

recall in ending that English *nannygoat* implies a *nanny*.¹⁰ The word may be onomatopoeitic.

WILLIAM M. CALDER III
University of Colorado,
Boulder

10. *The Compact Edition of the Oxford English Dictionary*, vol. 2 (Oxford, 1980), p. 4024 (s.v. "nanny").

ÆLIAN VARIA HISTORIA 5. 6

Ælian at *Varia Historia* 5. 6 narrates the estimable and often recalled self-immolation of the Indian sophist, Calanus, who constructed a pyre, induced the cooperative Macedonians to ignite it, and remained standing until reduced to ashes.¹ Alexander envied the man who triumphed over foes even more redoubtable than Porus, Taxiles, and Darius; for Calanus had triumphed *πρὸς τὸν πόνον καὶ τὸν θάνατον* (73. 32 Hercher = 76. 28 Diltz). Toil was no enemy of Alexander. Assassination always was. Restore the aspirate and read: *πρὸς τὸν φόνον καὶ τὸν θάνατον*. In his letter to Alexander apud Philo *Quod omnis probus* 96, Calanus scorns Greek threats of violence against him. Abduction, torture, or murder are meant. Spanhemius' *πρὸς τὴν πυρὰν* apud Perizonius-Kühn is needlessly violent; but he saw the difficulty.

WILLIAM M. CALDER III
University of Colorado,
Boulder

1. For the ancient testimonia, see W. Kroll, s.n. "Kalanos," *RE* 10 (1919): 1544.

EARLY ENGLISH MANUSCRIPTS OF CASSIODORUS' *EXPOSITIO PSALMORUM*

In an earlier issue of this journal Professor J. W. Halporn suggested that a fragmentary leaf in the University Library at Düsseldorf had once formed part of the incomplete epitomized text of Cassiodorus' *Expositio Psalmorum* which is contained in Durham Cathedral MS B. II. 30.¹ While preparing a study of the Durham manuscript (and unaware of Halporn's note) we had been tempted by the same speculation.² We have subsequently made, and here present, a fuller analysis of the paleographic evidence than was possible at the time of our original publication. Our study has been extended to include a second insular fragment of Cassiodorus' commentary, a single folio of Cambridge St. John's College MS Aa. 5. 1, so as to bring together three of the earliest surviving manuscripts of the *Expositio Psalmorum*. We are grateful to the Chapter authorities of Durham Cathedral for allowing access to MS B. II. 30 and to the Librarian of St. John's

1. "A New Fragment of Durham Cathedral Library MS B. II. 30," *CP* 69 (1974): 124–25.
2. R. N. Bailey, *The Durham Cassiodorus* (Jarrow, 1979).

College for supplying copies of the Cambridge leaf. We are also deeply indebted to Professor Bernhard Bischoff for the loan of his photographs of the Düsseldorf fragment, which is temporarily missing.³

The Durham manuscript now consists of 268 folios, numbered 1–266 (the foliation uses 16 and 156 twice).⁴ Folios 5–264v are written in eighth-century hands by six Northumbrian scribes and provide an abridged version of the text of the *Expositio Psalmorum* from *Praefatio* 17 to the third verse of Psalm 143.⁵ Deficiencies at both beginning and end have been made good on twelfth-century supply leaves (ff. 3v, 4, 265) and these extend the text back to *Praefatio* 2 and forward to the thirteenth verse of Psalm 143.⁶ In his *Catalogue of Durham Cathedral Manuscripts* (Oxford, 1939), Sir Roger Mynors convincingly argued that the text on the present folios 3v and 4 had been copied from one of the original eighth-century leaves which was then discarded before rebinding in the twelfth century. Similarly, the text on the present folio 265 was copied from the original folios 265 and 266r; “the verso of the original f. 266 was probably illegible already from dirt and wear.”⁷

The Düsseldorf leaf contains an epitomized commentary on part of Psalm 144, the surviving text running from *suavitatis tuae* to *varietate compleuit* on the recto and from *sextus locus* to *quoniam* on the verso.⁸ When he published this heavily cropped fragment, Professor E. A. Lowe drew attention to similarities, in format and hand, between it and Durham MS B. II. 30.⁹ Halporn, building on this observation, suggested that the Düsseldorf leaf had formed folio 268 of the complete Durham book, “since the intervening text would have filled the verso of the original 266 and the whole of the original 267.”¹⁰ At first sight this is an attractive theory but there are considerable difficulties in accepting it, as a close examination of the Durham volume will make clear.

Mynors determined the collation of MS B. II. 30 as: i–x^a (numbered in roman figures) | a–b¹⁰ c⁸ d–i¹⁰ k⁹ (f. 172 is added) 1–t⁸ u¹¹ (f. 258 is added) and 4 folios at the end (signed at the beginning with letters of the alphabet). All the complete quires seem to have been prepared in the same way, ruled in hard point for 36–39 lines of text in two columns (each marked by double bounding lines). The written space of each column is consistently 105 millimeters by 350 millimeters and the columns are uniformly 25 millimeters apart. Five scribes wrote these quires in near-identical style, using similar punctuation and marks of abbreviation. The first two scribes used a form of script which Professor Julian Brown, in his analysis of early Northumbrian manuscripts, has called “phase I minuscule”

3. We gratefully acknowledge the assistance of Dr. G. Karpp, Director of the University Library, in the search for this leaf.

4. For descriptions, see R. A. B. Mynors, *Durham Cathedral Manuscripts to the End of the Twelfth Century* (Oxford, 1939), pp. 21–22; E. A. Lowe, *Codices Latini Antiquiores*², vol. 2 (Oxford, 1972), no. 152; J. J. G. Alexander, *Insular Manuscripts, 6th to the 9th Century* (London, 1978), p. 46.

5. M. Adriaen (ed.), *Magni Aurelii Cassiodori Senatoris Opera* (Turnholt, 1958) (*Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina* [=CCSL], 97, 98), p. 24, line 17 (*cui iunguntur*) to p. 1283, line 97 (. . . *uenire notitiam*).

6. CCSL, p. 9, line 3 (*In primo . . .*) to p. 1287, line 257 (. . . *Ista quantum copios-*).

7. Mynors, *Catalogue*, p. 21.

8. CCSL, p. 1292, line 111 to p. 1296, line 295.

9. *Codices Latini Antiquiores*, Supplement (Oxford, 1971), no. 1786.

10. “A New Fragment,” p. 125.

while the others used the type he has labelled "phase II."¹¹ The first scribe wrote the whole of the opening block of the manuscript, quires i–x (ff. 5–81); a second wrote the next six quires (a–f) and the greater part of the seventh (ff. 82–146v); a third finished the seventh and continued to the end of the tenth quire k (ff. 147–77). In all these quires the ruling is for 39 lines. A fourth scribe wrote only quire 1 (ff. 178–85) and a fifth quires m–u inclusive (ff. 186–260); these quires are ruled for 37 lines with the exception of quire t (which is ruled for 36 lines) and some peculiarities in quire u, where the inserted leaf (f. 258) is ruled for 34 lines and the last leaf (f. 260) has been reruled on both sides for 40 lines, skillfully contained within the standard column spaces used throughout the manuscript. This latter anomaly can be explained as a device enabling the fifth scribe to finish his assignment, extending to the end of the *Divisio psalmi* of Psalm 141, within the quire; the next scribe could then begin his section, commencing with the *Expositio* of the same psalm, on the first leaf of a new gathering.

The remaining four leaves of the eighth-century section of the manuscript (ff. 261–64) were written by a sixth scribe using a script of phase II type. His double columns are of identical size to those employed elsewhere in B. II. 30 and are marked by double bounding lines; they are ruled for 34 lines. No quire signature appears on these folios but a small cross has been inscribed in the upper left hand corner of folio 261r.¹² These final leaves are annotated in the same eighth-century minuscule hands (probably those of the first two scribes) which occur in other parts of the manuscript.

After four folios in the hand of this last scribe, the eighth-century part of the manuscript ends in mid-sentence on the last line of folio 264v. The following twelfth-century leaf (f. 265) contains material which would have appeared on the original folios 265 and 266r. After this there is no direct evidence of the contents or foliation of the eighth-century manuscript but it is Halporn's suggestion that there was one other leaf (f. 267) and then the Düsseldorf fragment as folio 268. A seventh scribe would therefore have taken over by this stage, the hand presumably changing within a gathering, as in Durham's quire g.

If we are to assume that the Düsseldorf leaf once formed part of the Durham manuscript, we must recognize that there are discrepancies between the two. If the gathering of which folios 261–64 are remnants was a normal B. II. 30 quire (a quaternion or quinion), then the Düsseldorf leaf, as an integral part (f. 268), would have formed a bifolium with either folio 261 or folio 263. It shows however such dissimilarity as would not be expected on the second half of a bifolium. Its scribe has broken with two consistent characteristics of his six predecessors, including the man who wrote folios 261–64. First, according to Lowe's report, he has marked his columns with single and not double bounding lines.¹³ Second, while his column widths are the same as those of B. II. 30, the columns are set 10 millimeters closer and are 32 millimeters shorter than the regular pattern of

11. These distinctions formed part of Prof. Brown's unpublished Lyall lectures. Lowe classified the script of B. II. 30 as majuscule.

12. The existence of this cross has not been noticed in previous publications. Prof. David Wright has commented on the presence of such crosses in known Jarrow manuscripts in his review of P. Blair's *The Moore Bede*, *Anglia* 82 (1964): 111; but, as he himself indicates, the practice existed elsewhere, e.g., E. A. Lowe, *English Uncial* (Oxford, 1960), nos. XXXIV, XL.

13. See n. 9.

the Durham book.¹⁴ Further, unlike folios 261–64, which are ruled for 34 lines, the Düsseldorf leaf has 40. If, therefore, the fragment was part of a bifolium with Durham's folio 261 or folio 263, its scribe has chosen to ignore the rulings of his gathering. We would be forced to argue that the leaf was reruled, like folio 260 of quire u, but the explanation we offered for the latter irregularity is not applicable here. What is more, it is difficult to see why a scribe should rerule to give himself more lines, yet should force these lines into columns which are 32 millimeters shorter than those he already had available.

We therefore reject the possibility that the Düsseldorf fragment could once have been conjoined to any of the surviving leaves of Durham B. II. 30. Could it however have been a single inserted leaf? If so, the length of the columns would suggest that its overall dimensions differed from those of B. II. 30. We would have to envisage a manuscript which, having maintained a uniform stately progress for more than 260 folios, was suddenly disrupted by a smaller leaf, filled with a cramped and hurried script and prepared in a manner which flouted the conventions observed by six earlier scribes. All of this is, of course, possible but yet another discrepancy leads us finally to conclude that the fragment can never have formed part of the Durham manuscript: the two cursive minuscule hands which annotate throughout B. II. 30 do not appear on the German leaf while, conversely, the minuscule hand annotating Düsseldorf cannot be identified anywhere in the Durham manuscript.

The evidence we have reviewed leads us to reject Halporn's thesis. It follows that at least two manuscripts containing abridgements of Cassiodorus' commentary were produced in Northumbria. To the same area Professor Lowe assigned a fragment from a nonepitomized text of the *Expositio Psalmorum* which is folio 67 of Cambridge St. John's College MS Aa. 5. 1.¹⁵ On its recto this leaf has part of the commentary on verses 3–5 of Psalm 76 while the verso carries a section of the discussion of verses 6–8 of the same psalm.¹⁶ Both the Northumbrian localization and Lowe's "saec. VIII" date for this folio are, however, open to question. Professor Julian Brown has kindly drawn our attention (*per lit.*) to stylistic similarities between the Cambridge leaf and Oxford Bodley MS 426 containing Philippus' *Expositio in Iob*.¹⁷ Lowe had recognized that this latter work probably came from Wessex because of its links to charters prepared for Æthelwulf in 838 and 846.¹⁸ Dr. Chaplais' study of these charters has since left no doubt that they were produced at Winchester or Sherborne,¹⁹ and it follows that the Philippus manuscript is best assigned to the same southwestern area and dated to the period around 840; with it apparently goes the Cambridge Cassiodorus fragment.

The Cambridge leaf is thus southern English work, far removed in date from the Northumbrian epitomized commentaries in Durham and Düsseldorf. Never-

14. The measurements of the Düsseldorf fragment are based upon Lowe's description and Prof. Bischoff's photographs.

15. *Codices Latini Antiquiores*, Supplement, no. 1679.

16. The text runs from *mirabili ordinatione* to *obnoxium* on the recto and from *neque credunt* to *confidebat* on the verso (CCSL, p. 700, lines 89–117, and p. 701, line 137–p. 702, line 165).

17. Lowe, *Codices Latini Antiquiores*, 2: no. 234.

18. P. H. Sawyer, *Anglo-Saxon Charters* (London, 1968), nos. 298, 1438.

19. "The Origin and Authenticity of the Royal Anglo-Saxon Diploma," *Journal of the Royal Society of Archivists* 3 (1965–69): 57.

theless, there seem to be textual links between the Cambridge fragment and Durham MS B. II. 30; a collation shows that they share lexical and spelling variants in their comparable passages on Psalm 76 which are not recorded in the manuscripts used for the *Corpus Christianorum* edition.²⁰ It is therefore possible that both the Durham epitome and the Cambridge version ultimately derive from a common source text. A corollary of this speculation is that the masterly abridgement surviving in Durham Cathedral MS B. II. 30 was a product of English scholarship.

RICHARD N. BAILEY

RIMA HANDLEY

University of Newcastle upon Tyne

20. The lexical variants are *futura Domini* for *Domini futura* (CCSL, line 157), *sit adhuc* for *sit ei adhuc* (line 159), *Quod autem dicit adhuc* for *Quod autem ait adhuc* (line 163). The spelling variants are *solemniter*, *solacium* and *soiacium*, *adponet*, *adfirmantis* and *apponit* for the forms recorded in CCSL, lines 100, 110, 152, 160, 160. We are grateful to Mr. Gerald Bonner for a helpful discussion of the issues raised by these variants.