Audience and Amendment of Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 383 in the first half of the twelfth century

Thomas Gobbit

Institute for Medieval Studies, University of Leeds

1. Introduction

1.1 Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 383

Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 383 (henceforth CCCC 383),[1] is predominantly a collection of Anglo-Saxon law-codes and related tracts copied by one hand ca. 1100.[2] The manuscript was possibly produced at St. Paul's Cathedral, London, or was moved there early in the twelfth century.[3] The manuscript has been described by Patrick Wormald as one of a number of 'legal encyclopaedias', which he primarily defines as containing '*nothing* but law' [original emphasis],[4] although this article will argue that this term may be misleading.

Of the original quires of CCCC 383, seven are extant, as labelled in Figure 1 below with numerals. At least two quires, possibly more, are now missing. The former existence of the missing quires can be inferred from texts which are now

---

[1] Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 383 (?London: ?St. Paul's Cathedral, c. 1100). The manuscript has been catalogued variously as Felix Liebermann's **B**, Neil Ker's **65**, Helmut Gneuss' **102** and Timothy Graham's **55**.

[2] The date of production should be understood as within ten years of c. 1100 as it is based on palaeographical grounds given by Neil Ker as s. xi/xii, meaning the end of the eleventh of start of the twelfth century; Neil Ripley Ker, *Catalogue of Manuscripts Containing Anglo-Saxon*, (Oxford: Clarendon, 1957, rev edn 1990), p. xx.

[3] *Die Gesetze Der Angelsachsen*, ed. by Felix Liebermann, 3 vols. (Halle: Niemeyer, 1903-1916), I, xix; Montague Rhodes James, *A Descriptive Catalogue of Manuscripts in the Library of Corpus Christi College Cambridge*, 2 vols (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1912), II, 230-31; Ker, *Catalogue*, pp. 110-13; Timothy Graham, '55. Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 383' in *Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts in Microfiche Facsimile, XI, Corpus Christi College, Cambridge*, ed. by Timothy Graham and others (Tempe, Arizona: Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 2003), pp. 74-80. Helmut Gneuss, *Handlist of Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts: A List of Manuscripts and Manuscript Fragments Written or Owned in England up to 1100* (Tempe, Arizona: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 2001), p. 37.

[4] Patrick Wormald, *The Making of English Law: From King Alfred to the Twelfth Century* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1999), pp. 165, 224.

truncated and have been discussed in some detail by Wormald.[5] To summarise, quire 1 ends part way through the law-code known as II Athelstan while quires 2 and 3 begin part way in to Ælfred's *Domboc* and the laws of Cnut, respectively. In addition to this, the position of the law-code known as *Be Blasarium* shows that quire 1, which contains the final 3 lines of the tract, is displaced and should follow quire 3 as it ends with the initial seven lines of the tract.[6] A further two quires (as well as flyleaves) were supplied in the sixteenth century, as labelled in Figure 1 below with capitals.

	A^{10}	1^6	2^8	3^8	B^{10}	4^8	5^8	6^8	7^8	
	lacks 10		lacks 6		lacks 8-10			3 & 6 are half-sheets	3 & 6 are half-sheets	
	fols 1-9	fols 10-15	fols 16-22	fols 23-30	fols 31-37	fols 38-45	fols 46-53	fols 54-61	fols 62-69	
ii flyleaves	ix	21			7	32				ii flyleaves

FIGURE 1: QUIRAGE AND FOLIATION OF CCCC 383 IN ITS CURRENT FORM.

The main focus of this discussion will be on the extant quires of ca 1100, their emendation throughout the first half of the twelfth century and an analysis of these elements using the tract known as *Gerefa* as a case study. From this, arguments will be posited for the manner in which the manuscript was used in the first half of the twelfth century, some of the specific interests of its users and audience and in particular the relationship of CCCC 383 with the position, duties and values of the reeve.

1.2 Contexts of production and use of CCCC 383

The evidence for the connection between CCCC 383 and St. Paul's Cathedral is, at best, tenuous. A hand dating to the first half of the twelfth century, Hand 2, which may also have amended the other law-codes against the exemplar, added two further

---

[5] Ibid., pp. 230-31.
[6] Ibid., pp. 230-31.

tracts on the final folio of quire 7.[7] The first of these, known as the *[S]cipmen* list (fol. 69[r], L. 15 to fol. 69[v], L. 2), details the number of people owing service from a number of estates, the majority of which can be demonstrated as belonging to St. Paul's.[8] As the initial composition of the text has been dated to c. 1000,[9] and the version in CCCC 383 is simply the only extant copy, there is no definitive reason that the copy should actually have been made at St. Paul's. On the other hand, there is no reason why the manuscript should not have been copied there and, as no other convincing location presents itself, the argument that the manuscript was at least moved to, if not necessarily produced at, St. Paul's Cathedral may be tentatively accepted.

On the assumption that CCCC 383 was at St. Paul's in the first half of the twelfth century, something of the historical context surrounding its production can be posited. Firstly, the date of ca. 1100 places the production of the manuscript in either the reign of King William Rufus, (crowned 1087, died 1100) or in the reign of King Henry I, (crowned 1100, died 1135). The latter was crowned by Bishop Maurice; formerly both royal chaplain and chancellor to King William I and consecrated as Bishop of London in 1085.[10] As Wormald argues, somebody 'like Maurice should, to say no more, have been interested in a book like this'.[11]

The production, or at least acquisition, of CCCC 383 by St. Paul's may, however, reflect more than the legal interests (whether official or personal) of an ex-chancellor and bishop. The Anglo-Saxon cathedral of St. Paul's was razed in the 1087 fire of London and it was under Maurice that the construction of Old St. Paul's, the Anglo-Norman cathedral, was begun. The building of the cathedral was continued by Maurice's successor Richard de Beaumis, who was given the see in 1108 as a reward for his services to King Henry I. Richard had gained Henry's trust and respect in the Welsh Marches, governing Shropshire after the Montgomeries were expelled in 1102,

---

[7] Ibid., p. 230.

[8] *Gesetze* , ed. by Liebermann, I, xix; Felix Liebermann, 'Matrosenstellung aus Landgütern der Kirche London, um 1000', *Archiv für das Studium der Neuren Sprachen und Litteraturen*, 104 (1900), pp. 17-24; *Charters of St Paul's, London* ed. by S.E. Kelly, Anglo-Saxon Charters, 10 vols (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), X, 192-201.

[9] Liebermann, 'Matrosenstellung', p. 17; *Charters of St Paul's, London* ed. by S. E. Kelly, X, 192-94.

[10] Frank Barlow, *The English Church 1066-1154* (London: Longman, 1979), pp. 64, 76; Stephanie Mooers Christelow, 'Chancellors and Curial Bishops: Ecclesiastical Promotions and Power in Anglo-Norman England', *Anglo-Norman Studies*, XXII (1999), 49-69, (p. 56).

[11] Wormald, *The Making of English Law*, 236.

and he was noted for his knowledge of law and his administrative skills.[12] Richard, as a former reeve of a royal estate, is also a compelling contender for at least the acquisition, and possibly even the initial production, of CCCC 383. This is not to suggest that the production of the manuscript was undertaken directly by either of these bishops, or even that the production was overseen by them. Instead, it is simply to emphasise that each bishop provides a potential context for the manuscript's production and use. If Maurice would have been interested in its contents, then so also would Richard.

In the period immediately following, if not parallel with, the production of CCCC 383, the manuscript was used in a variety of ways by an unknown number of people. Whilst some of its audience have left no trace of their interaction with the manuscript, others have left evidence of their presence. In some cases, this evidence is simply the physical abrasion or staining of the parchment and ink, whilst in others it includes various amendments to the law-codes, limning and rubrics. There are also numerous additional texts and comments made in blank spaces in the text-block, between the lines and in the margins.

2.   The quires of CCCC 383

2.1 Overview of evidence for date of first binding of CCCC 383

In its current form, the surviving quires of CCCC 383 are bound as a codex. The dimensions of each folio are approximately 185 x 115 mm,[13] although there is variation throughout the manuscript, particularly as quire 7 has not been trimmed. The manuscript is therefore quite portable in size and, although this does not prove that it actually was carried, evokes the image of a pocket-sized legal reference book, to say the least. The current form of CCCC 383 is that imposed on it in the sixteenth century, which includes the displacement of quire 1 and the addition of quires A and B, as well as the flyleaves as shown previously in Figure 1. From the pagination added by Archbishop Parker it can be seen that the displacement of quire 1 from its

---

[12] Barlow, *The English Church*, p. 81.
[13] Graham, 'Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 383', p. 74.

position after quire 3 to before quire 2 happened at some point before this binding.[14] Evidence for binding prior to the sixteenth century is sparse, and I would argue that the codicological information implies that the manuscript actually existed as a series of unbound quires rather than as a discrete codex. This argument is based on four main points:

Firstly, there is some variation in the *mise-en-page* of CCCC 383 in both the structuring of items in the text-block and, less distinctly, the pattern of pricking and ruling. However, the former of these could simply have been copied from the exemplar of each text, and the latter may only represent subtle variations in execution when each quire was produced.

Secondly, the outer leaves of each quire are noticeably more damaged than those within. This implies that at some point the quires were separate and exposed, arguably to hands or pockets when the individual parts were carried and used. If the quires had been bound into one codex then their outer leaves would have been better protected and the degree of abrasion they suffered would have been much more similar to that suffered by the internal folios. Unfortunately, it can not be ascertained from this whether the damage to the outer leaves represents a later phase when the quires became unbound (and misaligned into their current order) or if the damage preceded their first binding.

Thirdly, with the exception of quire 7, the majority of the leaves of CCCC 383 appear to have been trimmed. This trimming would usually occur as part of the binding process to create a codex of uniform size and appearance. Throughout quires 1 to 5 of CCCC 383 there are at least ten items added in the margins that have definitely been trimmed, and a further five that may have been trimmed. Although three of the items are currently undated, the remaining items range from the first half of the twelfth century at the earliest, through to a single marginal addition of the sixteenth century made by Talbot on fol. 55[r].[15]

While it is possible that the pages could have been trimmed on multiple occasions, there is no direct evidence to confirm or deny this. It is more probable that the folios have only been trimmed once, as after the first trimming they would have been uniform in their size and shape. Unless the quires were rebound into new

---

[14] Wormald, *The Making of English Law*, p. 230.
[15] Ibid., p. 230.

positions which were misaligned from each other, the quires would not need to have been re-trimmed. Additional corroborative evidence that the quires were not re-trimmed can be found in evidence from the prick marks on the folios. A large number of the prick marks can still be seen on many of the folios whether trimmed or otherwise. Where the folios appear not to have been trimmed, as in quire 7, the prick marks are very close to the edge of the leaf. As each subsequent trimming would remove more of parchment edges, and consequently the prick marks, it seems likely that the manuscript was trimmed fewer times rather than more. While it cannot be proved with certainty that the manuscript was not re-trimmed, on balance it seems most likely that the first trimming was after Talbot's annotation in the sixteenth century.

Finally, there is a discernible pattern of transferral of the orange-red ink used for the limning and rubrication which implies that the quires were separate. As the evidence for this is quite involved, it will be discussed in detail below.

2.2 The transferral of orange-red ink(s) in CCCC 383

On numerous occasions throughout CCCC 383, the red ink used for the rubrics and limning has transferred onto the facing page, resulting in a mirror-image impression of the rubric or initial. While this transfer does not occur with every rubric or red initial, it occurs with a notable majority of them. The physical requirements for the ink to be able to transfer are straightforward. The ink needs to be at least slightly wet and the surface it is on needs to be pressed against the surface that the wet ink transfers on to. There are two possible ways for the ink to be wet, either because it has not yet dried after the item was added or, if the ink is water soluble, because the item subsequently became wet.

Unfortunately, testing whether the orange-red ink is water soluble would problematic, since it cannot be carried out without damaging to the manuscript. However, it can be inferred from the effects of water damage which have already occurred on CCCC 383 that the inks used for limning and rubrication are not water soluble. A clear example of this can be shown with the large initial $<I>$ introducing the laws of Ine in the left margin of fol. 23^r, adjacent to lines 3 – 8. A tide-line of

water damage runs across the support and over the text-block and the red initial. Whilst the black ink of the main text-block has faded noticeably in the affected area and the edges of the graphs have blurred, the red ink and edges of the < I > have remained unaffected by the water. Without concrete evidence to the contrary, it must be inferred from this that the red ink is not water soluble and, therefore, that subsequent wetting of the ink was not responsible for the transferral of pigment onto opposing pages. Consequently, it must be concluded that the transferral of red ink happened shortly after the initial production, whilst the ink was still wet from application.

From the pattern of the ink transferral two things can be inferred. Firstly, because the smudges of ink are directly aligned with their sources, the initials on the facing folios, the position of the folios must have been fixed in relation to each other before the limning and rubrication. This means that the bifolios must already have been at least folded and stacked into quire form and probably, although not necessarily, sewn when the limning and rubrication were performed. Secondly, the transferral of ink only ever occurs within the quires. There is never transfer of ink between the outer leaves of adjoining quires. Therefore, the limning and rubrication must have occurred before the quires were bound into codex form.

In comparison to the writing of the text-block, the limning and rubrication are subsequent layers of the manuscript's production. The rubricator has been identified with one of the slightly later amenders of the text-block of the first half of the twelfth century.[16] Although the ca. 1100 date when the manuscript was produced and the date of rubrication may overlap (depending on how old the respective scribes were, when they were trained and when they were active) it is more probable that the rubrication, which the main scribe did not anticipate, occurred later. Assuming this to be correct, the quires must have remained unbound for an extended period following the initial production of the manuscript.

While none of the points enumerated above is absolutely conclusive in its own right, taken together they have some corroborative weight. The implication is that the manuscript remained unbound at least into the first half of the twelfth century, and probably until the sixteenth century. Whilst relatively uncommon, this treatment of a

---

[16] Ibid., p. 234, footnote 285.

manuscript is often overlooked, although not unheard of. In an informative discussion of the subject, G. D. Hobson observed 'that unbound manuscripts often reposed for years on the shelves of medieval libraries; and that, in consequence, a medieval binding may be ten, twenty, fifty, a hundred years or more later than the manuscript'.[17] The manuscript Durham, Cathedral A. IV. 34 is an anonymous gloss on the *Canticorum Cantica*, copied in the first half of the twelfth century. The manuscript consists of 68 folios divided between eight quires of eight leaves and one quire, the fourth, of only four leaves. None of the quires has ever been bound together into book form.[18]

Although it is rare for a manuscript to have survived unbound into the modern day, medieval catalogues often refer to manuscripts stored 'in quaterno', which is to say unbound and wrapped in parchment.[19] Indeed, Robinson's often misused codicological unit, the so-called booklet, is founded on the concept of an independently produced text, or texts, copied in one or more quires being subsequently bound together into another manuscript.[20] In a discussion of this process, J. P. Gumbert identifies a composite manuscript, Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek, BPL 191 B, which contains four separate sections ranging in date from the eleventh through to the thirteenth century but not actually bound until early in the fifteenth century.[21] He posits, convincingly, that the 'scribe produces, in the course of the years, a number of small units, which are meant to be bound up eventually, but which remain, unbound, in a cupboard until the scribe is satisfied with their number'.[22] Leaving aside the issue of whether the scribe intended to bind the quires and where they were actually stored, both of which can only be assumption in the lack of direct evidence, it would appear that something similar to this may have occurred with CCCC 383.

---

[17] G.D. Hobson, *English Binding Before 1500*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1927), p. 56.

[18] R.A.B. Mynors, *Durham Cathedral Manuscripts to the End of the Twelfth Century* (Oxford: Dean and Chapter of Oxford Cathedral, Oxford University Press, 1939), p. 57; P.R. Robinson, 'The Booklet: A Self-Contained Unit in Composite Manuscripts' in *Codicologica*, 3 ed. by J.P. Gumbert (Leiden: Brill, 1980), 46-69, p. 52.

[19] Hobson, *English Binding*, p. 56; Robinson, 'The Booklet', p. 52.

[20] Robinson, 'The Booklet', p. 47; Robinson, 'Self-Contained Units in Composite Manuscripts of the Anglo-Saxon Period', Anglo-Saxon England, 7 (1978), 231-38, p. 233, repr. in *Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts: Basic Readings* ed. by Mary P. Richards (London: Routledge, 1994), 25-35, p. 27.

[21] J.P. Gumbert, 'Codicological Units: Towards a Terminology for the Stratigraphy of the Non-Homogenous Codex', *Segno e Testo*, 2 (2004), 17-42, p. 26.

[22] Ibid., pp. 27-28.

If anything, the form of CCCC 383 as a collection of separate quires increases the portability of the manuscript; the user would have been able to take as few or many quires as he required and each, being only six to eight leaves, would be far more transportable than a solidly bound book, no matter how small. If the quires existed as a series of related but unattached entities, then their storage in consecutive order would have been useful, especially as many of the law-codes cross quire boundaries, but far from essential.

3. Amendment of CCCC 383 in the first half of the twelfth century

3.1 Mise-en-page of the text-block of CCCC 383

Before the amendments to the *mise-en-page* can be discussed, a brief summary of the layout implemented by the main scribe is required. The text-block on each page measures ca. 145 mm x ca. 75 mm in height, and consists of 26 long lines with single, vertical bounding lines on each side.[23] The manuscript has been ruled in hard-point, and, as the first, third, twenty-fourth and final lines usually run across the centre fold of each bifolio, it can be seen that the laying out was done before the quire was assembled. The text-block was written by one hand, in a brown-black ink with the text laid out as a series of continuous items. Occasionally, these items are separated by one or more blank lines. Each item begins on a new line of the text-block and can be anything from a single line to multiple pages in length. Sometimes these items are an entire law-code or similar text, while at other times a law-code may be broken into multiple text-block items. Elsewhere a single text-block item may contain the end of one law-code and the beginning of another. This can be seen with the law-codes known as *Be Blasarium*, *Forfang* and *Hundred* on fol. 10[r].

Changes in the use and interpretation of the manuscript by its audience can be identified through the amendment of the text-block of CCCC 383 and the addition of marginal and interlinear comments. The manner in which the rubrication and the limning have been used to re-structure the *mise-en-page* of the text-block of CCCC 383 are discussed in the following sections.

---

[23] Graham, 'Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 383', p. 74.

3.2 Rubrication of CCCC 383

Contrary to Wormald's opinion, it would appear from the *mise-en-page* of CCCC 383 that the vast majority of the rubrics were not anticipated by the main scribe.[24] The main exception to this is found in examples such as the blank line left at the beginning of the Treaty of Ælfred and Guðrum on fol. 12^v, where the entire preceding line (L. 1) was left blank and subsequently rubricated. More usually throughout CCCC 383, where rubrics were supplied, they are either in blank space in the text-block introducing the items, marginal additions or some combination thereof. Although many of the items begin with some space left blank on the first or preceding line, this does not seem specifically intended for rubrication and many of the text-block items which have blank space available have not been rubricated. A number of text-block items, particularly in quires 2 and 3, have a different pattern; the beginning of the item is on the left of the line, blank space is left in the middle of the line and the final words of the preceding item are written over on the right. Throughout CCCC 383 the rubrics largely appear squeezed into the available space at the beginning of an item, placed in the adjacent margins, or a combination of the two.

In light of the many examples where the rubrication seems forced into whatever space was available, the relatively few instances where the rubrics do fit the text-block neatly seem to be by chance rather than design. The rubrication therefore does not appear to have been anticipated by the main scribe, or else the ultimate form of the rubrication differed from that which was originally intended. This corroborates the previous argument, although it is still by no means conclusive, that the rubrication occurred later in the first half of the twelfth century. Rather than being an anticipated part of the *mise-en-page* of CCCC 383, the rubrication appears to have been a later amendment to facilitate navigation of the various tracts for the user.

3.3 Limning of CCCC 383

As well as beginning the item on a new line, the first two lines are usually indented to the width of one or two graphs. In addition, the main scribe omitted the first graph of

---

[24] Wormald, *The Making of English Law*, p. 235.

the item so that it could be supplied by the limner. This was done either by leaving space before the new sub-clause which the limner marked with red or by the main scribe omitting the initial letter of the tract and leaving space for the limner to supply the appropriate graph in red ink. From this it can be seen that the main scribe anticipated the limning and the structure that it would take. Whether the variations in *mise-en-page* were deliberate choices on the part of the main scribe, another individual with supervisorial control of the production or were copied directly from the exemplar is uncertain.

However, it can also be seen that the limner, or another amender working in collaboration with the limner between the production of the text-block and the limning, deliberately restructured the *mise-en-page*. There are a number of examples where a graph from the original text-block written by the main scribe, particularly in quire 4, has been erased and replaced by a large, red initial by the limner. In some cases, two or more graphs were erased and replaced with a single graph, allowing more space for the limning and thereby further increasing its prominence. Notable examples of this can be found on fol. 38ᵛ, L. 26 and on fol. 45ʳ, L. 16 where < *ond* > and < *And* > respectively have been erased and replaced with limned tironian notae < 7 >. In other examples, such as on fol. 38ᵛ, L. 4 the original tironian nota has been erased along with the following graph, < þ > from the words < *7 þe þyllað.* > and replaced with only the limned < Þ >.

Although this erasure and limning always occurs partway through a text-block item, there are a number of examples where the erased and replaced graph occurs at the beginning of the line. Under these circumstances, such as on fols 39ʳ, L. 21, 39ᵛ, L. 15 and 41ʳ, L. 24, the text-block has been further restructured and the margin utilised to give the new break a similar *mise-en-page* to the main text-block items discussed above. This process becomes particularly prominent at the beginning of the law-code I Æðelred on fol. 11ʳ, L. 10 and the beginning of the laws of Ine on fol. 23ʳ, L. 6. Although more pronounced on the former of these, in both cases the *mise-en-page* of the text-block has been re-worked through erasure and re-writing to accommodate the limning and clearly define the beginning of the items and law-codes.

In addition to the amendments made by the limner to sub-divide or produce new text-block items, there is one instance where it would appear that the limner removed

an item from the text-block. There is a charm for the recovery of stolen cattle on fol. 59[r], L. 6-20,[25] the inclusion of which is seemingly at odds in a manuscript predominantly containing law-codes.[26] Stephanie Hollis justified the inclusion of the charm amidst a collection of Anglo-Saxon law-codes by arguing that the ritual performance of the charm became equated with the legal declaration that the theft had been committed.[27] However, in CCCC 383 the situation is further complicated. The entire text has been crossed out in red ink, clearly indicating that a subsequent amender of the manuscript deemed its presence inappropriate in a manuscript of law. Wormald observes that the red ink used is not the distinctive red crayon of Archbishop Parker and suggests that it was probably the work of the rubricator but unfortunately gives no evidence to support this claim.[28] As a tentative and circumstantial argument, it can be observed that the red ink used to score out the charm is very similar in hue to that used by the limner. On its own this argument is far from convincing. However, the main scribe of the text-block left blank space, as discussed above, for the limner to add in the initials: two in blank spaces mid-line on fol. 59[r] lines 6 and 8 and a third indented into the beginning of a new item on fol. 59[r], L. 13-14. The limner added none of these initials. This is the only instance in the extant quires of CCCC 383 where the limner did not add the initials as anticipated by the main scribe. It therefore seems most probable that it was the limner, either of his own volition or under the instructions of another, who deemed the charm inappropriate to the manuscript and consequently removed it.

4. The contexts of the *Gerefa* tract

The following section will consider the inclusion of the *Gerefa* tract in relation to the law-codes included in CCCC 383 and as a case-study of the amendment process discussed in the previous section. The vernacular copy in CCCC 383 is the only extant version of the tract known as *Gerefa*.[29] In the manuscript, *Gerefa* is the final

---

[25] G. Storms, *Anglo-Saxon Magic* (Nijmegan: Nijhoff, 1948), pp. 202-05.

[26] Wormald, *The Making of English Law*, p. 232.

[27] Stephanie Hollis, 'Old English "Cattle-Theft Charms": Manuscript Contexts and Social Uses', *Anglia: Zeitschrift für Englische Philologie*, 115, (1997), 139-64, (pp. 163-64).

[28] Wormald, *The Making of English Law*, p. 232, footnote 274.

[29] R.I. Page, '*Gerefa*: Some Problems of Meaning' in *Problems of Old English Lexicography: Studies in Memory of Angus Cameron* ed. by Alfred Bammesberger (Regensberg: Pustet, 1985), 211-28, (p.

text copied by hand 1 in quire 7 and runs from fol. 66ᵛ, L. 24 for 121 lines to its conclusion on fol. 69ʳ, L. 14. *Gerefa* follows on from the so-called *Rectitudines Singularum Personarum* (henceforth *RSP*), a tract describing the rights and duties of various individuals on an estate with the notable exception of the reeve,[30] and the relationship between the two tracts is subject to much, unresolved, speculation in the scholarship.[31] *Gerefa* has alternately been treated as a companion piece to *RSP* related in content,[32] the final section of the *RSP* tract,[33] a separate tract that has been reworked to unite it with *RSP*,[34] or an entirely distinct piece only related to *RSP* by circumstance.[35] From the *mise-en-page* of CCCC 383 it is impossible to conclude whether the main scribe, limner or rubricator viewed it as a separate tract or as a section of *RSP*.

As with the cattle charm, the inclusion of the *Gerefa* tract in CCCC 383 requires some discussion. The prevalent attitude in modern scholarship is that *Gerefa* is 'barely a legal document' and that it has 'little legal content',[36] which is at odds with its inclusion in a so-called 'legal encyclopaedia'. Rather than containing law directly, the opening lines of *Gerefa* emphasise that the competent reeve should know the lord's '*land riht*' and the '*folces ge rihtu*' which '*of ealddagū pitan geræddan*'.[37] The remainder of the *Gerefa* tract is a description of 'the qualifications and duties of the reeve in charge of a landed estate, including an account of the work to be done in the course of the year and lists of the tools and other equipment that had to be provided'.[38] Earlier scholarly discussion viewed the agricultural and economic details

---

212); R. G. Poole, 'The Textile Inventory in the Old English Gerefa', *The Review of English Studies* new series, 40 (1989), 469-78 (p. 469).

[30] Felix Liebermann, 'Gerefa', *Anglia: Zeitschrift für Englische Philologie*, 9 (1886), pp. 251-66; *Gesetze* ed. by Liebermann, III, 244-47; Wormald, *The Making of English Law*, pp. 387-89.

[31] R.I. Page, '"The Proper Toil of Artless Industry": Toronto's Plan for an Old English Dictionary', *Notes and Queries*, 220 (1975), 146-55, (pp. 148-49); P.D.A. Harvey, 'Rectitudines Singularum Personarum and Gerefa' in *The English Historical Review*, 426 (1993), pp. 1-22; Wormald, *The Making of English Law*, pp. 387-89.

[32] Liebermann, 'Gerefa', pp. 251-66; H.R. Loyn, *Anglo-Saxon England and the Norman Conquest* (Harlow: Longman, 1962), p. 193.

[33] *Gesetze,* ed. by Liebermann, III, 246; F.M. Stenton, *Anglo-Saxon England* 3rd edn (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1943, 3rd edn 1971), p. 475; Peter Hunter Blair, *An Introduction to Anglo-Saxon England* 3rd edn, With a New Introduction by Simon Keynes (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1956, 3rd edn 2003), p. 264.

[34] Harvey, 'Rectitudines', p. 3-4.

[35] Page, 'Gerefa', p. 214.

[36] Wormald, *The Making of English Law*, pp. 387-89.

[37] 'Gerefa', CCCC 383, fol. 66ᵛ, L. 24-26.

[38] Harvey, 'Rectitudines', p. 3.

contained in the tract as being quite complete.[39] However it has been subsequently argued that, 'there are too many omissions and inconsistencies' in the tract and that the duties mentioned 'are neither systematic nor comprehensive'. Therefore, *Gerefa* cannot be 'a practical guide to running an estate, whether to instruct the overseer [...] or for the landlord to check on his local manager's activities'.[40] Furthermore, the overall structure of the tract is that of a colloquy and the lists of tools and so forth are organised on an alliterative basis.[41] Therefore, the tract is usually interpreted as 'a work in the genre of "estates literature" rather than estate management',[42] and modern scholarship does not portray it as law or legislation or consider its relation to law beyond the apparent dichotomy of its inclusion in CCCC 383.

As well as defining the manuscript as a 'legal encyclopaedia', Wormald repeatedly disparages the competency of the main scribe, bluntly disparaging their competence in Old English, abilities as a copyist and questioning the degree to which they even understood the texts they were copying.[43] All of these arguments seem to stem from a desire to explain away the inclusion of *Gerefa* in CCCC 383 as little more than the error of an incompetent scribe. The initial *mise-en-page* and that of the subsequent amendment of CCCC 383, however, present a different interpretation. It has already been discussed above that the limner, or somebody employing authorial control over their work, had a competent understanding of the texts they were limning. On the one hand they sub-divided law-codes at appropriate points to turn them from continuous prose into accessible pieces, clearly labelled to allow a user to rapidly find an appropriate section of a text. On the other hand, the limner was also able to remove a tract whose inclusion was deemed inappropriate. Although there is no evidence of the rubricator actively excising texts, they also accepted the presence of the two tracts: *RSP* has rubrics added to all but the final of its sixteen text-block items, and the beginning of the *Gerefa* tract is also rubricated. The fact that both tracts were limned and rubricated rather than ignored or even crossed-through by amenders whose actions prove them to be competent and literate in Old English, must mean that both

---

[39] Loyn, *Anglo-Saxon England*, p. 193; Stenton, *Anglo-Saxon England*, p. 475.
[40] Harvey, 'Rectitudines', p. 8.
[41] Liebermann, 'Gerefa', p. 255; Harvey, 'Rectitudines', pp. 8-12; Wormald, *The Making of English Law*, p. 389; Herbert Dean Meritt, 'Conceivable Clues to Twelve Old English Words', *Anglo-Saxon England*, 1 (1972), 193-205, p. 193.
[42] Wormald, *The Making of English Law*, p. 389.
[43] Ibid., pp. 232-34.

tracts were deliberately included and continued to be accepted as a part of CCCC 383 throughout the early twelfth century.

Therefore, it is significant that *Gerefa*, unlike *RSP*, was not translated and copied into the early twelfth-century Latin collection of Anglo-Saxon law known as the *Quadripartitus*.[44] This may simply reflect, as Liebermann suggested, that translating the complex vocabulary of the tool list into Latin was simply too much of a challenge.[45] Alternatively, this exclusion may represent a change in context; either in the early twelfth-century audiences' understanding of what constituted law, or between the intended use of the *Quadripartitus* manuscripts in comparison with that of CCCC 383.

5. Conclusions

In summary, this discussion has presented a number of views on CCCC 383, both as a material artefact within a changing context, and as a collection of texts. It can be seen that, as an artefact, CCCC 383 was highly portable. Its probable form as a series of unbound quires would mean that a user could select only the sections they required while another user could, hypothetically, have used other parts of the manuscript at the same time. In addition, the apparent disorder that the quires are now bound into, with quire 1 displaced and at least two, if not more, of the original quires of now missing, seems less significant. After all, if the quires were produced and used in an unbound state, then there was no reason beyond neatness and ease of reference to store them in the logical order dictated by their contents.

The amendments made by the limner and rubricator discussed here, as well as the additions and corrections added to the various law-codes and tracts, reflect that CCCC 383 was engaged in and adapted for a changing audience and context. Furthermore, the form of CCCC 383 as multiple parts emphasises the multiplicity of interpretations and uses to which the manuscript was, and could have been, put. From the large collection of law-codes included in CCCC 383, it is apparent that the compiler, users and audience had an interest in Anglo-Saxon law. It is uncertain whether the use of the manuscript was for strictly legal reasons or simply for personal interest on behalf

---

[44] *Gesetze*, ed. by Liebermann, III, p. 246.
[45] Liebermann, 'Gerefa', pp. 258.

of Bishop Maurice, the ex-chancellor, or Bishop Richard, the former royal reeve, either of whom arguably could have had it produced or subsequently came to own it. What can be clearly seen is that CCCC 383 was not a 'legal encyclopaedia' in the sense of a manuscript intended, in theory if not in practice, to contain law exclusively. If CCCC 383 is considered from the perspective of *Gerefa*, rather than treating the tract as an obscure appendix on the final pages, a different interpretation can be made. The argument written in the text of *Gerefa* that a wise reeve should know law and the rights of individuals as set down in days of old, makes it a fitting conclusion to the law-codes assembled in CCCC 383. It is possible, therefore, that the law-codes preceding *Gerefa* are there primarily to supply this information. Many of the other law-codes included in CCCC 383 are also directed at reeves. The most notable of these, for example, being the code known as I Edward, fol. 52ᵛ, L. 9 to fol. 53ᵛ, L. 2, in which Edmund directly addresses his reeves and commands them to follow the laws as set down in Ælfred's *Domboc* – also included in the manuscript.[46] It can therefore be argued that the texts in CCCC 383 are not just a collection of law-codes and related texts but contain much of the knowledge that a wise and well-trained reeve would require. Furthermore, from the quantity of amendments and the restructuring made to the *mise-en-page* throughout the period, in particular the way that the texts were subdivided by the limner and made visually accessible, it can be seen that CCCC 383 was in the presence of an audience who actively engaged with the manuscript's contents and focused extensively on the position, duties and values of the reeve.

Bibliography

Primary Sources
Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 383
Durham, Cathedral A. IV. 34
Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek, BPL 191 B

Secondary sources and editions
Barlow, Frank, *The English Church 1066-1154* (London: Longman, 1979).
Charters of St Paul's, London ed. by S.E. Kelly, Anglo-Saxon Charters, 10 vols (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004).
Die Gesetze Der Angelsachsen, ed. by Felix Liebermann, 3 vols. (Halle: Niemeyer, 1903-1916).

---

[46] Wormald, *The Making of English Law*, p. 379.

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

Graham, Timothy, '55. Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 383' in *Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts in Microfiche Facsimile, XI, Corpus Christi College, Cambridge*, ed. by Timothy Graham and others (Arizona: Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 2003).

Gumbert, J.P., 'Codicological Units: Towards a Terminology for the Stratigraphy of the Non-Homogenous Codex', *Segno e Testo*, 2 (2004), pp. 17-42.

Harvey, P.D.A., 'Rectitudines Singularum Personarum and Gerefa' in *The English Historical Review*, 426 (1993), pp. 1-22.

Hobson, G.D., *English Binding Before 1500*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1927)

Hollis, Stephanie, 'Old English "Cattle-Theft Charms": Manuscript Contexts and Social Uses', *Anglia: Zeitschrift für Englische Philologie*, 115, (1997) pp. 139-64.

Hunter Blair, Peter, *An Introduction to Anglo-Saxon England* 3rd edn, With a New Introduction by Simon Keynes (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1956, 3rd edn 2003).

James, Montague Rhodes, *A Descriptive Catalogue of Manuscripts in the Library of Corpus Christi College Cambridge*, 2 vols (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1912).

Ker, Neil Ripley, *Catalogue of Manuscripts Containing Anglo-Saxon*, (Oxford: Clarendon, 1957, rev edn 1990).

Liebermann, Felix, 'Gerefa', *Anglia: Zeitschrift für Englische Philologie*, 9 (1886), pp. 251-66.

Liebermann, Felix, 'Matrosenstellung aus Landgütern der Kirche London, um 1000', *Archiv für das Studium der Neuren Sprachen und Litteraturen*, 104 (1900), pp. 17-24.

Loyn, H.R., *Anglo-Saxon England and the Norman Conquest* (Harlow: Longman, 1962).

Meritt, Herbert Dean, 'Conceivable Clues to Twelve Old English Words', *Anglo-Saxon England*, 1 (1972), pp. 193-205.

Mooers Christelow, Stephanie, 'Chancellors and Curial Bishops: Ecclesiastical Promotions and Power in Anglo-Norman England', *Anglo-Norman Studies*, xxii (1999), pp. 49-69.

Mynors, R.A.B., *Durham Cathedral Manuscripts to the End of the Twelfth Century* (Oxford: Dean and Chapter of Oxford Cathedral, Oxford University Press, 1939).

Page, R.I., '"The Proper Toil of Artless Industry": Toronto's Plan for an Old English Dictionary', *Notes and Queries*, 220 (1975), pp. 146-55.

Page, R.I., '*Gerefa*: Some Problems of Meaning' in *Problems of Old English Lexicography: Studies in Memory of Angus Cameron* ed. by Alfred Bammesberger (Regensberg: Pustet, 1985), pp. 211-28.

Poole, R.G., 'The Textile Inventory in the Old English Gerefa', *The Review of English Studies* new series, 40 (1989), pp. 469-78.

Robinson, P.R., 'The Booklet' in *Codicologica*, 3 ed. by J.P. Gumbert (Leiden: Brill, 1980), pp. 46-69.

Robinson, P.R., 'Self-Contained Units in Composite Manuscripts of the Anglo-Saxon Period', Anglo-Saxon England, 7 (1978), pp. 231-38, repr. in *Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts: Basic Readings* ed. by Mary P. Richards (London: Routledge, 1994), pp. 25-35.

Stenton, F.M., *Anglo-Saxon England* 3rd edn (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1943, 3rd edn 1971).

Storms, G., *Anglo-Saxon Magic* (Nijmegan: Nijhoff, 1948).

Wormald, Patrick, *The Making of English Law: From King Alfred to the Twelfth Century* (Oxford: Blackwell,1999).