

Cambridge University Press
 978-0-521-03862-1 - Anglo-Saxon England 5
 Edited by Peter Clemoes
 Excerpt
[More information](#)

Cuthswith, seventh-century abbess of Inkberrow, near Worcester, and the Würzburg manuscript of Jerome on Ecclesiastes

PATRICK SIMS-WILLIAMS

The fifth-century Italian manuscript of Jerome's Commentary on Ecclesiastes, Würzburg, Universitätsbibliothek, M. p. th. q. 2, which M. Adriaen takes as the base of his recent edition,¹ is interesting to English scholars on various counts.² On 1r it bears a very early Old English inscription, in Anglo-Saxon majuscule which Lowe and Bischoff date *c.* 700:³

Cuthsuithae. boec.
 thaerae abbatissan.

(‘a book of Cuthswith the abbess’).⁴ In all probability this was written in England itself rather than at an Anglo-Saxon centre on the continent, in view of the chronology of the English missions. The commentary is in ‘a beautiful

¹ Corpus Christianorum Series Latina 72 (1959), 247–61. Abbreviations used in the course of this article are: *BCS* = *Cartularium Saxonicum*, ed. Walter de G. Birch (London, 1885–93); *CLA* = E. A. Lowe, *Codices Latini Antiquiores* (Oxford, 1934–72); *DEPN* = Eilert Ekwall, *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of English Place-Names*, 4th ed. (Oxford, 1960); Finberg = H. P. R. Finberg, *The Early Charters of the West Midlands*, 2nd ed. (Leicester, 1972); *HE* = *Bede's Ecclesiastical History of the English People*, ed. and trans. B. Colgrave and R. A. B. Mynors (Oxford, 1969); *KCD* = *Codex Diplomaticus Aevi Saxonici*, ed. J. M. Kemble (London, 1839–48); *LSK* = Bernhard Bischoff and Josef Hofmann, *Libri Sancti Kyliani: die Würzburger Schreibschule und die Dombibliothek im VIII. und IX. Jahrhundert*, Quellen und Forschungen zur Geschichte des Bistums und Hochstifts Würzburg 6 (Würzburg, 1952); Sawyer = P. H. Sawyer, *Anglo-Saxon Charters: an Annotated List and Bibliography* (London, 1968); Tangl = *S. Bonifatii et Lullii Epistolae*, ed. Michael Tangl, *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Epistolae Selectae* 1 (Berlin, 1916, repr. 1955); *PNWorcs* = A. Mawer and F. M. Stenton, with F. T. S. Houghton, *The Place-Names of Worcester-shire*, EPNS 4 (Cambridge, 1927). *BCS*, *CLA*, Finberg, *KCD*, Sawyer and Tangl are cited by number, not by page (unless otherwise stated).

² The manuscript is described *CLA* ix, 1430; *LSK* pp. 88–9; and E. A. Lowe, *English Uncial* (Oxford, 1960), pp. 17 and 18.

³ *CLA* ix, 1430b; E. A. Lowe, *Palaeographical Papers 1907–1965*, ed. Ludwig Bieler (Oxford, 1972) 1, 243; *LSK* p. 88; Bernhard Bischoff, *Mittelalterliche Studien* (Stuttgart, 1966–7) 11, 333. N. R. Ker (*Catalogue of Manuscripts Containing Anglo-Saxon* (Oxford, 1957), no. 401 (see also p. xxviii)) gives s. viii as the date.

⁴ For facsimiles see Lowe, *English Uncial*, pl. 1b, or *CLA* ix, 1430a, or better *LSK*, pl. 13, or A. Brandl, ‘Chrousts Fund einer des ältesten ags. Aufzeichnungen’, *ASNSL* 107 (1901), 103–5, pl. Brandl (p. 105) quotes Liebermann's opinion that Cuthswith could not have written these words herself since the use of her title would go against the convention of humility.

Cambridge University Press
 978-0-521-03862-1 - Anglo-Saxon England 5
 Edited by Peter Clemoes
 Excerpt
[More information](#)

Patrick Sims-Williams

bold uncial of the oldest type',¹ but six leaves of the manuscript's original 114 (fols. 10, 13, 63, 68, 81 and 82) were replaced by leaves of a thicker parchment, in England according to Lowe and Bischoff.² It is not known why this was necessary, nor where the text was taken from. Lowe dates the writing of these later leaves to the seventh century.³ He observes that they were 'written, if one may judge from the syllable-by-syllable copying, by a scribe for whom Latin was an alien tongue and who was not completely sure of his uncial characters'.⁴ D. H. Wright remarks that their example of an English scribe 'doing his unequal best to reproduce the unfamiliar letter forms' is not a very helpful illustration of the relationship of English uncial to Italian models, 'for the script he writes has no style of its own, and therefore no future'.⁵ The main interest of the manuscript in the history of English uncial is as an illustration of foreign models which were available; it is, in Lowe's words, 'the oldest extant uncial manuscript that was at hand to serve as a model in an English scriptorium'.⁶

M. p. th. q. 2 is an especially interesting example of the position of England in the transmission of manuscripts. It is the most ancient of the surviving Italian manuscripts from Würzburg Cathedral Library. Some of these would have reached Germany overland from Italy; others would have come via England, probably with the eighth-century Anglo-Saxon missionaries.⁷ The Jerome clearly belongs with the latter group. Neither of the two catalogues of the Würzburg Library, of c. 800 and c. 1000, gives a certain answer to the question of when it reached Würzburg. Lowe tentatively proposed that the fourth entry, 'commentarius', in the earlier list referred to it;⁸ but this cannot be proved, and the entry could refer to other surviving early books.⁹ 'Ecclesiasten. Hieronymi' in the later list also could refer to it.¹⁰ We can at least say that these catalogues do not exclude the possibility that it was present when they were drawn up. In the most recent discussion, J. Hofmann regards the question as still open, while inclining to the earlier belief that the

¹ *CLA* IX, 1430a, with a facsimile of 12v (fuller in Lowe, *English Uncial*, pl. Ia). For 4v, 5r and 64r see Anton Chroust, *Monumenta Palaeographica* I. Serie, 5 (Munich, 1901), pls. 2–3.

² Lowe, *English Uncial*, p. 18; *LSK* p. 88.

³ *CLA* IX, 1430b, with a facsimile of 63r (fuller in *English Uncial*, pl. V). For 63v see Chroust, *Monumenta Palaeographica* 1.5, pl. 3.

⁴ *English Uncial*, p. 18.

⁵ D. H. Wright, 'Some Notes on English Uncial', *Traditio* 17 (1961), 450.

⁶ *English Uncial*, p. 18.

⁷ *LSK* pp. 5 and 155–6; cf. Wilhelm Levison, *England and the Continent in the Eighth Century* (Oxford, 1946), pp. 141 and 143.

⁸ 'An Eighth-Century List of Books in a Bodleian Manuscript from Würzburg and its probable Relation to the Laudian Acts', *Palaeographical Papers* 1, 243. To the objection that it is not described as *commentarius* in the text itself (*LSK* p. 89) one can reply that the cataloguer may well have been familiar with the genre of the books he listed.

⁹ *LSK* p. 144.

¹⁰ *Ibid.* p. 89; Ker, *Catalogue*, no. 401.

Cambridge University Press
 978-0-521-03862-1 - Anglo-Saxon England 5
 Edited by Peter Clemoes
 Excerpt
[More information](#)

Cuthswith, abbess of Inkberrow, and the Würzburg Jerome

book may have belonged to Burghard, the English bishop of Würzburg (742–53).¹ But I think we may go further: an aspect of some pen trials to which Hofmann himself draws attention² seems to me to lead to a *terminus ante quem* for its advent in Germany. The following scribbles in Anglo-Saxon half uncials of the eighth century deface 1r, above the Cuthswith inscription:

omniu
 omnium Inimicorum suorum dominabitur
 om. . . . nimicorum suorum suit tominabitur

This tag (ps. x secundum Hebraeos. 5) is quite common in Würzburg manuscripts, but it is not restricted to them, and seems to be a traditional scribal exercise of Hiberno-Saxon schools.³ Its appearance does not, then, in itself prove that the book was on the continent by the eighth century,⁴ though the confusion of voiced and unvoiced consonants, which seems to be a feature of East Frankish Latin, is very suggestive.⁵ Hofmann, however, points out that the pen trial occurs in a similar form in another Würzburg manuscript, M. p. th. f. 27 (Origen's Homilies on the Book of Numbers), 90v, in Anglo-Saxon majuscule and minuscule, probably of the last quarter of the eighth century.⁶

omnium inicorum suorum tominapitur, abidefg
 omniumi nicorum suorum tominapcj.

Hofmann notes that the two groups resemble each other in the striking unvoicing of *dominabitur* and in peculiarities of script. In particular, he regards the form of *r* in the Origen pen trial as an exaggerated and clumsy imitation of that in the other. It seems to me reasonable to conclude from this that the two commentaries were in the same scriptorium at the time when the pen trial in the Jerome was imitated in the Origen, that is, by the end of the eighth century. In all probability that scriptorium was in Germany, no doubt at Würzburg itself, for there is no question of the Origen having been in England; it was written in the second half of the eighth century in an Anglo-Saxon scriptorium on the continent, probably in Germany, but probably not at Würzburg,⁷ although it was almost certainly there in the episcopate of Hunbert (833–42), who probably mentions it in a letter to Hrabanus, and

¹ LSK pp. 159–60.

² *Ibid.* pp. 72–4.

³ *Ibid.* pp. 73 and 8, n. 20; Bischoff, 'Elementarunterricht und Probationes Pennae in der ersten Hälfte des Mittelalters', *Mittelalterliche Studien* 1, 77–8.

⁴ Indeed, the same tag may have been written in uncials on 113v while the book was still in England (see below, p. 4). This may have inspired the scribbler on 1r.

⁵ For examples see LSK p. 22.

⁶ *Ibid.* pp. 22 and 74.

⁷ *Ibid.* p. 10; CLA IX, 1407 ('Written in an Anglo-Saxon scriptorium on the Continent, probably in Germany, but hardly at Würzburg, though the manuscript may have reached this centre by the ninth century if the probatio pennae may be taken as a guide').

Cambridge University Press
 978-0-521-03862-1 - Anglo-Saxon England 5
 Edited by Peter Clemoes
 Excerpt
[More information](#)

Patrick Sims-Williams

when the catalogue of c. 1000 was drawn up.¹ I conclude therefore that Cuthswith's Jerome had reached Germany by the end of the eighth century, and probably Würzburg itself.

When did the Jerome leave England? A *terminus a quo* is suggested by P. Engelbert's recent comparison of some more pen trials on 1r and 113v in English uncial (one hand)² with the script of London, British Library, Cotton Augustus ii. 3, a contemporary and very probably original charter of Æthelbald of Mercia dated 736 granting land by the River Stour (in the north of the diocese of Worcester) for a monastery, and with the script of its endorsement (before 757) granting land in Morfe forest nearby.³

Die oben erwähnte Aethelbaldurkunde von 736 und noch mehr ihr etwas späterer Dorsualvermerk zeigen eine mercische Unziale, die der kentischen Unziale sehr viel ähnlicher als der northumbrischen ist. Mit aller gebotenen Reserve sei hier noch eine weitere Beobachtung mitgeteilt. Der Unzialtyp der Aethelbaldurkunde steht den unzialen Federproben der Würzburger Handschrift M. p. th. q. 2, f. 1r und f. 113v nicht fern. Dieser ehrwürdige Codex enthält f. 1r den bekannten Besitzeintrag der Äbtissin Cuthsuitha, die um 700 ein Kloster in oder bei Worcester leitete. Eine angelsächsische Hand des 8. Jahrhunderts hat unter das Exlibris der Äbtissin die Federprobe ADONAI DÑE D̄S MEUS, f. 113v zwischen die beiden Explicit-Zeilen des Codex OMNIUM INIMICORUM SUORUM DOMINABITUR und unter die zweite Explicit-Zeile DÑS TAMQUAM eingetragen. (Von derselben Hand vielleicht auch die Unzialbuchstaben am linken Rand der Seite.) Stil und Buchstabenstruktur erinnern an die Haupthand der Urkunde, das N mit seinem lang herabgezogenen, nach links umgebogenen ersten Strich an das N von DONAVI im Dorsualvermerk. Darf man in diesen Federproben Beispiele mercischer Unziale aus Worcester etwa um 750 erblicken, m. a. W. sind noch vor der Wanderung der Handschrift auf das Festland in oder bei Worcester geschrieben worden? Die Frage kann nur gestellt werden.⁴

As these conclusions are tentative, too much weight must not be attached to them. Caution is also needed in attempting to date closely the uncial of the pen trials by comparison with the charter; Engelbert also suggests a comparison of the script of the charter, and perhaps that of the pen trials too, with the uncial of Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 48 (for which a good

¹ LSK pp. 101 and 149.

² *Ibid.* pp. 73–4. For facsimiles of 1r see above, p. 1, n. 4; no facsimile of 113v is available.

³ BCS 154; Sawyer 89; Finberg 211. The charter was at Worcester s. xi^a (Ker, *Catalogue*, pp. 266–7). For facsimiles see Lowe, *English Uncial*, pl. XXIII, or Albert Bruckner and Robert Marichal, *Chartae Latinae Antiquiores* (Olten and Lausanne, 1954–) III, no. 183. In addition to the bibliography given by the above works, see Sherman S. Kuhn, 'From Canterbury to Lichfield', *Speculum* 23 (1948), 602–4; Kenneth Sisam, 'Canterbury, Lichfield, and the Vespasian Psalter', *RES*, n. s. 7 (1956), 115–16; Kuhn, 'Some Early Mercian Manuscripts', *ibid.* 8 (1957), 363–4; and *The Vespasian Psalter*, ed. D. H. Wright, EEMF 14 (Copenhagen, 1967), 34, 56 and pl. V.

⁴ P. Engelbert, 'Paläographische Bemerkungen zur Faksimileausgabe der ältesten Handschrift der Regula Benedicti (Oxford Bodl. Libr. Hatton 48)', *RB* 79 (1969), 410–11.

Cuthswith, abbess of Inkberrow, and the Würzburg Jerome

case can be made for a Worcester diocese origin),¹ but although he and Wright² agree in dating Hatton 48 to the mid-eighth century, Lowe and others place it at the beginning of the century.³ One may venture to think that the uncial pen trials indicate that the Jerome was still in England in the first quarter of the eighth century at least, and possibly later. This places its arrival on the continent – by the end of the century, as we have seen – during the period when the English missionaries were importing large numbers of books from their homeland to build up the libraries of their monastic schools and provide exemplars for their scriptoria.⁴

At the beginning of the present century Anton Chroust suggested that the abbess Cuthswith who owned the manuscript could be identified with an abbess of the same name mentioned in two charters of c. 700 which earlier scholars had rightly associated with Worcester or its environs (*diocese* would have been more correct), though the places they referred to had not been identified.⁵ Chroust's proposal has been accepted by James, Hofmann and Bischoff,⁶ among others, and Lowe also favoured it ('presumably of the nunnery at or near Worcester').⁷ Engelbert's comparison of its pen trials with Cotton Augustus ii. 3 speaks in favour of the identification, too, although, as he himself doubts whether Kentish and Mercian uncial would be much differentiated in the mid-eighth century, the resemblance with the Mercian charter may not do more than point to the presence of the book in the south of England in general. The identification is no wild speculation, though it must be admitted that absolute proof of such identifications can never be attained, since there are no exhaustive lists of the heads of religious houses. The Cuthswith of the charters is not only the only abbess of this name known to history, as Lowe and Hofmann say, but is also the only woman of any station so named in the considerable corpus of pre-Conquest female names.⁸ If the rarity of the name is taken into consideration together with the coincidence in date and station, Chroust's identification appears extremely probable, although it cannot be proved, short of finding a specific

¹ *Ibid.* pp. 406 and 411.

² 'Some Notes on English Uncial', pp. 449–50.

³ See *ibid.* p. 449: 'an opinion which he still holds' (1961); *CLA* II (2nd ed.), 240; Bischoff, *Mittelalterliche Studien* II, 332; D. H. Farmer, *The Rule of Saint Benedict*, EEMF 15 (Copenhagen, 1968), 22–3; G. Storms, *ESs* 53 (1972), 153–4.

⁴ See Levison, *England and the Continent*, pp. 139–48; Georg Baesecke, *Der Vocabularius Sti. Galli in der angelsächsischen Mission* (Halle, 1933), pp. 84–110; Pierre Riché, *Éducation et Culture dans l'Occident Barbare, VIe – VIIIe Siècles* (Paris, 1962), pp. 487–9; and Tangl, *Index*, p. 308, *s.v. libri*. On the Würzburg library in particular see *LSK* p. 160.

⁵ *Monumenta Palaeographica* 1.5, commentary on pl. 2; Brandl, 'Chroust's Fund', p. 103.

⁶ *Cambridge Medieval History* III (1922), 512; *LSK* pp. 88 and 159; and *Mittelalterliche Studien* II, 324 and 333.

⁷ *CLA* IX, 1430; *Palaeographical Papers* 1, 243.

⁸ William George Searle, *Onomasticon Anglo-Saxonicum* (Cambridge, 1897), p. 150. The name does not occur in Domesday Book or on the continent.

Patrick Sims-Williams

reference to the Cuthswith of the charters as the owner of this copy of Jerome. The purpose of this article is to add some new circumstantial evidence in its favour by outlining the history of Cuthswith's monastery and showing how the manuscript could have come into her possession and how it could have reached Germany by the end of the eighth century.

The originals of the two charters concerning Cuthswith are lost. The only surviving copies of them come from the late seventeenth century, so the evidence of seventeenth-century antiquaries is vital. The first mention of them in print is in George Hickes's *Grammar* in 1688. In this work Hickes, who was dean of Worcester until 1691, printed a transcript of a list of ninety-two charters in the cathedral archives which Dugdale had drawn up in 1643.¹ He followed this with a list of thirteen pre-Conquest and two post-Conquest documents which were still extant in his day² and which, excepting one (no. 14), he was subsequently to print in his *Thesaurus* of 1703–5.³ Dugdale had not listed the two Cuthswith charters, but they are nos. 2 and 3 in Hickes's list. There are copies of the fifteen charters listed by Hickes in the two late-seventeenth-century manuscripts, Oxford, Queen's College 368, pp. 140–70 (which I call Q) and Harley 4660 (H), which are evidently closely related to each other and to Hickes's *Thesaurus*. In Q in the margin beside the text of a charter of Æthelred of Mercia, no. 1 in Hickes's 1688 list,⁴ is a note: 'Ex Archivis Ecclesie Cathedralis Wigorn. Descripsit m^r Hopkyns Istius

¹ G. Hickes, *Institutiones Grammaticae Anglo-Saxonicae et Moeso-Gothicae* (Oxford, 1689–88 (*sic*)) II, 169–71. On Dugdale's list (in Oxford, Bodleian Library, Dugdale 12, pp. 502–6) see Cuthbert Hamilton Turner, *Early Worcester Manuscripts* (Oxford, 1916), p. xxx; Ivor Atkins and Neil R. Ker, *Catalogus Librorum Manuscriptorum Bibliothecae Wigorniensis, made in 1622–1623 by Patrick Young, Librarian to King James I* (Cambridge, 1944), pp. 13–14; Finberg pp. 11–12; R. R. Darlington, *The Cartulary of Worcester Cathedral Priory (Register I)*, Publications of the Pipe Roll Soc. n. s. 38 (1968 for 1962–3), xii, n. 1; and Sawyer pp. 63 and 476–81. I believe that Hickes's source for it was the transcript in London, British Library, Harley 4660, 2r–v, or something very similar. There is a related transcript in Oxford, Queen's College 368, pp. 136–40.

² *Institutiones* II, 171. The list is headed 'Chartæ MSS quæ infrà sequuntur, in Archivis Ecclesie Wigorn. etiamnum extant'. It is apparently printed from Harley 4660, 1r, with some errors, or from something very like it. (It is not in Queen's 368.) No. 1 = Sawyer 77; no. 2 = Sawyer 53; no. 3 = Sawyer 1177; no. 4 = Sawyer 58; no. 5 = Sawyer 1416; no. 6 = Sawyer 180; no. 7 = Sawyer 1430, 1260 and 1432; no. 8 = Sawyer 113; no. 9 = Sawyer 1289; no. 10 = Sawyer 726; no. 11 = Sawyer 1363; no. 12 = Sawyer 1384; no. 13, 'Aldredi Episc. Æthelstano cuidam & Ecclesie Wig. Saxonice', = Sawyer 1406. (In his *Catalogus*, Wanley mistakenly states that Hickes had not printed this in the *Thesaurus* (G. Hickes, *Linguarum Vett. Septentrionalium Thesaurus Grammatico-Criticus et Archaeologicus* (Oxford, 1703–5), pt v [Catalogus], p. 301, no. 1)); no. 14, 'S. VVlstani Ep. de Ecclesia S. Elenæ in Synodo Dioces. 1092', = Darlington, *Worcester Cartulary*, no. 52, printed (directly?) from the original by Henry Wharton (*Anglia Sacra* (London, 1691) I, 542–3) and from Harley 4660 in *Monasticon Anglicanum*, ed. William Dugdale, re-ed. J. Caley et al. (London, 1846) I, 609–10; and no. 15, 'Carta Historica de VVlstano Episcopo', is printed in Hickes's *Thesaurus*, pt I, 175–6, with a specimen facsimile facing p. 144, and from Harley 4660 in Dugdale's *Monasticon* (1846) I, 599–600.

³ Pt I, 139–41, 142 and 169–76.

⁴ Where it is wrongly attributed to Æthelbald, as in H, 1r, no. 1.

Cambridge University Press
 978-0-521-03862-1 - Anglo-Saxon England 5
 Edited by Peter Clemons
 Excerpt
[More information](#)

Cuthswith, abbess of Inkberrow, and the Würzburg Jerome

Ecclesiae Canonicus.¹ William Hopkins (1647–1700), who was installed a prebendary in March 1675–6, is noted for his work for Worcester library.² Hickes writes that they first met in 1678 or soon after and became close friends after Hickes himself was installed in 1680,³ and he acknowledges Hopkins's work in translating from Old English into Latin a piece he printed in the *Thesaurus*.⁴ I think we should credit him with the first transcriptions of the charters later printed by Hickes. The text of H has been altered by another hand (H²), but as it originally stood (H¹) it was virtually identical with the text of Q.⁵ The exact relationship between Q, H¹ and Hopkins is not important for the present purpose. The alterations by H² are. They fall into three categories. Firstly, the wording of H¹ is changed. For instance, one of the witnesses of the aforementioned charter of Æthelred of Mercia is *beorhtwald* in Q (p. 141) and H¹ (3r), but H² alters this to *torbtwald*, which is what is printed in the *Thesaurus*, part 1 (p. 169). Secondly, whereas Q and H¹

¹ Q, p. 140. The next sentence, which gives the page reference to the *Thesaurus*, is in a later hand. On p. 54 Hopkins is credited with the transcription of the account of Wulfstan's synod (Hickes's no. 14) and his Christian name is given.

² Atkins and Ker, *Catalogus by Young*, pp. 24–7.

³ G. Hickes, *Seventeen Sermons of Dr William Hopkins, published with a Preface Containing a Short Account of his Life* (London, 1708), pp. v–vi.

⁴ *Ibid.* pp. xxi and xxviii. *Thesaurus*, pt iv, 115–21. Note that this translation (*De Sanctis in Anglia Sepultis*) appears in H, 15r–18v, in the same hand (H¹) as that of the Worcester charters, and in the later part of Harley 464, on which see next note. Cf. Felix Liebermann, *Die Heiligen Englands* (Hanover, 1889), pp. xviii–xix (unreliable on authorship of manuscripts).

⁵ The relationship of Q, H¹ and H² and the *Thesaurus* has never been investigated. Birch does not mention the readings of Q and H¹ in printing the charters from H² in *BCS*. In his article 'The Anglo-Saxon Charters of Worcester Cathedral' (*JBAA* 38 (1882), 52–3) he describes H as 'copies of charters from originals in the archives of Worcester, probably by Hickes'. H¹ is certainly not Hickes's hand; it is hard to be definite about H² since it is mostly in imitation 'Saxon' script, but some of the letters in the parts which are not differ from those in the specimens of Hickes's writing I have seen. H²'s 'Saxon' hand resembles that in the later part of Harley 464, which belonged to Hickes (see Cyril Ernest Wright, *Fontes Harleiani* (London, 1972), p. 189). Hand H¹ seems to me to be very like one responsible for a few entries in the earlier part of Harley 464 (fols. 1–15), which are William Hopkins's *reliquiae* (see Wright, *Fontes*, p. 196). Birch and Sawyer (*Anglo-Saxon Charters*, p. 55) assume that H is a direct copy from the Worcester originals. Sawyer describes Q as 'transcript of charters as in' H (*ibid.* p. 65) and does not refer to it under individual charters. Henry Coxe (*Catalogus Codicum MSS. qui in Collegiis Aulisque Oxoniensibus Hodie Adservantur* (Oxford, 1852) 1, pt 6, p. 86) queried whether Q was by Dugdale; but this is impossible, for the poor copy of Dugdale's 1643 list of charters on pp. 136–40 is ascribed to Magister Willelmus Dugdale. A number of hands, some perhaps those of secretaries, alternate in transcribing the charters in Q. Atkins and Ker (*Catalogus by Young*, p. 26, n. 2) raise the possibility that the charters may be connected with Edward Thwaites, who was a member of Queen's (BA 1694, MA 1697, then a Fellow), quoting a Worcester Chapter Order of 1699 directing 'that the Treasurer do pay to Mr Thways the sum of £10 towards the charges of printing the charters of this Church'. However it is unlikely that this was an independent venture by Thwaites; it was probably a result of the campaign for support for the *Thesaurus* itself, for which Thwaites acted as treasurer (cf. J. A. W. Bennett, 'Hickes's "Thesaurus": a Study in Oxford Book-Production', *Eng. Stud. (Essays and Stud. collected for the Eng. Assoc.)* n. s. 1 (1948), 36–7). As Thwaites was responsible for the preparation of the *Thesaurus* for the press (*ibid.* p. 29) H is more likely than Q to be associated with him. There were a large number of Anglo-Saxonists from Queen's (see *ibid.* pp. 29–30 and 38) with whom Q might be connected.

Cambridge University Press
 978-0-521-03862-1 - Anglo-Saxon England 5
 Edited by Peter Clemoes
 Excerpt
[More information](#)

Patrick Sims-Williams

leave a number of passages blank or mark them with dots, presumably because they were illegible to Hopkins, H² and the *Thesaurus* fill in most of them. Thirdly, H² marks in some ‘Saxon letters’ sporadically over H¹’s Roman script¹ and adds various other directions to a printer, presumably the printer of the *Thesaurus*. In view of the similarity between the text of H² and the *Thesaurus* one must conclude that H² was or became the printer’s copy for the *Thesaurus* or its immediate source, and derives from a fresh collation of Hopkins’s transcripts with the original Worcester charters. Present knowledge of the Cuthswith charters, therefore, depends on transcripts by William Hopkins reflected in Q and H¹, partially supplemented by some different readings by a person unknown reflected in H² and the *Thesaurus*.

Hickes believed that the pre-Alfredian charters from Worcester which he printed in 1703 were originals,² but we cannot be sure that they were not copies; on his own admission in 1696 he was not yet able to distinguish a pre-Conquest document by its appearance³ and, as he printed from transcripts and may not have seen the charters since he was dean, he may not have had the benefit of Wanley’s expert advice on their scripts. His statement in the *Thesaurus* that ‘etiamnum asservantur’ at Worcester⁴ does not show that he had actually examined them recently, and may be a mistaken assumption, for in the same work Wanley reported them missing.⁵ Fortunately, despite this uncertainty, the substance of the Cuthswith charters is regarded as trustworthy by all modern scholars,⁶ and there is no motive for forgery.

The first of the two charters in favour of Cuthswith concerns land for establishing a monastery at ‘Penīfanham’, granted by Oshere, king of the Mercian sub-kingdom of the Hwicce, which was co-terminous in historical times with the diocese of Worcester,⁷ and by his son Æthelheard.⁸ It bears

¹ On the Saxon type used for the *Thesaurus*, see Bennett, ‘Hickes’s “Thesaurus”’, pp. 28, 32, 34 and 38. ² *Thesaurus*, pt 1, 145–6 and 168–9.

³ Kenneth Sisam, *Studies in the History of Old English Literature* (Oxford, 1953), p. 271.

⁴ *Thesaurus*, pt 1, 146. This would seem (judging by Bennett, ‘Hickes’s “Thesaurus”’, pp. 33 and 35) to have been printed in 1701, about a year before the part of the *Catalogus* cited in the next note.

⁵ *Catalogus*, p. 300. The provision in the *Thesaurus* of a specimen facsimile of one of the post-Conquest documents in the group of fifteen (see above, p. 6, n. 2, no. 15) shows that some of the group may have been available c. 1703. ⁶ Sawyer 53 and 1177.

⁷ A. H. Smith, ‘The Hwicce’, *Medieval and Linguistic Studies in Honor of F. P. Magoun, Jr*, ed. J. B. Bessinger and R. P. Creed (London, 1965), pp. 56–65.

⁸ Q, pp. 141–2; H, 3v; BCS 85; Sawyer 53; Finberg 382: ‘... ego OSHERE rex Huiccorum pro remedio animæ meæ, cum Ædilheardo filio meo, dabo terram quæ dicitur PENITANHAM quindécim tributariorum cum dylla uuidu cassatas consentiente comite meo Cutberhto, ad construendum monasterium CUTSUIDÆ abbatissæ...’ (BCS). The correct reading of ‘Penīfanham’ was observed by Finberg (see below); all printed editions, including the *Thesaurus*, omit the suspension. Birch suggests that some of the last letters of ‘dylla uuidu’ represent numerals referring to ‘cassatas’. In Q and H¹ there is a suprascript (c) after ‘dylla’ and a facetious note attached: ‘(c) hic Oedipus aliquis desideratur’. Most of the notes on place-names etc., in Q and H¹ (which were clearly written by someone familiar with the diocese of Worcester) are printed as footnotes in the *Thesaurus*, but this one is not. It is deleted by H².

Cambridge University Press
 978-0-521-03862-1 - Anglo-Saxon England 5
 Edited by Peter Cleomes
 Excerpt
[More information](#)

Cuthswith, abbess of Inkberrow, and the Würzburg Jerome

no date, but it has been dated 693 from its witness-list.¹ The second charter belongs to the reign of Cenred of Mercia (704–9). It concerns a further grant of five hides at ‘Ingin’ by Æthelheard and Æthelweard, who was probably his brother,² in exchange for 600 shillings.³ Professor Whitelock has suggested that the fact that Hickes prints these two charters without a break probably means that the second was endorsed on the first.⁴ His 1688 list supports this suggestion:

2. *Otheri Reguli Huuicciorum Cuthsuidæ Abbatissæ.*
3. *Ædilheardi & Ædilueardi eidem; in dorso secundæ.*

Also in H¹ (3v) ‘dorsum’ is written above ‘temporibus’ in the proem of the second charter, while in Q (p. 142), by an unconscious slip or a mechanical error in copying, the proem reads ‘Tempora dorsum temporibus...’! On the other hand, H² has deleted H¹’s ‘dorsum’ and it is omitted by the *Thesaurus*.⁵ This change is hard to explain except by assuming that they were going on what they regarded as better authority, for H² and the *Thesaurus* usually specify ‘in dorso’, ‘titulus in dorso’ etc.⁶ Yet if the two charters were separate, it is hard to explain why Hopkins, whose work underlies H¹,

¹ 693 is given by Stenton (*Preparatory to ‘Anglo-Saxon England’, being the Collected Papers of Frank Merry Stenton*, ed. D. M. Stenton (Oxford, 1970), p. 51, n. 4), Finberg 382, Sawyer 53 and Dorothy Whitelock (‘The Pre-Viking Age Church in East Anglia’, *ASE* 1 (1972), 22); but it is explained only in *Councils and Ecclesiastical Documents* (ed. Arthur W. Haddan and William Stubbs (Oxford, 1869–71) III, 232): ‘The date is determined by the facts that Otffor was Bishop of Worcester only from A.D. 691 or 692 to A.D. 693; and that Brihtwald did not return to England after his consecration until August 693.’ However, the date of Otffor’s death is unknown; as Stenton pointed out, citing *BCS* 76 (697+), on which see below, p. 16, for the death of Otffor in 692 ‘there is no earlier authority than Florence’, and the charter ‘supersedes the unsupported statement of Florence as to the date of Otffor’s death’ (review of H. Howorth, *The Golden Days of the Early English Church*, *EHR* 33 (1918), 258). Finberg (p. 32) suggests 699, following a late Evesham source. For 692 cf. also F. Liebermann, *Ungedruckte Anglo-Normannische Geschichtsquellen* (Strassburg, 1879), p. 18 and n. 5. Nevertheless, the date 693 for Cuthswith’s charter would be secured by the attestation of Gefmund, bishop of Rochester, were not the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* D, E, F, according to which he is dead in 693, merely an unreliable deduction from *HE* v.8. (See *Baedæ Opera Historica*, ed. Charles Plummer (Oxford, 1896) II, 284.) We may therefore suggest 693 × ?699.

² *BCS* 116; Sawyer 54; Finberg 201, which makes him Oshere’s son, is a dubious Evesham production, and I think its statement may be imitated from the reference to Oshere’s son Æthelric in the authentic *BCS* 157, Sawyer 94, just as its witness ‘Omuling abbas’ is seemingly imitated from the Fladbury charter *BCS* 76 mentioned in the previous note; nevertheless, the position of Æthelweard’s name in genuine witness-lists makes it probable that he was indeed one of Oshere’s sons.

³ Q, pp. 142–3; H, 3v; *BCS* 122; Sawyer 1177: ‘...ego ÆDILHEARDUS ET ÆDILUEARDUS DABIMUS TIBI CUTHSUIDÆ TERRAM QUÆ DICITUR INGIN . V MANENTIAM QUAM TU A NOBIS PROPRIO PRÆTIO REDEMISTI ID EST DC SOLIDIS...’ (*BCS*). *BCS* omits the variants in the *Thesaurus*.

⁴ As reported Sawyer 1177.

⁵ Pt 1, 170. There is no reason to think that H² and the *Thesaurus* were influenced by a transcript like Q, where the heading *dorsum* is buried inconspicuously in the text of the charter. Wanley (*Catalogus*, p. 300) notes that the second charter was an endorsement; but he is merely following the 1688 list here.

⁶ E.g. *Thesaurus*, pt 1, 172.

Patrick Sims-Williams

Q and the 1688 list, should have confounded them. The most plausible explanation I can see is that the second grant followed the first on the *same* side of a single charter, that Hopkins described it loosely as ‘in dorso’, and that H² and the *Thesaurus* took exception to this description. If this is correct, it is certain that both grants relate to the same Cuthswith, which is in any case almost certain.

Cuthswith may have belonged to the Mercian royal family, where names in C— are common.¹ She is less likely to be one of the ruling house of the Hwicce, whose names alliterate in a vowel² – though a member of it named Cyneburg occurs in an apparently genuine list of early abbesses in the Gloucester ‘foundation charter’.³ On the other hand, she may be a relative of Oshere’s *comes* Cuthbert, who consents to his grant⁴ and attests the later grant rather conspicuously (the only other witnesses are the Mercian king, Egwine, bishop of Worcester, and the two grantors).⁵ However this may be, Cuthswith’s purchase of the further five hides at ‘Ingin’ shows that her monastery had prospered in its first few years, and that she was a woman of substance; certainly not an unlikely person to own a valuable Italian manuscript.⁶

The location of Cuthswith’s monastery was unknown until Professor Finberg discovered the correct reading *Penitānham* and identified it with Inkberrow (SP/0157), ten miles east of Worcester:

¹ See below, p. 21.

² Finberg ch. 7.

³ *BCS* 535; see Finberg pp. 160 and 164–5. There is nothing to be said for his suggested identification with the West Saxon princess. On St Cyneburg of Gloucester, who was possibly a legendary development of the abbess, see, in addition to *ibid.* p. 166, n. 1, J. B. L. Tolhurst, ‘St Kynburga of Gloucester’, *Pax* (Prinknash Abbey) (1943), 85–7, and K. Hughes, *AB* 73 (1955), 350–1. A. Mawer and F. M. Stenton (*The Place-Names of Bedfordshire and Huntingdonshire*, EPNS 3 (Cambridge, 1926), 117, n. 1) identify this saint with Penda’s daughter Cyneburg; there is no evidence for this idea, which is opposed by Tolhurst and by P. Grosjean (*AB* 79 (1961), 168), who misrepresents Tolhurst as stating their identity. The name *Cyniburg* occurs three times in the list of queens and abbesses in the *Durham Liber Vitae* (*The Oldest English Texts*, ed. Henry Sweet, Early Eng. Text Soc. o.s. 83 (London, 1885), 154).

⁴ According to H² and the *Thesaurus*; Q and H¹ leave a blank.

⁵ The only other charter he attests is *BCS* 116, where he is described as ‘comes of the Hwicce’. Finberg (*Lucerna: Studies of some Problems in the Early History of England* (London, 1964), p. 76) sees in these three charters ‘traces of a system by which a comes, attached to a local ruler’s court, exercised a restraining influence in the interests of the central power’ (i.e. Mercia), comparing *BCS* 111 in which a subject East Saxon king is associated with ‘Pæogthath cum licentia Ædelredi regis comis’. (On Mercian political influence in that area see F. M. Stenton, *Anglo-Saxon England*, 3rd ed. (Oxford, 1971), p. 204; cf. Stenton, ‘Pre-Conquest Herefordshire’, *Preparatory to ‘Anglo-Saxon England’*, p. 197.) However, the title in *BCS* 116 may be mere pseudo-history, characteristic of the Evesham fabrications (see above, p. 9, n. 2); in the Cuthswith charters Cuthbert may simply be a personal comes confirming his lord’s grants (cf. Stenton, *Anglo-Saxon England*, p. 304, and *The Latin Charters of the Anglo-Saxon Period* (Oxford, 1955), pp. 34–7).

⁶ It is hard to assess the relative value of manuscripts and land. Benedict Biscop arranged with King Aldfrith to exchange a particularly fine manuscript ‘of the Cosmographers’ he had bought in Rome for eight hides (‘terra octo familiarum’); Ceolfrith later exchanged these eight for twenty hides (Bede, *Historia Abbatum*, c. 15, ed. Plummer, *Baedæ Opera Historica* 1, 380; Levison, *England and the Continent*, p. 42).