley at St. Augustine’s, terms of bibliographic excellence are used in the same way as those describing diminutive size – both of the records referred to above cite quality as a category of comparison: B21.5 is a “better” bible than its companions, whilst B68.44 is the “best” bible of the books donated by “Willelmi abbatis”.

Bibles were also distinguished in medieval booklists by their age (“In .ii. bus uoluminibus ueteribus” [B79.48]), or, recalling Thomas Elmham’s recording of St. Augustine’s ‘Biblia Gregoriana’, by the material (in this case parchment) upon which they were written (“Una biblia in pergamo in paruo uolumine litera optima complete scripta.” [S13.14]) Further to this example, bibles could also be recorded according to the scripts in which they were recorded, be the writing (and bible) small (“Vna parua biblia in minuta littera” [S1.1]), various in their number (“Biblia incompleta diuersarum scripturarum quondam fratris” [A8.6]) or distinctive for having been written, and by extension, distinguished from printed copies in the same collections (“A old bybyll wrytyn” [SH62.29]).

Just as the contents of a bible may be deemed noteworthy in these booklists (e.g. a bible’s script), evidence survives in medieval book lists and catalogues that bibles’/books’ external appearance could be deemed distinctive/ the volume’s distinguishing feature on the shelves amongst its fellows in a collection. Certain bibliophiles were demonstrably interested in either discerning whether the collection of a certain institution contained a particular desired volume or in locating a volume on the library’s shelves, the guidance provided by the institution’s catalogue could lead them, if not to ‘judge’ then to identify a book by its cover. Thus cataloguers were interested in recording what a book looked like on the outside (i.e. its binding; the kind of covering, its color, texture etc.) as well as what was inside it (i.e. its textual contents).

2056 “In vno volumine mediocri” (A16.2), and “liber mediocris” (A16.11).
2058 Described later as “An olde bible written” [SH64.78,”] | A8; John Leland’s list of Christ Church books, ca. 1536-40 | SH62: Rome, Italy, hospital of St. Thomas, Inventory of goods, 1 October 1496.
Cf. SH67.1 for an example of a collection in which the catalogues’ titles reflect the library’s physical arrangement, narrating the library’s practice of shelving their manuscripts and printed books separately, as reflected in their distinct listing in the catalogue.
The late 15\textsuperscript{th}-century catalogue (‘Registrum Librorum’) of the Augustinian monks of Leicester Abbey, compiled by William Charyte, precentor and prior of Leicester no earlier than 1477\footnote{The Leicester catalogue survives as a fair copy, Bodleian Library, Ms. Laud Misc. 623 [=CBMLC A20] CBMLC 6 [Teresa Webber & Andrew Watson, Libraries of the Augustinian Canons] (1998): Cat. A20 (106-399: [‘Biblie’: nos. 1-22, 120-4]) [104]. On the history of Leicester Abbey see A.H. Thompson, The Abbey of St. Mary of the Meadows Leicester (Leicester, 1949).} provides a particularly rich resource for considering this kind of cataloguing practice. By the late 15\textsuperscript{th} century Leicester Abbey had become one of the wealthiest and most prominent of the English Augustinian houses and boasted a library of impressive size, possessing over 940 volumes (not including books used in the liturgy or for administrative purposes) while the catalogue contains a total of 1,958 items.\footnote{This cataloguing practice is not unique, but it is uncommon for such a document to record the binding status of its entries in so many instances (as ‘standard cataloguing practice’), particularly in addition to the other descriptive categories employed in the Leicester catalogue and even more uncommon to do so for so large a collection (although few contemporary collections of comparable size existed).} The catalogue records 22 bibles (its first 22 entries) entered under the descriptive heading of “Biblie” and described in the catalogue’s prefatory section as “Omnes biblie pertinetes huic monasterio” (‘All the bibles belonging to this monastery’).\footnote{Biblie: Items 1-17: 1. Biblia per se in ii volumnibus et iacet in Refectorio a primum volumen in asseribus cum subalbo coopertorio b secundum volumen in consimili coopertorio / 2. a Biblia Roberti de Burton’ in magno volumine cum albo coopertorio b Tabula Interpretacionum nominum biblie in eodem / 3. a Biblia Alani de Ybestoke [ ] in asseribus cum coopertorio b Tabula interpretacionum nominum biblie e Item tabula super epistolas et euangelia dominicalia d Psalterium geminatum in eodem / 4. Biblia magna cum [ ] Apocrifica [ ] Willelmi Barow cum albo coopertorio / 5. a Biblia spi\textbackslash s\textbackslash xa Ade de Somerldby in albo coopertorio b Psalterium deminatum in eodem / 6. a Biblia Willemi Lecy’ in asseribus cum albo coopertori b Tabula interpretacionum nominum biblie / 7. Biblia Henrici Stred科尔’ cum coopertorio duplicato cum panno blodio / 8. a Biblia parua G. Salow quondam in nigro modo in albo coopertorio b Tabula interpretacionum nominum biblie / 9. Biblia parua Roberti Kegworthe cum albo coopertorio / 10. Biblia parua Iohannis Barkby in albo coopertorio / 11. Biblia nouiciorum per vicarium de Grantham / 12. Biblia Iohannis Lemynjong’ in albo coopertorio / 13. Biblia parua Iohannis Hankoke in rubico coopertorio / 14. Biblia parua Thome Bathe in albo coopertorio / 15. Biblia Pepyb in albo coopertorio / 16. Biblia solempnis in negro coopertorio / 17. Biblia fratis Thome Asty Biblie defectue et versificata: Items 18-22: 18. a Biblia defectiu in asseribus cum hispido coopertorio / b Templum domini in eodem [Robert Grossteste] / 19. Biblia defectiu per se in asseribus cum coopertorio quasi albo / 20. Biblia versificata W. de Montibus per se per Furmentyne cum albo coopertorio / 21. a Biblia versificata Laurencii de London’ in nudis asseribus b Sentencie sanctorium partum de fide catholica c Omelie super aliquibus euangelii. d Vndecim euangelia glosata e Versus historic tocius biblie f Pars Actus} The catalogue not only describes its books’ size, number of volumes, donor(s), secundo folio and textual contents, but, distinctively amongst the surviving corpus of medieval library catalogues, by describing each book’s binding, or lack of thereof.\footnote{2061 This catalogueuing practice is not unique, but it is uncommon for such a document to record the binding status of its entries in so many instances (as ‘standard catalogueuing practice’), particularly in addition to the other descriptive categories employed in the Leicester catalogue and even more uncommon to do so for so large a collection (although few contemporary collections of comparable size existed).} Almost every one of the community’s bibles is distinguished by its respective binding,\footnote{2062 This catalogueuing practice is not unique, but it is uncommon for such a document to record the binding status of its entries in so many instances (as ‘standard catalogueuing practice’), particularly in addition to the other descriptive categories employed in the Leicester catalogue and even more uncommon to do so for so large a collection (although few contemporary collections of comparable size existed).} in almost every case
the bibles are referred to as “in asseribus” (in wooden boards), “in coopertorio” (‘in covers’ [cooperio]) or in variations on the formula including “Cum coopertorio duplicato cum panno blodio” (7), “quondam in nigro modo in albo cooperta” (8), “In rubeo cooperta” (13), “In negro coopertorio” (16), “cum hispido coopertorio” (18) or “in quaternis” (limp binding, 22). In fact, so few of the bibles are not listed as bound, that this lack of binding itself is deemed distinctive, and thus bible no. 21 is unique amongst its listed companions as existing “In nudis asseribus” (in wooden boards, uncovered).

The status of complete/pandect Latin bibles, particularly 13th-century pocket bibles, within the extant canon of decorated and/or illuminated medieval manuscripts is noteworthy, but not uniformly distinguished. Almost all feature colored/ decorated initials et al, most some decorations (including historiated initials, miniatures and decorative borders) and very many contain illuminated features. Decoration and illumination may therefore be considered almost certain features of these bibles but should not, as a general rule, be considered characteristic. Thus it is extremely interesting to discover the frequency with which these bibles’ beauty and colorfulness were recorded in medieval institutional booklists as prominent amongst their distinguishing features. In 1352, two bibles of Trinity Hall in Cambridge were distinguished, each from the other, by their relative size, but their beauty was deemed a remarkable feature they shared: “Una biblia magna et pulcra” (UC 57.53) and “Una alia biblia minor et pulcra.”

––


2065 These findings will prove especially interesting when considered in connection with A.N.L. Munby’s Connoisseurs and Medieval Miniatures, 1750-1850 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972).
The bible that is now Trinity College, Oxford Ms. 53 was located at Syon Abbey during the first quarter of the 16th century, where both its beauty and its supplementary interpretational text were listed as characteristic - “Biblia pulcra cum interpretacionibus”. (SS1.1228) Bibles at St. Augustine’s (early 14th century) and at Glastonbury (1334) were catalogued as a “Bibliam pulcam” (BA3.5) and a “Bibliam preciosam”, (B42.1) whilst the 1418 catalogue of Peterhouse College, Cambridge lists a bible as “pulcheririma.” (UC48.62) Some institutions categorized certain of the ornamented bibles in their collections not by aesthetic value judgments of the books’ beauty, but rather in material terms; by the fact of their containing gold. Unsurprisingly, the lists that do so are all inventories and thus function as chronicles of books’ economic value. The 1433 inventory of Glasgow cathedral catalogues “Una biblia integra, in pulcro uolumine, auro illuminat’” (S12.96) whilst the 1507 inventory of goods for the Hospital of St. Giles, Kepier, likewise lists “Vnam bibliam cum auro aluminat’.” (SH18.12) More unusual are two references to bibles featuring silver – these are the first two items of the inventory of books made in October 1448 of the hospital of St. Mary Elsing in London, the records describing the two bibles as “Item j. Textus magnus argentus et deauratus” (SH33.1) and “Item j. parui Textus argent’ et deaurat’ pro subdiaconis.” (SH33.2) Given such descriptions, it is no surprise to find the bibles further qualified as listed amongst those books located “In officio sacriste.” (SH33.1-30)

Conclusion: The Reading Abbey Bible-Theft Letter

The story of one bible that certainly was demonstrably used and treasured by its owner is recorded in a letter from ‘Frater Aluredus,’ sacristan of Reading Abbey

---

2066 UC57: Trinity Hall, Cambridge, List of books granted by the founder, 1 June 1352.
2067 The Registrum of the library of the Brethren of Syon Abbey (compiled ca. 1500-24) survives as CCCC Ms. 141 (for bibliographical description of this ms. see M.R. James, CCCC 1912: I. 326-7; cf. ms’ entry on Parker Library on the web online here; the catalogue was published in CBMLC 9 [Syon Abbey, Ed. Vincent Gillespie; with The Libraries of the Carthusians, Ed. A.I. Doyle] (2001): CBMLC SS1); Cf. C3a.1, “Pulcrum volumen biblie” and S12.96 and 121: Glasgow cathedral, Inventory, 24 March 1433.
2068 BA3: St. Augustine’s, see above, and entry 1 in B42: Glastonbury Abbey, list of books given by Abbot Adam of Sudbury (1323-34) | UC48: Peterhouse College, Cambridge, Catalogue, 24 Dec. 1418.
2069 S12: Glasgow cathedral, Inventory, 24 March 1433 | SH18: Kepier, hospital of St. Giles, Inventory of goods, 7 December 1507.
2070 SH33: London, hospital of St. Mary Elsing, Inventory of books, 7 October 1448.
concerning the theft of a bible from the cloister of Reading abbey in July 1253. The letter is preserved today as text copied into the front of a 13th-century volume of school texts and historical compendia, now Lambeth Palace Library, Ms. 371 (see Figs. 5.13A-B and Appendix II.C for text in full), and this document narrates one final illuminating perspective on the use of ‘Biblia integra’/complete Latin bibles in the monastic libraries of medieval England.

In his letter, Aluredus describes the bible as “Biblia una parua mensure quasi unius palmi et dimidii in qua multa utilia scripta continebantur de claustro nostro furtim sublata est.” Thus chronicled is a small bible volume (measuring 1½ palm’s lengths) to which had been added a list of those books located in the community’s cloister (a list whose institutional-specificity is qualified as “furtim sublasta est” i.e. that this list records the books ‘privately held’ in Reading’s cloister collection). The outrage expressed by the sacristan at this “sacrilegio terribilis” is matched only by his eagerness to recover the book – so ardent is his desire to regain it that he has circulated multiple copies of the letter “per totam Angliam per breuitores nostros” in order that anyone who might possibly be in a position to purchase the book be vigilant to Aluredus’ search for it. The sacrist (backed by his institution) even offers to reimburse anyone who comes into possession of the book, either by purchase or as a pledge on a loan:

Quocirca uniuersitatem uestram rogamus attentius et exhortamur in Domino quatinus si penes aliquem uestrum dicta byblia sit deposita uel pignori obligata seu quocumque precio comparata hoc ispum nobis significare curetis, certissime scituri quod sine omni cauillatione pretium ipsum seu mutuum uobis integere refundemus, dum tamen ipsam bybliam resuperare possimus.

His desperation to maximize his chances of regaining the bible leads him to offer an unusually detailed description of its distinguishing features (“Hec autem in dicta byblia scripta continebantur”), listing the many texts the codex contains, its illustrative and illuminated features, and the order of these contents. Visually, this list is written as a simple block of text within the letter - the act of the letter’s having been recorded being more important than the visual organization of its contents - but so precisely does Aluredus taxonomise the contents of his bible, their ordering and their internal sub-

2071 CBMLC 4 [English Benedictine Libraries. The Shorter Catalogues, Eds. R. Sharpe & others.] (1996): Cat. B73 (448-51). Concerning Frater Aluredus see ??? and his name written in Bodleian Library, Ms. Auct. F.3.8 (Fig. 5.13C).
divisions through employment of positional formula ("Deinde", "et", "post quam", "post...ante", "post quas/ quos") that his addressee is presented with a Bible Contents List that, if visually separated into its constituent ‘items,’ is organized as follows:

Videlicet in principio libri fuit
(a) tractatus domini Roberti quondam Lincolniensis episcopi qui sic incipit, Templum Domini.
(b) (Deinde) cherubin de confessione
(c) (et) descriptio candelabri et significacio eiusdem.
(d) (Deinde) series sanctorum partum ab Adam usque ad Christum, i. arbor hystorie scolastice nobiliter depicta et illuminata,
(e) (post quam) byblia.
(f) Item post psalterium ante Parabolas Salomonis est kalendarium integrum.
(g) Item in fine Ecclesiastici, scilicet ante nouum testamentum, est annotatio epistolarum et euangeliorum que per annum legentur, per quam sciri potest quo (sic) capituloinueniri debent.
Item post bybliam sunt
(h) Uersus de recapitulatione utriusque testamenti.
(i) (Post quos) interpretaciones secundum Remigium.
(j) (Deinde) concordancie byliotece secundum Reinmundum.
(k) (Item post quas) quidam prologi qui defuerunt in dicta byblia.
(l) (Post quos) diffiniciones secundum ordinem alfabeti.
(m) (Post quas) plures uersus de iiij euangelistis.
(n) (Post quos) Augustinus de spiritu et anima.

Although Aluredus is offering a narrative inventory of the contents of a single codex, this descriptive cataloguing is organized as effectively as any of the library catalogues analyzed above. Here the organizational schema governing the medieval listing of a library’s books is deployed to map the listing of a book. The effects are profound.

As is the telling languge in which Aluredus itemizes the bible’s contents (a-m) itemizing the Bible text and its supplementary extrabiblical texts positioned around a core of Scriptural text. In the taxonomic language Aluredus displays his understanding of ‘The Bible’ as simultaneously encompassing a textual corpus (as an item [fem. sing.] on the book’s list of contents, ‘byblia’ here meaning ‘The Scriptural Canon’) and as a material object (as the ‘biblia’ codex which has been stolen). The ‘byblia’ text (e) is situated in the middle of the volume, although that is not in fact how Aluredus indexes its position, since he describes the book’s contents through listing them in a linear, sequential progression.
from the bible’s front cover to back cover. Thus the ordered listing of Aluredus’ Contents List does not refer to the texts at the front and back of the book (before and after The Scriptures) as ‘prefatory texts’ and ‘endtexts,’ since such language would privilege the internal position of the “byblia” amongst all items. Instead the front texts (a–d) and those at the back of the book (h–m) are described as located “In principio libri” and “post bybliam.” The ‘byblia’ text is indexed as “post quam”, i.e. “After The Front Texts.”

This non-privileging of the ‘byblia’ text is the result of Aluredus’ detailed distinction rather of the bible’s supplementary texts. This taxonomic method is symptomatic of the list’s form/contents having been dictated by its function: Aluredus was providing a ‘Wanted’ description of his bible for the purpose of its identification by its distinctive features, thus his itemized characteristics of his bible constitute the keywords/features of his bible-search, and his indexical marks distinguishing his bible amongst all the bibles in 13th-century England (“By these signs shall ye know him”). Telling insight into medieval Bible use is offered by the fact that, at a time when The Bible’s text and its ordering was becoming increasingly standardized according to the ‘Parisian’ model, Aluredus demonstrates that what would have been distinctive and particularly useful for the identification of his particular copy of The Bible in the late 13th-century would have been its extrabiblical supplementary texts and little to do with its Scriptural text. Indeed, the only reference to the contents of the bible’s Scriptural Text is by negative definition. If there is the suggestion of a canonical ‘wholeness’ or ‘completeness’ legible in the grammatical case of ‘byblia,’ so to does Aluredus’ description of the positioning within this ‘byblia’ text of his those texts added to his bible which permit its liturgical use (f and g) indicate a discernable sense of a ‘Right Order’ of The Scriptural Canon. This is a


2073 On the establishment of the ‘Paris’ bible as a textual model, see Light (2011A).

2079 Although of course the need to add such texts to the bible at all problematizes a picture of pandect bibles as useful copies for reading the Bible with a single codex; if this were the case, there would surely be no need to supplement its’ text with liturgical additions and double the functioning of its Scriptural text for readerly use?
A particularly impressive ability is Aluredus’s ability to list the textual and decorative contents and their order to an astonishingly high degree of textual and codicological detail from memory. 2080 It is only through intimate, regular personal use that one acquires this kind of familiarity with a book. Alured demonstrably knew this bible from cover to cover, and from the depth of his personal, intimate connection with this bible, it seems extremely probable that it was his own copy. Could we perhaps argue that Aluredus’s ability to retrieve and reassemble a very detailed and specific description of his lost bible - along with the ordering of its contents - from the storeroom of his memory is proof of the efficacy of the contemporary mnemonic devices in used for memorizing Scriptural information such as the Summarium Biblicum?

The degree of textual and codicological detail that Aluredus is able to provide for his lost bible certainly testifies to the depth of his personal, intimate connection with this bible book, which seems very likely to have been his own copy. His readerly knowledge of his bible’s contents and their order is demonstrably extensive, and his familiarity with both its texts and its distinguishing visual features is so acute that he could taxonomize its contents from memory in great detail, reassembling the parts of his lost bible from the storeroom of his memory. 2081 This kind of familiarity is only gained through intimate, regular personal use of a book. Aluredus demonstrably knew his bible from cover to cover.

2080 Re: Aluredus’ ability to produce such a detailed description of bible’s contents/ features (textual etc.) - compare with mnemonic devices for memorizing Scriptural info. e.g. the Summarium Biblicum – See Lucie Doležalová, “The Summarium Biblicum: A Biblical Tool both Popular and Obscure”, Form and Function in the Late Medieval Bible, Eds. Light & Poleg (Brill, 2013).

2081 With regards to Aluredus’ ability to produce such a detailed description of bible’s contents/ features (textual etc.) - compare with mnemonic devices for memorizing Scriptural information such as the Summarium Biblicum – see Lucie Doležalová, “The Summarium Biblicum: A Biblical Tool both Popular and Obscure”, Form and Function in the Late Medieval Bible, Eds. Light & Poleg (Brill, 2013).
cover. Aluredus’ employment of this insular Benedictine epistolary network to pursue his bible over a wide network far afield reads like a parent’s fervent anxiety for a lost child. Reading Abbey’s institutional valuing of the book is also discernable in their willingness to offer a financial incentive for its recovery. It is uncertain whether their efforts were rewarded with the bible’s safe return. However, their combined exertions tell of a celebrated complete Latin bible that was valued by many and particularly treasured by one, a bible whose loss was felt very deeply indeed, and without which its owner seems to have felt agonizingly incomplete.

2082 Alan Coates has suggested that Alured’s lost bible volume and Bodleian Library, Ms. Auct. D.4.10 might be one and the same. However there are inconsistencies between Alured’s description and the contents and structure of the Bodleian bible as it is today. First, some of the subsidiary texts which had appeared in Alured’s bible are absent; for example, Bodleian Library, Ms. Auct. D.4.10 contains neither the Grosseteste or Alan of Lille texts, although there are indications that the bible has lost some leaves at the beginning, where these texts would have been (the Reading ex libris inscription has been displaced from the front to the back of the volume, now on fol. 600v), and has also lost its final five folios (only stubs remain) where the Pseudo-Augustine text would have been. (Nevertheless, the loss of those leaves which might have determined this identification does not disprove the theory that the two bibles are one and the same; although the Bodleian bible does not contain texts included in Alured’s bible, physical evidence strongly suggests that Bodleian bible certainly could once have contained these texts in the same places.) However, there are two further factors which make it less likely that the Bodleian bible is that described in Alured’s letter: first, there is no calendar between the Old and New Testaments in the Bodleian bible as in Alured’s description, instead the New Testament continues immediately after the Apocrypha; and second, the order in which the texts are listed in Alured’s letter is not the same as that in the Bodleian bible, for in the latter, the concordance comes before the IHN. See Alan Coates, English Medieval Books: The Reading Abbey Collections from Foundation to Dispersal (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999): 64-5, 67, 156 (no. 64); cf. English Benedictine Libraries: The Shorter Catalogues, CBMLC 4 (1996): B73 (“Letter concerning the theft of a book, 1253”, 448-51 [449]).
Appendix I: Images

Fig. 1.1A: The Codex Amiatinus (Biblioteca Medicea-Laurenziana, Florence, Cod. Amiatino 1), fol. 5r - Ezra portrait

Fig. 1.1B: Book press

Fig. 1.1C: Small bible codex
Fig. 1.2: The Vivian Bible (now BnF, Paris, Ms. lat. 1), fol. 3v - Full-page illustration showing the work of St. Jerome in translating and distributing the Latin Bible
Fig. 1.3: Walters Art Museum, Ms. 51, fols. 1v-2r – Full-page images of the Three Living and the Three Dead (on two folios added at the front of the bible ca. 1290-1300)
Fig. 1.4: Huntington Library, San Marino CA, Ms. HM 26061, fol. 178v - Full-page Crucifixion miniature with Mary and John (facing the Canon of the Mass; fol. 179r)
Fig. 1.5: British Library, Arundel Ms. 250, fol. 3r - Full-page miniature depicting the Ark of the Covenant; one of six full-page miniatures in this bible (on fols. 1-3v) forming a cycle of images of the Old Testament
Fig. 1.6A: British Library, Yates Thompson Ms. 1 (The Fécamp Bible), fol. 4v - Large historiated Genesis initial in colors and gold, depicting Creation; the bible includes 79 such initials, located at the beginning of each biblical book and at the major divisions of the Psalms.
Fig. 1.6B: British Library, Yates Thompson Ms. 1, fol. 419v – One of the bible’s large initials with zoomorphic and foliate decoration in colors located at the beginning of prologues; in this case at the opening of Matthew, its initial depicting the Tree of Jesse.
Fig. 1.6C: British Library, Yates Thompson Ms. 1

fol. 4v: Creation initial (detail)
fol. 419v: Tree of Jesse initial (detail)
Fig. 1.7A: Bodleian Library, Oxford, Ms. Kennicott 15, p.339 – inc. psalter in parallel columns

Fig. 1.7B: Bodleian Library, Oxford, Ms. Kennicott 15, p.3 - ‘Paris’ capita lists for Genesis
Fig. 1.7C: Bodleian Library, Oxford, Ms. Kennicott 15, pp. 8-9 (Genesis XIII-XVI); showing old chapter divisions (marked by one line initials) and modern chapters (added but possibly contemporary)
Fig. 1.8A: York Minster Library Ms. XVI.N.6, fols. 121v-122

Fig. 1.8B: York Minster Library Ms. XVI.N.6

fol. 156r (Proverbs)  
fol. 161v (inc. Psalter)
Fig. 1.8C: York Minster Library Ms. XVI.N.6, fol. 318r – the opening of the IHN
Fig. 1.9A: Trinity College, Cambridge, Ms. B.10.1, fol. iir - the name “Langetonī” in the left hand margin on the ruled line marking the top of the textblock.

Fig. 1.9B: Trinity College, Cambridge, Ms. B.10.1, fol. 462r - the name “Langetonī” also added directly after the final entry of the IHN (“Zuzim consiliantes eos vel consiliatores eorum”) in the blank space of the second half of the last line: “[...]liatores eorum ~ Langetonī”.

Fig. 1.10: BnF, Paris, Ms. lat. 14417, fol. 125r – The beginning of a list of biblical incipits (on fols. 125-6), whose opening rubricated ‘heading’ explicitly attributes the ‘modern’ chapter divisions to Stephen Langton, identified here as Archbishop of Canterbury.
Fig. 1.11: BnF, Paris, Ms. lat. 10419, fols. 23v-24r – demonstrating the precise demarcation of the seven parts of each chapter with marginal letters.
Fig. 2.1A: British Library, Ms. Royal 1 B.XII, fol. 431r

Fig. 2.1B: British Library, Ms. Royal 1 B.XII, fol. 431r (detail)
Fig. 2.2B: UPenn Ms. Coll. 591, Folder 16, fol. 4r
Fig. 2.3: Rosenbach Museum & Library, Ms. 484-13, fol. 7v
Fig. 2.4: The Free Library of Philadelphia, Ms. Lewis E 42, fols. 6v-7r
Fig. 2.6: Durham Cathedral Library, Ms. A.II.19, fol. 250r
Fig. 2.7: British Library, Add. Ms. 49999, fols. 10v-11r
Fig. 2.8: Free Library of Philadelphia, Ms. Widener 9, fols. 19v-20r
Fig. 2.9: British Library, Arundel Ms. 303, fol. 353r, inc. Matthew
Fig. 2.10: Bodleian Library, Oxford, Ms. Lat. bib. e.7, fol. 5r, *inc.* Genesis
Fig. 2.14A: UPenn RBML, Bible Portfolio1: Leaf 2 ("Leaf from a Miniature Manuscript Bible / Circa. 1240 A.D.") in *Original Leaves from Famous Bibles: Nine Centuries 1121-1935 A.D., Collected and Assembled by Otto F. Ege* (Cleveland, OH: Ege?, October 1936) Shows the impression of the textblock transferred from the leaf’s verso onto the mount
Fig. 2.14B: UPenn RBML, Bible Portfolio1: Leaf 2 recto (“Leaf from a Miniature Manuscript Bible / Circa. 1240 A.D.”) in Original Leaves from Famous Bibles: Nine Centuries 1121-1935 A.D., Collected and Assembled by Otto F. Ege (Cleveland, OH: Ege?, October 1936)
Fig. 2.16A: Free Library of Philadelphia, Ms. Lewis E 39, fol. 10r; Frater Ambrose Prologue
Fig. 2.16B: FLP, Ms. Lewis E 39, fol. 10r; detail of added marginal notes
Fig. 2.16C: FLP, Ms. Lewis E 39, fol. 159v; inc. Psalter
Fig. 2.16D: FLP, Ms. Lewis E 39, fol. 150v (Job 3)
Fig. 2.16E: FLP, Ms. Lewis E 39, fol. 373v; Apocalypse (penultimate page)
Fig. 2.16F: FLP, Ms. Lewis E 39, fol. 149v; expl. Prologue to Job and inc. Job
Fig. 2.16G: FLP, Ms. Lewis E 39, fols. 301v-302r; Matthew 17-20
Fig. 2.16H: FLP, Ms. Lewis E 39, fols. 135v-136r; expl. Kings IV/Prologue to Tobit and inc. Tobit.
Fig. 3.1: Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, Ms. 66A, fol. 67r

Fig. 3.2A: CCCC Ms. 16II, fol. 30r  
Fig. 3.2B: CCCC Ms. 16II, fol. 71r
Fig. 3.3A: British Library, Ms. Harley 1748, fol. 13r (inc. Genesis)

Fig. 3.3B: British Library, Ms. Harley 1748, fol. 260v
Fig. 3.4A: Trinity College, Cambridge, Ms. B.10.1, fol. 399r (inc. Selections from Isidore’s *Etymologies*, fols. 399r-410v)
Fig. 3.4C: Trinity College, Cambridge, Ms. B.10.1, fol. ii

The text appears to be a page from an ancient manuscript, written in Latin. The content is not clearly visible due to the image quality.
Fig. 3.5A: UPenn RBML, Ms. Codex 1053, Vol. II, fols. 129r (inc. list of pericopes)
Fig. 3.5B: UPenn RBML, Ms. Codex 1053, Vol. II, fol. 130r (inc. highly abbreviated capitula lists; on this folio, for Genesis)
Fig. 3.6A: York Minster Library Ms. XVI.N.6, fol. iiiv

Fig. 3.6B: York Minster Library Ms. XVI.N.6, fol. iiiv
Fig. 3.6C: York Minster Library Ms. XVI.N.6, fol. viv

Fig. 3.6D: York Minster Library Ms. XVI.N.6, fol. viv
Fig. 3.6E: York Minster Library Ms. XVI.N.6, fol. iiiiv

Fig. 3.6F: York Minster Library Ms. XVI.N.6, fol. 121v
Fig. 3.7A: UPenn RBML, Ms. Codex 1560, fol. 60v
Fig. 3.7B: UPenn RBML, Ms. Codex 1560, fol. 1r
Fig. 3.8A: CUL, Ms. Kk.5.10, fol. 1r (detail) -
Shows the opening of the *Adaptationes Veteris ac Novi Testamenti*, attributed to Adam de Dora (fols. 1r-8v) which precedes the Bible text; rubric reads: “???”.

Fig. 3.8B: CUL, Ms. Kk.5.10, fol. 8v (detail) -
Shows the end of the *Adaptationes Veteris ac Novi Testamenti*, attributed to Adam de Dora (fols. 1r-8v); rubric reads: “Explitiunt Adaptaci[on]es uet[er]is ac noui testament[j].”
Fig. 3.9A: Bodleian Library, Ms. Auct. D.4.10, fol. ir
Fig. 3.9B: Bodleian Library, Ms. Auct. D.4.10, fol. 586v
Fig. 3.9C: Bodleian Library, Ms. Auct. D.4.10, fol. 503r – Real Concordance
Fig. 3.10A: CUL, Ms. Dd.8.12, fol. 463r

Fig. 3.10B: CUL, Ms. Dd.8.12, fol. 464r
Fig. 3.11: Corpus Christi College, Cambridge; Ms. 437, fol. 2v
Fig. 3.12A: Corpus Christi College, Cambridge; Ms. 246, fol. 400v
Fig. 3.13: York Minster Library Ms. XVI.N.6, fol. vir
Fig. 3.14D: FLP, Ms. Lewis E 39, fol. 9r

Top half:

Bottom half:
Fig. 3.15A: CCC, Ms. 437, fol. 284 – Beginning of *themata* for sermons at the back of the bible (fols. 284r-95r)
Fig. 3.15B: CCCC, Ms. 437, fol. 295r – Beginning of an abbreviated concordance-type list of topics in the Gospels (fol. 295r-96r)
Fig. 3.18: NYPL, Ms. MA 12, fol. 596r
Fig. 3.19A: British Library, London, Ms. Egerton 2867, fol. 424r - Calendar, Sept. to Dec.
Fig. 3.19B: British Library, London, Ms. Egerton 2867, fol. 424r (detail); the feast of the Dedication of St. Martin’s Priory, Dover (“Dedicatio ecclesie sancti Martini de Dovor”), 19 October in the Calendar
Fig. 3.19C: British Library, London, Ms. Egerton 2867, fol. 534r – Lections
Fig. 3.20A: UPenn RBML, Ms. Codex 236, fol. 402v – Illuminated [historiated] ‘‘T’’ initial (“Te igitur…””) depicting the Crucifixion which marks the beginning of the Missal
Fig. 3.20B: UPenn RBML, Ms. Codex 236, fol. 460r - incipits (fols. 460r-62v)
Fig. 3.20C: UPenn RBML, Ms. Codex 236, fols. 460v-461r
Fig. 3.21: Bodleian Library, Oxford, Ms. Lat. Bib. e.7, fol. 199v – Missal text
Fig. 3.22A: British Library, Harley Ms. 2813, fol. 228r - Missal Text

Fig. 3.22B: British Library, Harley Ms. 2813, fol. 227v (detail) – Entry for the Feast of St. Francis
Fig. 4.1: Stockholm, Kungliga Bibliotek, Cod. Ms. A.148 (The Codex Gigas), fol. 81r – Jerome’s preface to the Psalter plus the beginning of the Psalter’s text.
Fig. 4.3: CCCC Ms. 246, fol. i v: “P[re]ciu[m] ---- iiij marc[us]”

Fig. 4.4: British Library, Ms. Burney 1, fol. 1v

Fig. 4.5: British Library, Ms. Burney 5, fol. 1r
Fig. 4.6A: Bodleian Library, Oxford, Ms. Auct. D.3.2, fol. 198r

Fig. 4.6B: Bodleian Library, Oxford, Ms. Auct. D.3.2, fol. 122r
Fig. 4.7A: British Library, Royal Ms. 3.E.V, fol. 90v-91r

Fig. 4.7B: British Library, Royal Ms. 3.E.V, fol. 90v-91r
Fig. 4.8A: BL, Royal Ms. 1.D.1, fol. 1r (full page)
Fig. 4.8B: BL, Royal Ms. 1.D.I, fol. 1r (details)

Franciscans

Dominicans

Carmelites

Pied Friars?
Fig. 4.8C: BL, Royal Ms. 1.D.1, fol. 4v – Miniature depicting the Crucifixion, the Virgin, Saint Martin and the days of creation; also including possible portrait of the bible’s patron (lower margin, beneath the miniature)
Fig. 5.1A: Durham Cathedral Library, Ms. B.IV.24, fol. 2r. The beginning of the mid 12th-century book list. The reference to “A Martilog” at the head of col. b corresponds to entries in the Spendement inventories.

Fig. 5.1B: Durham Cathedral Library, Ms. B.IV.24, fol. 2r (detail)
Fig. 5.2: The north-west corner of Durham Cathedral’s cloisters - Free-standing *almaria* were located in the north range, backing against the cathedral’s southern wall; the door to the Spendement is in the west range, close to the corner.

Fig. 5.3: Cambridge University Library Ms. Kk.5.10, fol. 8v - The cataloguing hand of Thomas Swalwell, monk and ‘librarian’ of Durham (d. ca. 1539) at the front of a Durham bible:


*Iste Liber assignat almariolo novicioz m Thoma Swalwell sacre theologie professore an[no] d[omini] ([…o])
Fig. 5.4A: Durham Cathedral Library, Ms. B.IV.46, fol. 1r - Durham’s 1392 Spendement inventory
Fig. 5.4B: Durham Cathedral Library, Ms. B.IV.46, fol. 34r - Durham's second Spendement inventory (1395)
Fig. 5.5A: Durham Cathedral Library, Ms. B.IV.46, fol. 19r – Durham Cathedral priory’s 1395 inventory of those of its books kept and used in the cloister; headed “Libraria claustralis dunelmensis.”
Fig. 5.5B: Durham Cathedral Library, Ms. B.IV.46, fol. 19r (detail) – The first part of the section recording the bibles (“Libri biblic”) listed in Durham Cathedral priory’s 1395 inventory of its Cloister collection (entries A to G)

Fig. 5.5C: Durham Cathedral Library, Ms. B.IV.46, fol. 19v (detail) – The end of the ‘Bibles’ section in Durham Cathedral priory’s 1395 inventory of its Cloister collection (from the end of entry G through entry J)
Fig. 5.6: Durham Cathedral Library, Ms. A.II.3, fol. 2r - first folio of the biblical text; its Dunelmian provenance recorded in an 18th-century hand above the rubricated incipit of Jerome’s Prologue (“Liber Ecclesiae Cathedalis Dunelm”)
Fig. 5.7B: British Library, Burney Ms. 3, fol. 2r - inscription reads: “Biblia Roberti Abbatis de librario sancti August[ini Cant’]”

Fig. 5.7C: British Library, Burney Ms. 3, fol. 2r - inscription reads: “Abbe: bollo / Robe Augi’(?).”
Fig. 5.7D: British Library, Burney Ms. 3, fol. 2r - The initials of Clement of Canterbury

Fig. 5.8: British Library, Burney Ms. 11, bottom of fol. 54r – Ownership inscription of Clement of Canterbury
Fig. 5.9: Corpus Christi College, Cambridge Ms. 49, fol. iv.v – This front flyleaf bears both the inscription of Geoffrey’s name recording the bible’s St. Augustine’s provenance (“Biblia G. de Langele minor”) and a list of the books of the Bible and their order in this copy (running down the outer edge of the page)
Fig. 5.10A: Lambeth Palace Library, Ms. 371, fol. 1r – The text of Frater Aluredus’ letter recording the theft of his bible (begins at the large ‘O’ initial in blue [“Omnibus”] at the head of the page)
Fig. 5.10B: Lambeth Palace Library, Ms. 371, fol. 1r (detail) – The first half of Frater Aluredus’ letter, from his opening salutation (“Omnibus matris ecclesie filiiis ad quos presentes littere…”, line 1) through the start of the section in which he describes the contents of his bible (“Hec autem in dicta byblia scripta continebantur…”, line 17)
Appendix II: Supplementary Texts


i The Gautier Lebaude Atelier

13 of the 15 manuscripts attributed to the Gautier Lebaude Atelier are Bibles and 10 of these 13 Bibles are ‘portable’ size (5 ‘pocket’ and 5 ‘Saddle Bag’).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Current Location</th>
<th>Size (mm)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early (5)</td>
<td>Biblioteca Nacional, Madrid, Ms. 553</td>
<td>193 x 133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frankfurt, Stadtbibliothek, Lat. qu. 56 (Ausst. 23)</td>
<td>256 x 174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Huntington Library, San Marino, CA, Ms. HM 1074</td>
<td>174 x 119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Princeton, NJ, Scheide Ms. 4</td>
<td>138 x 96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Biblioteca Ambrosiana, Milan, Ms. Q 34 Sup.</td>
<td>238 x 160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late (5)</td>
<td>Wadham College, Oxford Ms. 1 [A.5.2]</td>
<td>235 x 168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bodleian Library, Oxford, Ms. Canon. Bibl. lat. 47</td>
<td>212 x 152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Williams College, Williamstown, Mass., Ms. Loan 505</td>
<td>207 x 140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Newberry Library, Chicago Ms. 18</td>
<td>150 x 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Cod. Reg. lat. 1-2</td>
<td>158 x 115 (in 2 vols.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


2084 The three Gautier Lebaude Atelier ‘lectern’ Bibles (all ‘Early’) are BnF, Paris, Ms. Latin 14397 (355 x 225 mm), Ex-Miles Burkitt (355 x 266 mm) and BnF, Paris, Ms. Latin 36 (328 x 200 mm).
ii The Mathurin Atelier

29 manuscripts attributed to Mathurin Atelier (25 ‘outright’ plus four ‘Closely Related’) and of this total, 27 are bibles, all of them in portable format (24 ‘pocket’ - including all four ‘Closely Related’ - and 3 ‘Saddle Bag’)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributed Outright / Closely Related</th>
<th>Current Location</th>
<th>Size (mm)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attributed outright (23)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NY, Union Theological Seminary Ms. 46</td>
<td></td>
<td>185 x 135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Walters Art Museum, Ms. 58</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>222 x 150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Codex Reginensis lat. 3</td>
<td>180 x 120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koninklijke Bibliotheek, The Hague, Ms. 10 E 33</td>
<td>155 x 112</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge, Ms. 5</td>
<td>184 x 133</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bodleian Library, Oxford, Ms. Canon. Bibl. lat. 15</td>
<td>145 x 99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UVA, Charlottesville, Ms. Alderman 4</td>
<td>157 x 105</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenkintown, PA, Lessing J. Rosenwald Collection 31</td>
<td>139 x 95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Morgan Library &amp; Museum, NY, Ms. Glazier 15</strong></td>
<td>175 x 121</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hatfield House, Marquis of Salisbury Collection, Cecil Papers 309</td>
<td>157 x 105</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Library, Ms. Yates Thompson 41</td>
<td>152 x 103</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BnF, Paris, Ms. Latin 228</td>
<td>127 x 92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BnF, Paris, Ms. Latin 233A</td>
<td>142 x 98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BnF, Paris, Ms. Latin 203</td>
<td>149 x 104</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Museum of Art, NY, X.418 (B 483)</td>
<td>139 x 94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliothèque Royale de Belgique, Brussels, Ms. 10518</td>
<td>146 x 96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliothèque Royale de Belgique, Brussels, Ms. 10521</td>
<td>155 x 102</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard University, Ms. Latin 264</td>
<td>165 x 116</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BnF, Paris, Ms. Latin 16265</td>
<td>139 x 98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Boulogne-sur-Mer, Ms. 6</strong></td>
<td>291 x 200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham Cathedral Library, Ms. A.IV.30</td>
<td>235 x 147</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chester Beatty Library, Dublin, Ms. 53</td>
<td>164 x 108</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BL, Ms. ? (olim Holkham Hall, Norfolk, Ms. 10)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>‘Closely Related’ (4)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Paul im Lavanttal 20/2.4</td>
<td>171 x 113</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Genesis only; rest + Du Prat Atelier)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koninklijke Bibliotheek, The Hague 132 F 21</td>
<td>133 x 83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BL, Yates Thompson Ms. 1 (NT only [Hand IV])</td>
<td>143 x 91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biblioteca Nacional, Madrid, Ms. Res. 253 (Vitr. 2.4)</td>
<td>149 x 100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

2086 Purchased at auction by The Chester Beatty Library, Dublin, Sotheby’s, *Chester Beatty, Western Manuscripts, Part 2* (24 June 1969), Lot 50 (DBM ID# 3093); cf. entry in Millar’s catalogue II: 42-7.
2087 Acquired by the British Museum in 1952 [with the assistance of the National Art Collections Fund, the Pilgrim Trust and Friends of the National Libraries] as part of a purchase of twelve Holkham manuscripts; cf. *A Handlist of the Manuscripts in the Library of the Earl of Leicester at Holkham Hall*, abstracted from the catalogues of William Roscoe & Frederic Madden and annotated by Seymour de Ricci (Oxford: OUP for the Bibliographical Society, 1932); 2.
iii The Soissons Atelier

18 of the 21 manuscripts attributed to the Soissons Atelier are bibles, 14 of which are portable size (12 ‘pocket’ and 2 ‘Saddle Bag’) and 4 Lectern

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ms. Current Location</th>
<th>Size (mm)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Cod. Ross. 317</td>
<td>160 x 117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bamberg, Staatsbibliothek, Msc. Bibl. 8 (A.I.22)</td>
<td>152 x 110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BnF, Paris, Ms. Latin 212</td>
<td>180 x 120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koninklijke Bibliotheek, The Hague, Ms. 10 E35</td>
<td>126 x 81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntington Library, San Marino CA, Ms. HM 1070</td>
<td>144 x 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Museum of Art, NY, Ms. 31.134.9</td>
<td>152 x 98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BnF, Paris, Ms. Latin 200</td>
<td>146 x 108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princeton, NJ, Ms. Scheide 7</td>
<td>260 x 180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pécs, Század Másolik Negyede, Püspöki Könyvár, Ms. O.IX.10</td>
<td>136 x 92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beinecke RBML, Yale University, Ms. 433</td>
<td>185 x 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library of Congress, Washington DC, Ms. 71</td>
<td>150 x 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westminster Abbey, London, Ms. 3</td>
<td>155 x 112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westminster Abbey, London, Ms. 4</td>
<td>150 x 105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliothèque Royale de Belgique, Ms. 2053</td>
<td>221 x 160</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R. Branner (1977): 77-8, Appendix V H 216-17 and Figs. 174-84; cf. Robert Branner, "The ‘Soissons Bible’ Paintshop in Thirteenth-Century Paris," Speculum 44.1 (Jan. 1969): 13-34, which includes discussion of the following bibles: Bibliothèque Royale de Belgique, Ms. 2053 (221 x 160 mm), Metropolitan Museum of Art, NY, Ms. 31.134.9 (152 x 98 mm), BnF, Paris, Ms. Latin 16748-9 (I: 465 x 345mm, II: 475 x 343 mm), Princeton, NJ, Ms. Scheide 7 (260 x 180 mm), and Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Cod. Ross. 317 (160 x 117 mm)

The four Soissons atelier ‘lectern’ bibles are Holkham Hall Ms. 9 (3 vols.; ca. 391 x 265 mm), BnF, Paris, Ms. Latin 16748-9 (2 vols.; 465-75 x 343-5 mm), Soissons 63 (356 x 234 mm) and Naples V.LAA.10 (348 x 230 mm)

From the bequest of Gwynne M. Andrews (formerly B 482)
iv The Aurifaber Atelier

32 out of the 35 manuscripts attributed to the Aurifaber Atelier are bibles, and 30 of these 32 are portable bibles (22 ‘pocket’ and 8 ‘Saddle Bag’) and 1 ‘lectern’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ms. Current Location</th>
<th>Size (mm)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Newberry Library, Chicago, Ms. 19</td>
<td>139 x 94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BnF, Paris, Ms. Latin 226</td>
<td>148 x 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Württembergische Landesbibl., Stuttgart, Bibl. qu. 8</td>
<td>220 x 148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bodleian Library, Oxford, Ms Broxb. 89,9</td>
<td>168 x 105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lille Ms. 37 (5) + Guines atelier</td>
<td>155 x 103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bodleian Library, Oxford, Ms. E.D. Clarke 31</td>
<td>157 x 110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musée Dobrée, Nantes, Ms. VII</td>
<td>124 x 96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sion College, London, Ms. Arc. L.40.2/L.3</td>
<td>148 x 102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>now ? (King Haakon’s Bible) (olim Beatty 52)</td>
<td>146 x 92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliothèque Ste.-Geneviève, Paris, Ms. 1184</td>
<td>226 x 145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koninklijke Bibliotek, The Hague, Ms. 10 E 36</td>
<td>139 x 92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chester Beatty Library, Dublin, Ms. 51</td>
<td>254 x 172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BnF, Paris, Ms. Latin 10426</td>
<td>154 x 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library of Congress, Washington DC, Ms. 19</td>
<td>161 x 113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BnF, Paris, Ms. Latin 13155-7 (now in 3 vols., badly trimmed)</td>
<td>ca. 107 x 75 (all 3 vols.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bodleian Library, Oxford, Ms. Canon. Bibl. lat. 15 +Mathurin atelier</td>
<td>145 x 99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Library, Add. Ms. 35085</td>
<td>125 x 80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Vienna, Ms. 1125</td>
<td>190 x 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>??? (Ex-Olschki 35352)</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2091 R. Branner (1977): App. V O 231-3. Recent proposed additions to the bibles produced in The Aurifaber Atelier include: Dr. Jorn Gunther Rare Books AG, Highlights of Dr. Jorn Gunther (May 2014): no. 2 (ca. 1250-75, Paris [585 fols.m 188 x 128 mm + 13 HIs and 134 DIs]; Provenance - Karl Ludwig of Wittelsbach, Son of Frederick V, ‘der Winterkonig’; Dr. Jorn Gunther Rare Books AG); SDBM ID# 234574.

2092 The single Aurifaber atelier ‘lectern’ bible is Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Munich, CLM2092 10001-2 (2 vols.; ‘Folio’).


2094 Probably of Parisian origin; written in a small hand of ordinary type resembling Millar (The Library of A. Chester Beatty) 52 (Dearden [2012]: no. 218). 84 historiated and 60 decorated initials in French style, all good average examples.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Library/Institution</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>British Library, Ms. Harley 1297</td>
<td>246 x 163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kunstmuseum, Öffentliche Kunstsammlung, Basel, KK inv.A 11 (U.IX.30)</td>
<td>194 x 135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koninklijke Bibliotheek, The Hague, Ms. 10 E 34</td>
<td>114 x 81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biblioteca Nacional, Madrid, Ms. Res. 188</td>
<td>168 x 116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biblioteca Nacional, Madrid, Ms. 559</td>
<td>186 x 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliothèque Ste.-Geneviève, Paris, Ms. 1181</td>
<td>264 x 185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge, Ms. 1060-1975</td>
<td>264 x 185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musée Dobrée, Nantes, Ms. VIII (in 2 vols. w/gloss of Hugh of St.-Cher)</td>
<td>270 x 180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Library, Add. Ms. 16140 (Part Bible)</td>
<td>298 x 201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biblioteca Nacional, Madrid, Ms. Vitr. 23-7</td>
<td>142 x 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law Society, London, Ms. 107.f (sold 2013; now?)2096</td>
<td>122 x 80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lambeth Palace Library, Ms. 1364</td>
<td>155 x 105</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2095 Cited as “London, Private Collection” (ex-Yates Thompson 1) by Branner (1977): 232. Previously in Tempsford Hall Library; William Stuart sale at Christie’s, 6 March 1895, Lot 145, purchased by Yates Thompson [his Ms. 1] [SDBM ID# 49961]; sold to Sir Sydney Cockerell, 19 February 1914 [no. 71 – “Bible from Notre Dame Cathedral”- in de Hamel (1987): 203]; sold by Cockerell to Quaritch for £5,000 on 18 January 1957; sold by them for £6,500 on 12 March 1957 to Henry Davis; given by him in 1975 to the Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge; see description in M.R. James, A Descriptive Catalogue of Fifty Manuscripts from the Collection of Henry Yates Thompson (Cambridge: CUP, 1898): 1-5 (Description: Ms. 1: France, 1280-1300, 473 fols., 10⅞ x 7⅛ inches [= 260 x 181 mm], 2 cols./55 lines + 5 HIs)

2096 On loan/ housed at Canterbury Cathedral; N.R. Ker, MMIBL I (1964): / Sold at Sotheby’s 5 June 2013 (‘Highlights from the Mendham Collection, Property of the Law Society of England and Wales,’ Sale L13409), Lot 11 (Sold for £25,000 to ?).
15 of the 36 manuscripts attributed to the Johannes Grusch Atelier are bibles, and 10 of these 15 are portable bibles (7 Pocket’ and 3 ‘Saddle Bag’) and 4 Lectern

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>‘Period’</th>
<th>Ms. Current Location</th>
<th>Size (mm)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early (3)</td>
<td>Ex-Cuthbert Adamson Collection</td>
<td>125 x 84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Free Library of Philadelphia, Ms. Lewis E 242 (Patou Bible)</td>
<td>175 x 123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Biblioteca Nacional, Madrid, Ms. Res. 188 + Aurifaber (1st part)</td>
<td>168 x 116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle (1)</td>
<td>BnF, Paris, Ms. Latin 179</td>
<td>235 x 156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late (6)</td>
<td>Sarnen, Collegium, Ms. 16</td>
<td>250 x 170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BnF, Paris, Ms. Latin 15475</td>
<td>290 x 198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BnF, Paris, Ms. Latin 211</td>
<td>165 x 110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Vienna, Ms. 1150</td>
<td>140 x 94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Metropolitan Museum of Art, NY, Ms. X.418 (B 483) + Mathurin</td>
<td>139 x 94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>British Library, Add. Ms. 54235 (Ex-Millar)</td>
<td>131 x 88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only 15/36 of the manuscripts Branner attributes to the Johannes Grusch Atelier are bibles; see Branner (1977): 82-6, Appendix V: 222-23 and Figs. 212-43. The Atelier is so-named for the canon Fr. Johannes Grusch who copied one of its bibles in 1267 (Sarnen, Collegium Ms. 16; 250 x 170 mm); see Branner (1977): 82, 86, 156, 223 & Fig. 239. Also three recent proposed additions to the bibles produced in The Johannes Grusch Atelier: 1 Gunther/Ferrini/Roth, Illumination… (26 July 2002); no. 1 [SDBM ID# 30280] [Attr: “Johannes Grusch Atelier”: 1265, Paris [437 fols., 151 x 102 mm, 2 cols./50 lines + 81 HIs and 100 DIs]; Provenance: Newborough; F**]; 2 Dr. Jörn Gunther Rare Books AG, Masterpieces, Catalogue 9 (2008): No. 9 [SDBM ID# 125197] [Attr: “Johannes Grusch Atelier, style”: 1288, S. France [533 fols., 356 x 245 mm, 2 cols./53 lines + 80 HIs and 69 DIs]; Provenance: Brooke; Millard; Quaritch; Doheny; Ritman; Gunther; Qf: De Ricci: I, 21, no. 4; Supp: 21, no.4]; 3 Ex-Schoyen Collection Ms. 251 (154 x 102 mm); 1263, Paris , France [338 fols. 154 x 102 mm, 2 cols./44 lines + 72 HIs]; Provenance: Dominican Convent Lyon; Charles IV; Napoleone Bonaparte; Arthur Wellesley, The Duke of Wellington; Christie’s London, Valuable Printed Books and Manuscripts (Sale 5334), 13 June 2012, Lot 7; not sold at auction; subsequently purchased by Quaritch (Sales History pre-2012: Sotheby’s, Western Manuscripts and Miniatures (Sale: SWITHUN), 19 June 1979, Lot 42; Sam Fogg, Catalogue 12: Medieval Manuscripts (1989): no. 6; [sold to Schoyen?]).

Appendix II.B: A Compilation of Recorded Prices Paid for Manuscript Bibles, or Sums for which they were Valued, 1200-1500 (as discussed in Chapter 4)

**Price Categories:** Here, a bible priced/valued at £2 is included in the ‘£2-£4’ category, and a bible priced/valued at £4 in the ‘£4-£6’ category etc.

**Color Key:** Small bibles in red, large bibles in blue and multi-volume bibles in purple; small bibles known to be 13th-century portable bibles in red and underlined

**Currency Conversion:** All prices converted to British pounds sterling, shillings and pence (£ s d; 1 pound sterling (£) = 20s or 240d / 1 shilling = 12d); the currency as given in each respective source noted after ‘converted’ currency in square brackets, e.g. “£4 [marcs]”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E.g. no.</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>User Group</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type of Transaction</th>
<th>Price/Valuation (£ s d)</th>
<th>Categories of ‘Price/Amount’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Under £2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>ca. 1277</td>
<td>Bishop</td>
<td>Will</td>
<td></td>
<td>£2 13s 4d [4 marcs]</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ca. 1263</td>
<td>Abbot</td>
<td>Abbey Records</td>
<td></td>
<td>£? [200 livres tournois]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1313</td>
<td>Bishop</td>
<td>Inventory of effects (post mortem)</td>
<td>4a £10 (in 13-vols.)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4b £4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4c £1 (20s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>ca. 1349</td>
<td>Royal Administrator</td>
<td>Sale recorded in secondary source</td>
<td>5a £2 (40s)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(also rector, archdeacon &amp; canon)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>ca. 1376</td>
<td>Archbishop of Canterbury</td>
<td>Valuation by merchants (post mortem)</td>
<td>£? [12 francs]</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>ca. 1397</td>
<td>Nobility/</td>
<td>Inventory of</td>
<td>7a £3 6s 8d (66s 8d)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aristocratic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1473</td>
<td>Monk</td>
<td>Note in bible</td>
<td>£1 (20s)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1462</td>
<td>Chaplain (at the University of Oxford)</td>
<td>Note in bible</td>
<td>£2 (40s)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1458</td>
<td>Monk?</td>
<td>Note in bible</td>
<td>£? [12 florins]</td>
<td>X?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>ca. 1463-80</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>Note in bible</td>
<td>£3 6s 8d</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1462</td>
<td>Fellow of College in London</td>
<td>Note in bible</td>
<td>£4 2s 8d [6 marcs 40d]</td>
<td>X?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>14th century</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Note in bible</td>
<td>£2 13s 4d [4 marcs]</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>14th century</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Note in bible</td>
<td>£10</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>15th century</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Note in bible</td>
<td>£2 2s</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>15th century</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Note in bible</td>
<td>£3 16s 8d [5 marcs]</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.g. #</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>User Group</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Amount (£ s d)</td>
<td>Categories of ‘Amount’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Under £2</td>
<td>£2-£4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1328</td>
<td>Major secular clergy</td>
<td>Bishop</td>
<td>18a £10</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Inventory of books <em>(post mortem)</em></td>
<td>18b 13s 14d</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18c £1 (20s)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1357-8</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bishop</td>
<td>£2 (40s)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1423</td>
<td>Minor secular clergy</td>
<td>Archbishop</td>
<td>£10</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>ca. 1404</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bishop</td>
<td>£6 13s 4d</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1385</td>
<td></td>
<td>Canon → Archdeacon</td>
<td>£2 (40s)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1342</td>
<td></td>
<td>Archdeacon/Royal Administrator</td>
<td>£2 (40s)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>1448</td>
<td></td>
<td>Canon residentiary</td>
<td>£6 13s 4d</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>1462</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rector</td>
<td>£2 (40s)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>ca. 1429</td>
<td></td>
<td>Members of the Universities or those associated with them</td>
<td>£3 6s 8d</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26+</td>
<td>ca. 1458</td>
<td></td>
<td>Corpus Christi College, Cambridge</td>
<td>£3 6s 8d</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>ca. 1440</td>
<td></td>
<td>Peterhouse, Cambridge</td>
<td>£2 (40s)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>1439</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pembroke College, Cambridge</td>
<td>£3 6s 8d</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>1444</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pembroke College, Cambridge</td>
<td>£2 13s</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>1344</td>
<td></td>
<td>Merton College, N/A</td>
<td>£3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>1453</td>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>Fellow</td>
<td>Inventory of goods (<em>post mortem</em>)</td>
<td>£6 13 4d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>1368</td>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>Fellow</td>
<td>Will</td>
<td>£2 (40s)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>1354</td>
<td>Exeter College, Oxford</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>College Register</td>
<td>£3</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>1357</td>
<td>Exeter College, Oxford</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>College Register</td>
<td>£3</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>1358</td>
<td>Exeter College, Oxford</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>College Register</td>
<td>£3</td>
<td>X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>1374</td>
<td>New College, Oxford</td>
<td>Barber</td>
<td>College Register</td>
<td>£2 13s 4d [4 marcs]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>ca. 1400?</td>
<td>New College, Oxford</td>
<td>Founder</td>
<td>Will</td>
<td>£2 13s 4d (53s 4d)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>ca. 1387</td>
<td>New College, Oxford</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>College Register?</td>
<td>£1 6s 8d</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>ca. 1387</td>
<td>New College, Oxford</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>College Register?</td>
<td>£1</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>1404</td>
<td>Winchester College, Oxford</td>
<td>Founder</td>
<td>Will</td>
<td>£5 6s 8d [8 marcs]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>1410</td>
<td>Winchester College, Oxford</td>
<td>Fellow</td>
<td>Will</td>
<td>£2 13s 4d [4 marcs]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>ca. 1421/2 2?</td>
<td>Winchester College, Oxford</td>
<td>Fellow</td>
<td>Will</td>
<td>£2 13s 4d [4 marcs] <em>but later</em> £2 (40s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>ca. 1428/2 9?</td>
<td>Winchester College, Oxford</td>
<td>Fellow</td>
<td>Will</td>
<td>£4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>ca. 1428/2 9?</td>
<td>Winchester College, Oxford</td>
<td>Fellow</td>
<td>Will</td>
<td>£2 (40s)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>(ca.1434 ?)</td>
<td>Winchester College, Oxford</td>
<td>Scholar</td>
<td>Will</td>
<td>£4 6s 8d</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix II.C: Letter concerning the theft of a bible from Reading Abbey, 1253 (Lambeth Palace MS 371, fol. 1r).\textsuperscript{2101}

Omnibus matris ecclesie filiis ad quos presentes littere peruenerint frater Aluredus dictus sacrista Radingie eternam in Domino salutem.

Cum secundum apostolum omnes unum corpus simus in Christo, inuicem alerius membra iustum est ut uno membro patiente compatiantur uniueri adeo ut damna singulis irogata uelut in se suscepta reputent communia. Proinde uobis uniueris et singulis dolentes innotescendum duximus quod anno gracie m\textsuperscript{iii} cc\textsuperscript{liii} mense iulio circa festum sancte Margarete martiris suadebat et proinde saeculo suo quibus hic mundus plenus est 1 biblia una parua mensure quasi unius palmi et dimidii in qua multa utilia scripta continebantur de claustro nostro furtum sublata est.\textsuperscript{2102} Pro quo non tam furto quam sacrilegio terribilis sentential a domino Sarum episcopo et toto collegio nostro prouulugata est. Dicta eciam sententia postea per totum archidiaconatum Berk’ in omnibus ruralibus capitulis sollemniter denunciata et publicata fuit tam in auctores sceleris quam in ipsius byblie detentores a tempore noticie. Quocirca uniuersitatem uestram rogamus attentius et exhortamur in Domino quatinus si penes aliquem uestrum dicta byblia sit deposita uel pigori obligata seu quocumque precio comparata hoc ispum nobis significare curetis, certissime scituri quod sine omni cauillatione pretium ipsum seu mutuum uobis integere refundemus, dum tamen ipsam byblia resuperare possimus.

Hec autem in dicta byblia scripta continebantur, uidelicet in principio libri fuit a\textsuperscript{2103} tractatus domini Roberti quondam Lincolniensis episcopi qui sic incipit, Templum Domini. Deinde b cherubin de confessione et c descriptio candelabri et significacio eiusdem. Deinde d series sanctorum partum ab Adam usque ad Christum, i. arbor hystorie scolastice nobiliter depicta et illuminata, post quam e byblia. Item post psalterium ante Parabolas Salomonis est f kalendarium integrum. Item in fine Ecclesiastici, scilicet ante nouum testamentum, est g annotatio epistolarem et euangeliorem que per annum legentur, per quam scrii potest quoto (sic) capitulo inueniri debent. Item post bybliam sunt h uersus de recapitulatione utriusque testamenti. Post quos i interpretaciones secundum Remigium. Deinde j concordancie bybliotece secundum Reimundum. Item post quos k quidam prologi qui defuerunt in dicta byblia. Post quos l diffiniciones secundum ordinem alfabeti. Post quas m plures uersus de iiijer euangelistis. Post quos n Augustinus de spiritu et anima.

Tenor huius littere bene signatus missus fuit per totam Angliam per breuiiores nostros et nihil certum inueniri uel audiri potuit de dicta byblia, quod grauiter confolemus.


\textsuperscript{2102} Italics mine.

\textsuperscript{2103} I reproduce here Sharpe’s editorial alphabetical identification of this bible’s contents.
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