Weaving New Perspectives Together

Weaving New Perspectives Together: Some Reflections on Literary Studies

Edited by

María Alonso Alonso, Jeannette Bello Mota,
Alba de Béjar Muíños and Laura Torrado Mariñas

CAMBRIDGE SCHOLARS
PUBLISHING

Weaving New Perspectives Together:
Some Reflections on Literary Studies,
Edited by María Alonso Alonso, Jeannette Bello Mota, Alba de Béjar Muíños
and Laura Torrado Mariñas

This book first published 2012

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

12 Back Chapman Street, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2XX, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN (10): 1-4438-3911-6, ISBN (13): 978-1-4438-3911-2

DEDICATED TO

Dr Ana Bringas López and Dr Jorge Luís Bueno

This volume is dedicated to two of the most inspiring senior lecturers at the Universidade de Vigo who, with their invaluable experience and ceaseless support, have made the preparation and completion of this collection a fact. This book builds upon their exemplary contribution to promoting active postgraduate involvement within the Department of English, French and German Philology at our home university. We deeply acknowledge their invaluable assistance and wisdom and sincerely hope they will continue to motivate us and many others in the years to come.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Part 2: Narrative and Female Identity:
(Re)Configurations of Womanhood in the Novel

Part 3: Cultural Theory and Textual Representation

INTRODUCTION

"What is literature?" and, more specifically, "how can literary representations surpass artistic modes of reception?" are two of the most fundamental questions lying at the heart of this volume. Indeed, these two interrogations may appear seemingly straightforward in all their uncomplicated simplicity and yet, these deceitfully simple questions have aroused a wide variety of academic debate as scholars past and present have tried to explore the many interrelations existing between literature in its simplest form, i.e., literature as the mere jotting down of a series of words on paper, and the whole collage of literary representations that can be found in different cultural and artistic constructions. Thus, and bearing these and other pertinent questions in mind, this publication sets forth to recuperate the well of knowledge originated at the first *Bridging the Gaps, Minding the Context* international postgraduate conference, held in March of 2011 at the Universidade de Vigo, so as to expand its primary aims. Since one of the objectives of the meeting was to promote scholarly contact among early career researchers, this volume is an attempt at bringing together the works of some young scholars currently undergoing their postgraduate studies in different European institutions. Additionally, this publication does also benefit from the thought-provoking contributions of three well-established lecturers to whom we are deeply grateful. Hence, this edited book seeks to compile a variety of novel literary perspectives, practices and theories, which may eventually open new avenues of investigation and contribute to other independent lines of research for those who are already on their way.

In this vein, Dr Francisco Álvarez López's article, "The Manuscripts of the Old English RSB: A Methodological Approach to the Study of English Benedictine Manuscripts", inaugurates this volume's Part One by reflecting on the very question that gave reason to this compilation, that of "what is literature?", so as to offer a truly enlightening overview on the physicality of literature seen through the different renderings of a single book, the *Rule of St Benedict*, as it evolved over time in the Anglo-Saxon period. Álvarez López's work starts a conversation around the idea of transposition that the first group of articles in this volume then develop upon considering a variety of literary forms and their interconnection to one another—be they from the same artistic genre or not. Thus, Borja Aguiló Obrador's study enquires into the notions of hybridisation and the

shared concern for alternative modes of consciousness through an analysis of Roethke's "Greenhouse" poems vis-à-vis Tarkovski's *Stalker*, in order to explain how these two elements work to inextricably link together what could otherwise seem to be two relatively independent literary and cinematic pieces of work. This interest in the cinematic mode and its literary echoes is shared as well by Miguel Ángel Gomes Gargamala who, in his contribution to this volume, examines different cinematic versions of the Anglo-Saxon classic *Beowulf*, providing an explanation for the many divergences to be found amongst them and ascribing the success of this Old English hero to Hollywood's fascination with "the blur distinction between Gods and Demons". Crossing over the border between right and wrong as well, Daniel Nicolás Ferreiro's chapter in this section of the volume offers a superb overview on how Daniel Clowes' comic book *The Death Ray* is at the same time both a subversion and a confirmation of the comic genre by providing a series of juxtapositions between his main case study and previous graphic novels. As an end note to this section, Márcia Diana Lemos's study reflects on Joyce's humour in *Finnegans Wake* by offering a detailed overview on the many metafictional echoes that can be found in its lines, which range from Diderot's *Jacques le Fataliste et son maître* to Sterne's *Tristram Shandy* while briefly alluding to Stanley Kubrick's masterpiece *Dr Strangelove or How I learned to stop worrying and love the bomb*. As disparate as these chapters' topics may seem, they all share a concern for the complex and blurry divide that oftentimes exists between one literary form and another, exposing in various ways how artistic pieces can, and do, talk to one another.

On Part Two of this volume, "Narrative and Female Identity", the contribution of Dr Teresa Prudente's "Woolf and/vs. Joyce: New Perspectives for a Dynamic Comparison" expounds a comparative revision of the innovative narrative techniques developed by two of the main figures in the literary tradition of the British Isles whom criticism has often considered but separately. Prudente's careful conjoined study of Woolf's and Joyce's writing successfully eludes a critical tradition which has frequently categorised both authors in a hierarchy of sorts as it also opens new avenues for the study of such canonical figures outside the most common approaches. Prudente's analysis introduces the second part of this volume which comprises an approximation to the narrative genre from "alternative perspectives". Hence, the chapters present in this second section are all connected by a common pivotal figure, that of the woman, as it has been represented in literature and culture. First, José Carregal Romero will take his readers to the cultural and literary context of Ireland. Starting with an analysis of the traditional concept of motherhood, the

author then goes on to examine the works of Colm Tóibín and Joseph O'Connor. Carregal's study proposes a revision of how some of the traditional texts of Irish Nationhood ultimately build national identity upon the subjugation of women by Catholic and patriarchal values. Thus, Tóibin's *The Heather Blazing* is presented as an example of "revisionism in contemporary Irish fiction" inasmuch as it questions the Irish Constitution and the definition of family. Similarly, O'Connor's "Mother's We All the Same", offers an alternative vision of motherhood. Carregal's piece brings together traditional Irish texts on family, motherhood, and nation with contemporary "post-national" literature pieces. In a similar fashion, Melania Evelyn Sánchez connects the 19th century Victorian culture of the Supernatural with 21st century Neo-Victorian fiction. Cultural practices of the supernatural, Sánchez explains, operated for long as a site where the social impositions of the Victorian era over social roles could be partially relieved, especially so for gendered roles. The author uses the work of the Welsh novelist Sara Waters, *Affinity*, to show how this recent literary trend is deployed to rediscover the intricacies of Victorian society as well as the perspective of those most affected by its constrictions, women. The third chapter in this section is by Andrea Ruthven who analyses the work of Seth Grahame-Smith and Jane Austen *Pride Prejudice and Zombies* from a gender perspective. After introducing the readers to the history and criticism of the figure of the zombie in popular culture, Ruthven frames her examination of Austen's rewriting within feminist criticism to conclude that Grahame-Smith's work can be considered the result of a post-feminist aesthetic that neutralises any subversive potential once present in Austen's text. Last in this second part, Auba Llompart's analysis expands on the genre focus in his section ot present an exploration of Neil Gaiman's *Coraline* as an example of children's Gothic fiction. Llompart sees the main character in Gaiman's work not as an example of other forms of Gothic tradition—where children played fixed parts as characters in a novel—but as a case of a different narrative genre, one that is at the nexus of Gothic fiction and children's narrative, an experimental ground termed Children's Gothic.

Part Three in this collection is brilliantly introduced by an article authored by Dr Maggie Ann Bowers whodiscusses Homi Bhabha's notion of cultural translation and the difficulties of translating hybrid identity into new contexts. Dr Bowers applies her knowledge of multi-ethnic and cross-cultural studies to focus her attention on the transfer of cultural identity occurring in contexts of cultural contact. By exploring the dichotomy between the terms of "translation" and "migracy" the author reflects on the physical quality of the notion of "space" in order to consider the extent to

which colonised indigenous communities often find their identities tethered by the imposition of a different cultural framework. In order to do so, Dr Bowers examines the attitude towards Native American culture and ideology in Leslie Marmon Silko's *Ceremony* and N Scott Momaday's *House Made of Dawn.* Through an analysis of the main characters in these texts, Dr Bowers explores the implications that new cultural standards have for Native American literature. Also closely related to Dr Bowers' investigation, Jiri Salamoun's chapter in this third part considers the symbolism of the element of water in Thomas King's novel *Green Grass, Running Water*. Relying on Edward Said's idea of narratives as instruments of power, Salamoun grounds his analysis on traditional Native American lore so as to then illustrate the way in which Thomas King uses his characters to highlight the strong influence that external cultural frameworks have over Native American individuals. In the conclusion to his study, Salamoun proposes that King consciously uses the element of water to have his readers reflect on the process of colonisation within a Native American context. In a similar light, though moving on to investigate the way in which racist philosophies have influenced coloured communities in South Africa, chapter thirteen in this volume offers an insight into Zoë Wicomb's *David's Story*. Cynthia Lytle's contribution to this volume thus considers the importance that Gayatri Chakravorti Spivak's concept of "subaltern discourse" has for Wicomb's narration. Her study shows the way in which Wicomb's text deconstructs history and identity, as well as folklore and memory, through different female characters that work to question and contest oppressive ideologies common to both coloured and non-coloured communities. Lytle's study emphasises how Wicomb's work seems to speak about the need to reclaim and recover coloured cultural histories through the use of folklore thus challenging racial and gender prejudices still alive today. Finally, this third part will conclude by recovering some of the key points raised in Dr Bowers's study but from a different perspective. In the chapter rounding up this comprehensive volume, Antonio Paoliello draws attention to the need to carefully consider non-Western literary traditions from a theoretical perspective. Paoliello's essay primarily concerns itself with the case of Sinophone Malaysian literature, a field of study which, according to the author, lacks a theoretical approach. Through a reference to Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari's idea of *littérature mineure*, Paoliello explores the importance of place and space together with the role of language for the Sinophone Malaysian literary system, and he does so through an analysis of He Shufang's short story "Don't Mention It Again". His study closes by signalling how the application of Western critical theories to

apparently unrelated literary traditions may be useful in order to bridge the gap between theory and practice among different cultural systems.

Thus, the chapters included in this collection aim to connect and navigate topics pertaining to the worlds of literature, cinema, culture and the humanities in general, providing an insight into some of the most recent scholarly work produced by early-career researchers across Europe. If the chapters here presented expand across disparate disciplines or topics in a sometimes seemingly unrelated manner, we invite readers to "bridge the gap" of their apparent difference, for they will surely find that many bridges cross over from one chapter and topic onto another.

PART 1:

THE OTHER LIFE OF BOOKS: STUDYING INTER- AND INTRA-RELATIONSHIPS IN LITERARY TEXTS

CHAPTER ONE

THE MANUSCRIPTS OF THE OLD ENGLISH RSB: A METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH TO THE STUDY OF ENGLISH BENEDICTINE MANUSCRIPTS

FRANCISCO JOSÉ ÁLVAREZ LÓPEZ.
UNIVERSITY OF LONDON

Introduction

The following pages present a study of the physical context in which the Old English translation of the *Rule of St Benedict* (*RSB*) was transmitted from its creation in the second half of the tenth century to the production of its final surviving copy in the early thirteenth. The timeframe covered runs parallel with some crucial historical events which undoubtedly influenced the relevance and use of this vernacular text. The most relevant palaeographical and codicological information provided by the extant copies in which this text survives will be considered in an attempt to achieve a better understanding of these manuscripts and the use made of them by their monastic communities. The methodological approach used in the examination of this group of manuscripts has four main parameters: the format in which the OE *RSB* was circulated; the scripts used by the different scribes, particularly when the vernacular text was copied alongside the Latin; the nature of the other original items copied alongside the OE *RSB* by the same (or other contemporary) scribes; and, finally, the later annotations and emendations made to the *RSB* by late medieval readers. The structure of this study will, therefore, closely resemble this pattern.

Historical Setting

One of the highlights of the history of tenth-century England is the accession of King Edgar to the throne in 959 (he was already king of Mercia in 957) and his subsequent active support for the ecclesiastical shake-up devised and directed by Bishop Æthelwold of Winchester and Dunstan, archbishop of Canterbury. The two monastic prelates (alongside the somewhat secondary figure of Oswald, bishop of Worcester and archbishop of York) set out to establish a network of newly reformed monastic communities throughout their dioceses and ultimately across the whole realm. This process, which began with the reformation of their own Episcopal sees, is commonly known as the Benedictine Reform since the customary they followed thoroughly in pursuit of monastic perfection was the *RSB*. The actual impact of this reforming wave has been recently questioned in view of the lack of material evidence to support widespread establishment of reformed houses during this period.[1] In Barrow's view, it would seem that the extent of the reform was smaller than traditional scholarship had previously assumed.[2]

Whatever the case, at some point between King Edgar's marriage to Ælfthryth in 964/5 and his premature death in 975, the *RSB* was translated into OE by Bishop Æthelwold.[3] Evidence for this identification is provided by a late source. The twelfth-century *Liber Eliensis* reports that King Edgar and his queen Ælfthryth commissioned a translation of *RSB* to be carried out by Æthelwold in exchange for an estate at Sudbourne

[1] See J. Barrow, 'The Chronology of the "Benedictine Reform"' in D. Scragg, ed., *Edgar, King of the English, 959-975: New Interpretations* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2008), pp. 211-23.

[2] For the traditional narrative of the Benedictine Reform, see D. Knowles, *The Monastic Order in England: A History of its Development from the Times of St Dunstan to the Fourth Lateran Council, 940-1216*, 2nd edn. (Cambridge: C.U.P., 1963), pp. 31-56; and the collection of essays in D. Parsons, ed., *Tenth-century Studies: Essays in Commemoration of the Millennium of the Council of Winchester and the 'Regularis Concordia'* (London: Phillimore, 1975). The latest comprehensive revision of the reforming process is found in the essays in Scragg, *Edgar*.

[3] D. Dumville, *English Caroline Script and Monastic History: Studies in Benedictinism, AD 950-1030* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1993), pp. 7-15; M. Gretsch, *The Intellectual Foundations of the English Benedictine Reform* (Cambridge, C.U.P., 1999), pp. 226-34 R. Jayatilaka, 'The Old English Benedictine Rule: Writing for Women and Men', *Anglo-Saxon England* 32 (2004), 147-87, at 147-50.

(Suffolk).[4] The veracity of this entry has been discussed for years but it is now widely accepted as original.[5] In order to understand the purpose of this rendition we need to consider the vernacular historical treatise commonly known as *Edgar's Establishment of the Monasteries* (*EEM*). This text, believed to be the work of Æthelwold himself[6] and which is contemporary with the Benedictine Reform despite surviving in a single vernacular copy from the early twelfth century, offers an overview of the reforming process, including a reference to the translation of the Benedictine customary. It records that the *RSB* was translated to "deprive uneducated monolingual speakers of English (*þa ungelæredan inlendisce*) of their excuses for not obeying the precepts of the *Regula* on account of their deficient knowledge of Latin' so that they might 'the more zealously serve God and have no excuse that they were driven by ignorance to err".[7] In view of this, it may be concluded that Æthelwold's was a purposeful translation created (and circulated) under the sponsorship of the royal family that was intended to bridge the existing gap between the accession of new recruits to monastic orders and their lack of appropriate Latin comprehension skills. The aim was an utterly practical one. Novices needed to understand and abide by the monastic regulations from the moment they entered the monastery, but this was virtually impossible unless the text in which those regulations were laid out was available in their own language.

---

[4] It reads: 'Æadgarus rex et Alftreð dederunt sancto Æðelwoldo manerium, quod dicitur Suðburn, et cyrographum quod pertinebat, […] eo pacto ut ille regulam sancti Benedicti in Anglicum idioma de Latino transferet. Qui sic fecit.' E.O. Blake, ed., *Liber Eliensis* (London: Royal Historical Society, 1962), book ii, ch. 37, at p. 11. Recently translated in J. Fairweather, trans., *Liber Eliensis: A History of the Isle of Ely from the Seventh Century to the Twelfth* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2005), pp. 134-5.

[5] D. Whitelock, 'The Authorship of the Account of King Edgar's Establishment of the Monateries' in J.L. Rosier, ed., *Philological Essays: Studies in Old and Middle English Language and Literature in Honour of Herbert Dean Meritt* (The Hague: Mouton, 1970), pp. 125-36; Dumville, *English Caroline*, p. 10, n. 14; Gretsch, *Foundations*, pp. 229-30.

[6] Whitelock, 'Authorship'; Gretsch, *Foundations*, pp. 230-1.

[7] 'Hæbben forþi *þa ungelæreden inlendisce* þæs halgan regules cyþþe þurh agenes gereordes anwrigenesse, þæt hy þe geornlicor Gode þeowien and nane tale næbben þæt hy þurh nytennesse misfon þurfen' [my italics]. D. Whitelock, et al., eds., *Councils and Synods, with Other Documents Relating to the English Church, AD 871-1204* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1981), pp.142-54.

The Manuscripts of the Old English RSB

TABLE 1. List of Manuscripts containing the OE translation of the *RSB*.

MANUSCRIPT	DATE
Oxford, Corpus Christi College, MS 197	s.x[2]
Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 178, part B	s. xi[1]
London, British Library, Cotton Titus A. iv	s. xi *med.*
Wells Cathedral Library, MS 7 [chs. 49-65]	s. xi *med.*
Durham Cathedral Library, B.IV, 24	s. xi[2]
London, British Library, Cotton Faustina A. x, part B	s.xii[1]
London, British Library, Cotton Claudius D. iii	s.xiii[1]

Only seven copies of the vernacular translation of the *RSB* have survived, not all of them complete. Even though the survival rate is remarkable in comparison with that of other contemporary texts, these seven manuscripts provide evidence of a complex textual tradition whereby Æthelwold's translation might have been revised a number of times between the eleventh and thirteenth centuries.[8] Besides, none of the extant copies is contemporary with the reforming movement, which means that we are deprived of both Æthelwold's original as well as of all the copies produced during his lifetime, that is, during the first reforming wave. The earliest extant copy of the vernacular *RSB* was produced in the last quarter of the tenth century, after Edgar's and Æthelwold's deaths. No other copy survives from before 1000 and most of the surviving manuscripts were produced in the eleventh century. Finally, two late copies have survived from the early twelfth century and from the early decades of the thirteenth century.[9]

[8] Jayatilaka, 'Benedictine Rule', 182-7.

[9] I have discarded those copies containing only chapter 4 as they seem to reflect a different textual transmission from that of the full copies.

Format

The presentation of the vernacular text is a distinctive feature that may allow us to establish two variant groups. Most of the surviving copies present a bilingual format whereby the OE *RSB* follows the Latin text chapter by chapter. On the other hand, only two manuscripts contain independent monolingual recensions. It should be noted that these two vernacular copies are later than the rest, which may suggest an amendment in the transmission of the bilingual *RSB*, whereby at some point late in the eleventh century the OE translation was already being circulated on its own. Despite the fact that Claudius D.iii was produced in the thirteenth century the case for an independent transmission should not be undermined. The vernacular text in this late manuscript is an early-Middle-English update of Æthelwold's text and whoever produced it used an early-eleventh-century version of the bilingual text as exemplar.[10]

The majority of the copies display a bilingual version of the *RSB*. OCCC197, CCCC178, Cotton Titus A.iv, Cotton Claudius D.iii and Wells 7 all share this format which also lacks a chapter list and shows inconsistent chapter headings in the OE text (whenever they are found) amongst the different copies. The use of this bilingual layout is not uncommon amongst Anglo-Saxon manuscripts. It is found in English charters from the ninth century onwards. S801, a diploma of King Edgar granting land to Æthelwold from 975, is just one of the many examples where a bilingual format is used with the terms of the transaction in Latin and the boundaries in the vernacular. The so-called *Paris Psalter* (Paris, B.N., lat. MS. 8824) is another relevant, albeit somewhat later, example. This mid-eleventh-century manuscript contains bilingual versions of the psalms in parallel columns. In this parallel-text arrangement the Latin original is presented in the left-hand column and the vernacular translation in the right.[11] A final, fitting example is the bilingual copy of the *Rule of Chrodegang* in CCCC191.[12] This Exeter manuscript from s.xi$^{3/4}$ contains a copy of the rule for canons with the OE text following the Latin chapter by chapter, the same format found in most copies of the bilingual *RSB*. These examples come to show firstly that the production and circulation of bilingual texts in Anglo-Saxon England were commonplace by the late

[10] Jayatilaka, 'Benedictine Rule', 158.
[11] Ker, *Catalogue*, no. 367; H. Gneuss, *Handlist of Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts* (Tempe, Arizona, 2001), no. 891; G.R. Owen-Crocker, ed., *Working with Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts* (Exeter: University of Exeter Press, 2009), p.6.
[12] Ker, *Catalogue*, no. 46; Gneuss, *Handlist*, no. 60.

tenth century.[13] Also, CCCC191 reveals that although a variety of formats was available for texts written in two languages, the one alternating Latin and OE seems to have been favoured for customaries such as the *RSB* and the *Rule of Chrodegang*. Finally, that the earliest surviving manuscripts of the bilingual *RSB* follow this pattern must reveal Æthelwold's original preference.

The two remaining manuscripts contain independent monolingual renderings of the vernacular *RSB*. The most problematic of them is Durham, Cathedral Library, B.IV.24, where the OE text is found alongside a detached copy of the Latin. However, as I have argued elsewhere, there is only tentative evidence to suggest that both texts were initially intended to form a unit and it rather seems that the vernacular may have been produced at a different scriptorium and was later attached as a supplement to the Latin.[14] The reasons that triggered the need for a vernacular translation may simply reflect Æthelwold's concerns as expressed in the *EEM*, but it must be noted that B.IV.24 provides the earliest evidence of the OE *RSB* being circulated on its own. This is further supported by the twelfth-century copy in Faustina A.x, Part B. This codex is the only vernacular recension of the *RSB* to have survived, and apparently used, on its own, without evidence of having ever coexisted alongside the Latin text. Its uniqueness is further enhanced by the fact that this vernacular copy was produced four decades after the Norman takeover, once the native English ecclesiastical elite had been almost completely wiped out.

Scribes and Other Original Items

In the seven manuscripts here discussed, up to eight different scribes took part in the copying of the OE *RSB*. A survey of the texts copied by those "original" scribes reveals that they were almost exclusively interested in the *RSB*, since most of them did not write any other item. This is the case in OCCC197, CCCC178, and Durham B.IV.24 and Wells 7, even though the fragmentary nature of the latter prevents any conjecture about the existence of any other contents in the manuscript. In the three other instances the original scribes went on to copy further items. The bilingual *RSB* in Titus A.iv was the work of two mid-eleventh-century hands. An experienced hand copied the first part of the text, whereas a

[13] For other examples see Dumville, *English Caroline*, p. 12, n. 24.

[14] F.J. Alvarez Lopez, 'A Comparative Analysis of the Palaeography of the Manuscripts Containing the Æthelwoldian Translation of *Regula Sancti Benedicti* written in England' (Unpublished PhD Thesis – University of Manchester, 2010), section 5.4.

second, less-skilful one completed the *RSB* and supplemented it with the so-called "Carolingian compendium", a group of texts derived from Benedict of Aniane's reforms in ninth-century Francia.[15] Similarly, the main hand in Faustina A.x, part B went on to write a second vernacular item immediately after the OE *RSB*. In this late copy, the customary is followed by *EEM*. Finally, the latest surviving copy was written by a scribe who is also found in the final section of Bede's *Martyrologium* in Claudius D.iii.

Nevertheless, even though in most instances the scribes that wrote the OE *RSB* did not enter any other text, those copies were not always intended to stand on their own, as the contemporary addition of other content shows. Whereas the earliest copies in OCCC197 and CCCC178 seem to have been originally conceived to be the sole items in those manuscripts, from the mid-eleventh century onwards a slightly different picture begins to emerge. Along with the aforementioned case of Titus A.iv, the copy of the OE *RSB* in B.IV.24 was part of an ensemble from the outset. Evidence suggests that this text was added as part of a miscellaneous collection which contained three other original items: a calendar, Archbishop Lanfranc's *Constitutiones* and the Latin version of the *RSB*. Beyond interpretations of the principles of selection behind the formation of this group, it remains clear that the vernacular customary was never intended to be either the main or the only item in this manuscript.

Later manuscripts support the tendency whereby the OE *RSB* was circulated increasingly less often on its own after the mid-eleventh century. Thus Faustina A.x, part B which was supplemented with the *EEM*, was probably never intended to be used on its own and may have been attached to Part A (a late eleventh-century copy of Ælfric's *Grammar* and *Glossary*) immediately after its production. Similarly, the copy in Claudius D.iii contains a bilingual copy of the *RSB* that was written alongside a selection of texts reminiscent of that found on B.IV.24, comprising a martyrology and a calendar with the obits of individuals of particular relevance for the community at Wintney (Hants). The presence of a variety of original contemporary texts besides the OE *RSB* among the later copies may well suggest an alteration in the perception and use of the customary and, consequently, the manuscripts in which it was copied. The relevance given to this text in the decades immediately after the Benedictine Reform seems to have partially died away in the years leading to the Norman Conquest. For some reason, English monastic communities from the mid-eleventh

[15] It includes three pieces: *Aachen capitula*, *Memoriale qualiter* and *De festivitatibus anni*. See Alvarez Lopez, 'Comparative', p. 86.

century onwards did not feel that the OE *RSB* was required to be copied and preserved on its own.

Script

Another question that needs to be addressed as part of any study of bilingual manuscripts from the late Anglo-Saxon period is the scribes' reaction when each language required its own set of letterforms.[16] An analysis of the responses of the most careful scribes provides an insight into their skill in handling the two alphabets as well as into the broader sociolinguistic framework of hierarchical relationships between scripts.

The earliest manuscripts of our group reveal a strict binary system of scripts derived from two independent traditions which came into contact on the eve of the Benedictine reform. The introduction of the continental Caroline minuscule by the reformers transformed the position of the Anglo-Saxon minuscule as sole script in the insular scriptoria.[17] From the mid-tenth century the strikingly round letterforms originally imposed by Charlemagne in his empire would replace the insular alphabet in the Latin texts. It has been noted that none of our codices was produced during the reformers' time but, as pointed out by both Bishop and Dumville, OCCC197 was the work of a scribe with an excellent skill in both scripts at a time when maintaining that difference seemed to be a matter of great ideological importance.[18]

Once the initial impetus of the reform had slowed down, the purity of the continental script seems to have deteriorated progressively and a degree of insularity reveals itself in the Latin letterforms. From the eleventh century most copies reveal a parallel tendency whereby the vernacular script becomes more angular and the continental more insular. It must be noted that, since none of these manuscripts was intended to be a display copy, the care and concentration manifested by the scribes may significantly vary between them. Thus, whereas the performance in OCCC197 is of a remarkable quality, Titus A.iv shows the work of two

[16] Alvarez Lopez, 'Changing Scripts: A Case Study of the Use of Different Scripts in the Bilingual Text of Cambridge, Corpus Christi Colle, 178, Part B', *Quaestio Insularis* 8 (2007), 19-35.

[17] The canonical studies on the introduction and development of the Caroline minuscule in England remain T.A.M. Bishop, *English Caroline Minuscule* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971) and Dumville, *English Caroline*, esp. pp. 16-19. See also, J. Roberts, *Guide to Scripts Used in English Writings up to 1500* (London: British Library, 2005), pp. 85-6.

[18] Bishop, *ECM*, pp.xxi-xxiii and Dumville, *ECS*, pp. 19-35.

rather different scribes: the first, an experienced, overconfident hand; the second revealing some lack of skill. Nevertheless, the scribes of the earlier bilingual texts were overall capable of maintaining the expected separation of scripts with a high degree of success. Yet, it is not uncommon to find instances where a script was used in the wrong language. Slips of concentration were fairly frequent in short chapters, when scribes alternate from script to script in quick succession.[19]

A fine chronological line can be set at about the year 1100 when the separation between Caroline minuscule and the insular Anglo-Saxon minuscule becomes so blurred that it is no longer possible to establish clear-cut differences, except for those letterforms which remain unique to OE (*æ*, insular *g*, *wynn*, *þ*, *ð*).[20] In the latest copies such as Faustina A.x scribes do not show significant differences between Latin and OE beyond the aforementioned special letterforms.[21]

In a few cases the difference between the two written languages is not merely reduced to the shapes of particular letterforms. A detailed comparison of their size reveals that the Latin forms are noticeably bigger than their vernacular counterparts in some copies, particularly in Wells 7. Whereas this difference is not so obvious in earlier manuscripts, this mid-eleventh-century fragment displays an obvious dissimilarity whereby the Latin text is visually clearer and more solemn. Equally, in Claudius D.iii the different size in Latin and vernacular is further emphasized by the use of a dissimilar nib for each language. Here, not only did the scribe consciously write smaller letterforms in the English text, but he/she was clearly establishing that difference by using a thicker pen. It seems to me that this distinction may derive from an ideological and hierarchical creed. Latin was at this time the language of the Church and, by implication, the language of God. This ideological hierarchy seems to be rigorously maintained with regards to the appearance in which bilingual texts were to be presented. Thus, besides the fact that the version in the divine language precedes the vernacular translation, its bigger size provides a symbolic reminder of the language that a monk (or indeed any Christian) should strive to dominate if the precepts of a saintly life were to be fully observed.

---

[19] Alvarez Lopez, 'Changing Scripts'.

[20] This is effectively the beginning of a transitional period characterised by a transitional script: Protogothic minuscule. See Brown, *Guide*, pp.72-3 and Roberts, *Guide*, pp.104-7.

[21] This can be examined considering the Latin quotations inserted in the vernacular text. See fo. 118v.

Later Annotations

All of the manuscripts contain later annotations by individuals of different dates who either entered full texts or extracts or who simply glossed or corrected those original items. A study of these may provide data essential for a successful interpretation of these codices' early ownership as well as the use given to them by later readers.

Both OCCC197 and B.IV.24 seem to have been annotated with a similar aim in mind. These contain a number of documentary records relating to their communities alongside the Benedictine customary. In the case of the former, members of the community of Bury St Edmunds inserted a number of entries relating to this house's possessions as well as two annalistic entries relating to King Cnut and the monastery's foundation.[22] With regards to the bilingual *RSB*, the text was corrected and even its structure altered in the eleventh century when chapter 7 (*De humilitate*) was split into thirteen different sections.[23] The case of the Durham manuscript is not as simple. As already noted, its copy of the OE *RSB* was originally attached to a calendar, Lanfranc's *Constitutiones* and the Latin *RSB*. Shortly after this, a copy of Usuard's *Martyrologium* was also inserted and subsequently followed by an extensive number of items related to a large variety of topics and even genres. Apart from personal notes and a list of conventions with other monastic houses, they include liturgical notes, booklists, professions, gospel pericopes and a prolific epistolary collection.[24]

Following a similar original structure, but bearing significantly less annotations, Claudius D.iii also consisted initially of a martyrology (in this case Bede's), the bilingual *RSB* and a calendar. These three items were supplemented by two other minor texts in Anglo-Norman: a poem and some instructions for the use of the martyrology. As for later annotations, beyond a number of obits entered in the calendar from the thirteenth to the fifteenth centuries, only a list of goods donated in 1420 to Wintney's refectory was entered. However, different processes of correction of the bilingual *RSB* show that the text was still being used well into the fourteenth century.

---

[22] Dumville, *English Caroline*, pp. 30-2.
[23] Fos. 22r to 31r.
[24] Alvarez Lopez, 'DCL, B IV, 24: A Palaeographical and Codicological Study of Durham's Cantor's Book' in I. Moskowich-Spiegel and B. Crespo-García, eds., *Bells Chiming from the Past: Cultural and Linguistic Studies on Early English* (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2007), pp. 209-26, esp. 213-18.

CCCC178, part B presents a straightforward structure in which the OE *RSB* was the sole original item. Later users of the manuscript did not have the need to alter this and only one late-eleventh century passage from the *Seven Ages of the World* was inserted on the last leaf of the manuscript.[25] However, the OE text of the *RSB* was used in the thirteenth century by a prominent member of the community at Worcester. The so-called the "tremulous hand" glossed it extensively in the process of creating Latin-OE wordlists which he entered on fo. ii v and p. 458.[26]

The "Carolingian compendium" and the bilingual *RSB* copied in Titus A.iv display only two later insertions on the final leaves of the manuscript. The first is a late-twelfth-century copy of chapter 49 and a section of chapter 48 from the *RSB* in Latin, a passage known to have been circulated on its own in medieval England.[27] A few decades later, a different hand simply translated this item into French. The second part of the *RSB* and the Carolingian supplements show numerous corrections as a result of the second scribe's aforementioned lack of ability.

Finally, and in a category of its own, Faustina A.x, part B offers an utterly different example from those seen so far. As noted above, the codex was originally formed by the OE *RSB* and *EEM*. No other full texts were added to these, but their margins were extensively used in the mid-twelfth-century when an annotator decided to enter a number of extracts from a variety of sources including Halitgar's *De vitiis et virtutibus*, Roger de Caen's *De professione monachorum*, Seneca's *Letters to Lucilius*, Publilius Syrus' *Proverbs* and some theological questions quoting Peter Abelard. Later users of this manuscript entered short wordlists and quotations, but none went as far as that mid-twelfth-century annotator who significantly altered the nature and utility of a late copy of Æthelwold's translation.[28]

---

[25] P. 458.

[26] C. Franzen, *The Tremulous Hand of Worcester. A Study of Old English int he 13th century* (Oxford: O.U.P., 1991), pp.49-51.

[27] See T. Hunt, *Teaching and Learning Latin in 13th-Century England*, 3 vols. (Woodbridge: D.S. Brewer, 1991), vol. 1, p. 27. He also provides an edition on pp. 27-8.

[28] For a detailed study of the marginalia in Faustina A.x, part B see Alvarez Lopez, 'Marginal Evidence for Twelfth-century Monastic Scholarship: Annotation, Provenance and Use in London, British Library Cotton MS. Faustina A. X, Part B', *Electronic British Library Journal* (Forthcoming, 2012).

Conclusions

Purpose, Use and Reuse

In the previous sections it has been shown how most copies of the bilingual *RSB* were produced as independent items, intended to stand as the sole, or core, element of manuscripts with a clearly defined identity. This fact, which is particularly obvious in the earlier copies, might indicate a tendency towards a more personal and private function. The codicological and palaeographical evidence seems to corroborate this interpretation. The four earliest codices (OCCC197, CCCC178, Titus A.iv and Wells 7) exhibit little evidence of having being comprehensively used, which is not surprising bearing in mind that even though the books were probably used by more than one individual, many of these readers would not have the authority to leave traces on the manuscript. Only those members of the community elevated to their highest ranks or those in charge of liturgical and pastoral duties within the monastery (specially the *cantor*) would have had the opportunity to modify the text, either by emendation, glossing or annotation. In addition, the size and decorative qualities of the different copies suggest that none of them was intended to be used as a display copy. None of the seven extant manuscripts was written in display script and very few have any decorations at all. Indeed, those that do exhibit only very modest foliate terminals and beaded forms.[29] This overall modest appearance seems to suggest that these manuscripts were produced for individual reading. Finally, the case of CCCC178 may also be significant. As has been noted above, this early-eleventh-century manuscript was methodically used in the thirteenth century, albeit not precisely because of its content. The "tremulous hand" chose this codex because of the language it was written in. In his study of the OE language, this thirteenth-century reader left glosses and wordlists in Latin and the vernacular throughout the composite as evidence of a careful linguistic exploration of a language with which he was evidently no longer familiar.

However, there is one exception to this lack of grandeur in the appearance of these codices. Claudius D.iii was mostly copied in gothic scripts which immediately marks out the letterforms in comparison to those in the other codices. It is no surprise that a parallel dissimilarity in size is evident. Whereas the average page size of the other six manuscripts is *c*.251x167mm., the leaves of the Claudius manuscript measure

[29] See on OCCC197 fos. 31v and 32r; on CCCC178, pp. 362 and 450; on Titus A.iv, fos. 35r and 36r; on Wells 7, fos. 5v and 13v.

c.340x242mm.[30] In addition to being bigger in size, the "Wintney manuscript" was also more elaborately ornamented. Decorated initials are found throughout the text and they sometimes take up almost the entire margins.[31] However, the key to understand the use made of this codex in the Cistercian nunnery rests with the other items copied alongside the bilingual *RSB*. The main item in the codex is preceded by a copy of Bede's *Martyrology* and is followed by a calendar. This combination of articles is not uncommon in medieval manuscripts and another example of this can be found among the other copies of the OE *RSB*. B.IV.24 also contains a martyrology and a calendar alongside the OE (and Latin) *RSB*. These are only four items in a manuscript which is notably reknowned for the numerous items added to it during the twelfth century and which make it a very complex piece.[32] However, as with the Claudius copy, it is the three items they share that help us understand their use. There was one particular event in the daily life of every Benedictine or Cistercian monastery where a calendar, a martyrology and the *RSB* would have been required. The whole community would gather at the daily Chapter meeting to listen to one of the leading members of the community (be it abbot/abbess, prior/prioress or even the cantor) as he/she read out a chapter from the *RSB* (hence the meeting and room's name) before he/she went on to explain it. The meeting would also include the discussion of pastoral matters within the community as well as the reading of a passage from the martyrology to commemorate a particular martyr or saint. Finally, prayers were said for those deceased individuals (saints, royals, donors or former inmates) of particular relevance to the community and whose names were kept in a calendar. Therefore, given the presence of such items, along with further evidence of frequent reading found in them, it is likely that both manuscripts were used in the chapter meetings of the communities at Durham and Wintney.

Finally, Faustina A.x, part B must be considered on its own. Firstly, this is the only surviving copy of the OE *RSB* that was never, as far as we can tell, kept and used alongside a Latin version. Also, it is remarkable

[30] As for written space, the average size of the other manuscripts is *c*.201x121mm. whereas in Claudius D.iii is *c*.240x159mm.

[31] See, for example, fo. 81v.

[32] On this manuscript see M. Gullick 'The Scribes of the Durham Cantor's Book (Durham, Dean and Chapter Library, MS B. IV. 24) and the Durham Martyrology Scribe', in in D. Rollason, M. Harvey and M. Prestwich, eds., *Anglo-Norman Durham: 1093-1193* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1994), pp. 93-109; A.J. Piper, 'The Durham Cantor's Book (Durham, Dean and Chapter Library, MS B.IV.24)', in Rollason, *Anglo-Norman*, pp. 79-92; and Alvarez Lopez, 'B IV, 24'.

that having been produced decades after the Norman takeover both its original items are in the vernacular. The English character of the codex, further enhanced by the source and content of both texts,[33] highlights the production of vernacular texts in a hostile environment in which Latin had become almost exclusively the language of the scriptorium. However, where this copy certainly stands out from the rest is in the traces that later readers left on its leaves. Even though the entire part B shows no evidence of use between its production early in the twelfth century and the middle of the twelfth century, by this date a single individual decided to use the codex's margins to annotate a number of excerpts. These include passages from continental authors such as Halitgar of Cambrai and Roger of Caen, as well as Classical texts such as Seneca's *Letters to Lucilius* and Publilius Syrus' *Proverbs*. As I have argued elsewhere, the combination of themes and genres explored in these passages, alongside the original contents of the composite, might point towards its use in the classroom as a teaching tool.[34]

Final Remarks

The study of the manuscripts containing the OE *RSB* provides an insight into the transmission and use of a crucial text in the monastic history of late Anglo-Saxon history and into the Norman period. The careful examination of four palaeographical and codicological aspects has exposed a complex amount of data which, in turn, sheds new light on the approach that different monastic communities at different moments in time had to the same text as well as on the material framework in which it was circulated and used.

It has been shown that Æthelwold translated the *RSB* into the vernacular to allow new monolingual English inmates entering the monastic life (*þa ungelæredan inlendisce*) to quickly get to grips with the basic principles and regulations of their new ascetic life. This purpose might be reflected in the bilingual format in which the translator chose to present his work whereby the OE text follows the Latin chapter by chapter. The four earliest manuscripts follow this pattern, as does the latest, which was adapted from a lost eleventh-century copy. However, it would seem that from the late eleventh century the vernacular text began to be circulated on its own and its prominence as the sole item in a codex began to fade. Whereas in earlier manuscripts the bilingual *RSB* plays the

[33] See section 2.2 above.
[34] Alvarez Lopez, 'Comparative', pp. 172-3.

foremost role in the codex (notwithstanding the presence of supplementary items alongside), evidence from the late eleventh century onwards shows otherwise. From that time the Benedictine customary appears alongside other items which reveal themselves at least as important and which seem to have been the object of frequent (probably daily) use. Finally, the work of the original scribes also provides a vivid picture of the evolution of script with particular reference to late Anglo-Saxon England. Given the use of two separate scripts in the bilingual Anglo-Saxon copies of the *RSB*, they illustrate the evolution of this separation of scripts as it became increasingly blurred throughout the eleventh century. In spite of this, copies such as Wells 7 and Claudius D.iii reveal how the distance between the two languages is also portrayed not only in terms of different letterforms but also in terms of size.

To conclude, the seven manuscripts discussed above form a fascinating group. Despite sharing Æthelwold's OE *RSB* as a common element, they diverge in almost everything else. The methodological approach used in this study reveals the extent of the variance amongst these manuscripts. They were all produced at different times, in different places and, most importantly, they were used with different purposes in mind. Apart from the *RSB*, no other text is found in any two codices of the group. Besides confirming the intricate textual transmission of the OE *RSB*, this paper has shed light on the production and use of manuscripts at the end of the Anglo-Saxon era as well as suggesting new paths for the study of Anglo-Saxon manuscripts.

Works Cited

Alvarez Lopez, F.J., "Changing Scripts: A Case Study of the Use of Different Scripts in the Bilingual Text of Cambridge, Corpus Christi Colle, 178, Part B", *Quaestio Insularis* 8 (2007), 19-35

—. "DCL, B IV, 24: A Palaeographical and Codicological Study of Durham's Cantor's Book," in Moskowich-Spiegel, *Bells Chiming*, pp. 209-26

—. "A Comparative Analysis of the Palaeography of the Manuscripts Containing the Æthelwoldian Translation of *Regula Sancti Benedicti* written in England." Unpublished PhD Thesis – University of Manchester, 2010.

—. "Marginal Evidence for Twelfth-century Monastic Scholarship: Annotation, Provenance and Use in London, British Library Cotton MS. Faustina A. X, Part B", *Electronic British Library Journal.* Forthcoming, 2012.