

THE CODEX AMIATINUS : ITS HISTORY AND IMPORTANCE.

By SIR HENRY H. HOWORTH, K.C.I.E. D.C.L. F.R.S. F.S.A.

Bede's tract on the history of the abbots of Jarrow and Monkwearmouth is largely based on an earlier work on the life of abbot Ceolfrid by a monk of one of those two monasteries whose name is not recorded. Bede both epitomises and enlarges this earlier narrative, and tells us *inter alia* that Ceolfrid ruled for seven years at Jarrow and twenty-eight years over the combined monasteries. The anonymous author in speaking of the abbot says :

Bibliothecam quam de Roma vel ipse, vel Benedictus adtulerat, nobiliter ampliavit, ita ut inter alia tres pandectes [i.e. whole Bibles] faceret describi, quorum duo per totitem sua monasteria [i.e. Jarrow and Monkwearmouth] posuit in aecclesiis, ut cunctis qui aliquod capitulum de utrolibet testamento legere voluissent, in promptu esset invenire quod cuperent ; tertium autem Romam profecturus donum beato Petro apostolorum principi offerre decrevit.¹

In his paraphrase of the work of this anonymous author, Bede refers to these codices as follows :

Bibliothecam utriusque monasterii quam Benedictus abbas magna caepit instantia, ipse non minori geminavit industria ; ita ut tres pandectes novae translationis, ad unum vetustae translationis quem de Roma adtulerat ipse super adjungeret ; quorum unum senex Romam rediens secum inter alia pro munere sumpsit, duos utrique monasterio reliquit.²

¹ Plummer, *Bede*, i, 395. In translation : He nobly enlarged the library which either he or Benedict had brought from Rome, in such wise that amongst other things he caused to be written three pandects, and he placed one in the churches of each of his two monasteries so that all those who wished to read any chapter of either testament might at once find what they wanted. The third, however, he decided to present as a gift to the blessed Peter, the prince of the apostles, when he set out for Rome.

² *ibid.* i, 379. In translation : The library of each monastery which abbot Benedict had commenced with great perseverance, with no less perseverance he doubled, for to the old translation which he had brought from Rome he added three pandects of the new translation. One of these on his return to Rome in his old age he took with him among other things as a gift : of the other two he gave one to each monastery.

This statement seems very plain, and yet it is full of ambiguity. About 716 Ceolfrið, at the age of seventy-four, resigned his abbacy and determined to go on a pilgrimage ('apostolorum limina peregrinaturus adiret').¹ He took with him a letter of commendation to the pope from his successor, abbot Hwaetberht, with certain gifts. Before he reached Rome he fell ill, and died on 25th September, 716, at Langres (Lingones), where he was buried.² Of his companions some returned home and some went on to Rome, taking with them the gifts he had sent ('delatura munera quae miserat'),³ among which was the 'Pandectes interpretatione beati Hieronymi presbiteri ex Hebraeo et Greco fonte transfusus,' one of the three pandects of the new translation mentioned above and thus described. This pandect, as is well known, has survived the dangers of more than twelve hundred years, and is extant in a very perfect condition. It has been identified by an interesting and ingenious inductive process with the most famous of all Latin Biblical manuscripts, namely, the Codex Amiatinus, now preserved in the Mediceo-Ambrosian Library at Florence. A few words will establish the proof of this contention.

On the title-page are some verses stating that it had been presented to the monastery of Monte Amiata by a certain 'Petrus Langobardorum abbas,' who lived at the end of the ninth or beginning of the tenth century. The second hexameter runs thus :

Petrus Langobardorum extremis de finibus abbas.

The famous Italian scholar De' Rossi showed in 1886 that the name and style of the Lombard abbot in the dedicatory verses were written over erasures, and that the name *Petrus* had been altered from *Ceolfrið*; the word *abbas* had done duty for both names, while the words *corpus Petri* in the first line had been changed to *Coenobium Salvatoris*. This was a clear proof that the original dedication had been made by an abbot Ceolfrið. He further suggested that the word *Langobardorum* had been

¹ Plummer, *Bede*, i, 395.

² *ibid.* i, 385 and 402.

³ Anon. Life of Ceolfrið, *ibid.* i, 400 and 402.

substituted for that of *Britannorum*. Bishop Forrest Browne pointed out two objections to this view, namely, that the hexameter did not scan when altered as De' Rossi suggested, and secondly, that it was virtually impossible for a Northumbrian of the eighth century to speak of himself as a Briton. In his opinion the second word should be *Anglorum*,¹ a view afterwards shown to be correct.

Dr. Hort, writing in the *Academy* of 26th February, 1887, was further able to show that in the anonymous life of Ceolfrid already cited, the publication of which by Stevenson in 1841 had apparently been overlooked abroad, there occur certain verses in which Ceolfrid's name was enshrined. These, Dr. Hort showed, were the verses in which Ceolfrid dedicated the pandect he took to Rome as a present to the pope in the very words which occur also in the Codex Amiatinus. The verses, as reported in the anonymous life, are :

Corpus ad eximii merito venerabile Petri
Dedicat aecclisiae quem caput alta fides
Ceolfridus Anglorum extremis de finibus abbas
Devoti affectus pignora mitto mei.
Meque meosque optans tanti inter gaudia patris
In caelis memorem semper habere locum.

Inasmuch as the circumstances, the date of the script, etc. concurred to support this induction, it was at once and everywhere accepted. A large part of the story is told with admirable lucidity in Mr. H. J. White's memoir on the manuscript in the second volume of *Studia Biblica*. This discovery at once greatly enhanced the value of the Codex Amiatinus, which was thus proved to be certainly not later than the year 716. The discovery naturally led to a more careful and critical examination of the manuscript. This showed that it was not homogeneous, but that the first quaternion is markedly different from the rest, the parchment on which it is written being not quite so tall as that of the other gatherings, and darker and thicker. Further, this gathering is not signed, and the second quaternion, beginning the Bible-text itself, is marked I. Lastly, the writing of the lists and prefatory

¹ London *Guardian*, 2nd March, 1887.

matter in the first quaternion is in a different hand from that of the body of the book, all going to show that that section and the rest of the volume came from two different sources.

Mr. White has given a syllabus of the contents of this quaternion which is instructive. He tells us that fol. 1 is blank ; 1*b* has the dedicatory verses already cited ; 2 is blank ; 2*b* and 3 contain a large bird's-eye view of the tabernacle ; 3*b* is blank ; 4 contains a prologue to the contents of the manuscript ; 4*b* contains a list of the books in the Amiatine manuscript arranged to suit two volumes, with certain hexameter lines below ; fol. 5 has a picture of Ezra seated at his desk with a bookcase close by ; 5*b* is blank ; 6 contains a list of the Bible books according to Jerome with a sacred lamb, etc. above ; 7, underneath the head of a monk, has another and different list of the sacred books (Bishop Browne calls it the 'Hilarionian' and 'Epiphanian' division of scripture) ; 7*b* is stained yellow, and has drawn on it five circles arranged crosswise within a larger circle ; 8 contains the Bible books according to St. Augustine, and also a picture of a dove with spread wings surrounded by flames, with two fillets from which hang the six divisions of the sacred books ; 8*b* is blank, and Bishop Browne regards it as an 'outside.' The latter also observes that fol. 6 must at one time have been next to fol. 8, since part of the couplet at the top of the latter can be read on the face of fol. 6*b*, a considerable part of the couplet having been impressed in reverse upon it. This is due to the fact that this entry, unlike any other in the manuscript, is formed by a profusion of thick black pigment which has been silvered, and has the air of an insertion.

If, says Bishop Browne, the quaternion were arranged properly, from the nature of the case the 'temple' must have been the innermost sheet. The leaf with the Augustinian division of scripture has naturally been the innermost. The Ezra portion, with the Hieronymian division, would then be 2 and 7 ; the prologue and the contents of the codex, the 'Hilarion' division, and the contents of the Pentateuch, which are now two separate pages, would be 3 and 6.¹

¹ London *Guardian*, 29th April, 1887, p. 651.

Professor Corssen and Mr. White have both written about the contents of this quaternion and have greatly illustrated it, but the last word has still to be said. I would urge in regard to the first leaf with its dedicatory verses that it has nothing to do with any other part of the manuscript, but was entirely supplied by Ceolfrid himself, who wrote the verses. The fourth folio, again, which is stained on both sides with a fine purple while the writing is on a yellow ground (doubtless to simulate gold), is arranged in tables within a double arch of twisted-rope pattern, and contains the prologue and the list of books in the succeeding codex. This was once, no doubt, as Professor Corssen suggests, an integral part of the volume in its pristine and uninterpolated condition, forming probably its initial pages.

There are some slight discrepancies between the prologue and the actual contents of the book, which is also the case with the table of contents. On this Bishop Browne says: 'It will be found on counting the books recited that they are sixty-six; adding one each for 2 Samuel, 2 Kings, 2 Chronicles, and 2 Esdras, we obtain seventy, the number of the prologue. On the other hand, the codex actually contains seventy-one, Jeremiah and Lamentations being represented in the contents as Hieremias. Thus the discrepancies may not be real.'

The rest of the folios in the first quaternion, namely, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, and 8, had nothing whatever to do originally with the succeeding codex and have been transplanted from another manuscript. They were probably added to this one by Ceolfrid to give his gift to the pope a grander and more sumptuous appearance. The codex is quite complete without them.

It is plain, therefore, that the first quaternion of the Codex Amiatinus, with the exception of folios 1 and 4, had nothing to do with the manuscript as originally written.

Let us now turn to this transported boulder, that is, folios 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, and 8 of quaternion 1. Whence did it come? It had already been noticed by Dr. Corssen in 1883 that one of the pictures in the second and third folios of the Codex Amiatinus, namely, that of the tabernacle, was also mentioned by Cassiodorus as contained

in a codex in his library which he refers to as the 'Codex grandior.' Cassiodorus thus speaks of it : 'tabernaculum templumque domini . . . quae depicta subtiliter lineamentis propriis in pandecte latino corporis grandioris.'¹ Elsewhere, speaking of the tabernacle in Ps. xiv, 1, he says : 'Quod nos fecimus pingi, et in pandectes majoris capite . . . collocari.' This last reference I owe to Bishop Browne.² Cassiodorus elsewhere describes the contents of the 'pandectes grandior,' and tells us that the Latin text in it was the Old Latin version. Now, as we have seen, Bede tells us that Ceolfrid, or Benedict Biscop, brought a pandect to Northumbria containing the Old Latin version. Dr. Hort very ingeniously carried this induction further by quoting two passages from Bede's minor works. One of these came from his tract on the Tabernacle, ii, 12, and reads as follows : 'Quo modo in pictura Cassiodori senatoris cujus ipse in expositione psalmorum meminit expressum vidimus'; and again, in his tract on Solomon's temple, ch. xvi, he says : 'Has vero porticus Cassiodorus senator in pandectis ut ipse psalmorum ex positione commemorat triplici ordine distincta'; adding below : 'Haec ut in pictura Cassiodori reperimus distincta.'

As Dr. Hort says, 'This is the language of a man who had actually seen with his own eyes the representation of the tabernacle and the temple which Cassiodorus had inserted in his pandect.'³ This is not all. In the preface to his memoir *de Institutione divinarum litterarum*, Cassiodorus tells us how he had withdrawn from the world and devoted himself to study, and adds :

Indubitanter ascendamus ad divinam scripturam per expositiones probabiles patrum. . . . Ista est enim fortasse scala Jacob per quam angeli ascendunt et descendunt. . . . Quo circa si placet hunc debemus lectionis ordinem custodire ut primum tirones Christi, postquam psalmos didicerint auctoritatem divinam in codicibus emendatis jugi exercitatione meditentur donec illis fiat, domino praestante, notissima : ne vitia librariorum impolitis mentibus inolescant, quia difficile potest erui quod memoriae sinibus radicum constat infigi.

The work in which these commentaries of the Fathers were abstracted or copied he describes in the first nine

¹ *Inst.* ch. v.

- *Guardian*, 27th April, 1887, p. 652.

³ See White, *Studia Biblica*, ii, p. 300.

chapters of the *de Institutione*, each chapter being devoted to describing a single codex. The whole work consisted of nine codices or volumes. These codices were respectively headed :

Caput I, primus scripturarum divinarum codex est Octateuchus ; c. II, in secundo regum codice ; c. III, ex omni igitur prophetarum codice tertio ; c. IV, sequitur psalterium codex quartus ; c. V, quintus codex est Salomonis ; c. VI, sequitur hagiographorum codex sextus ; c. VII, septimus igitur codex . . . quatuor evangelistarum superna luce resplendet ; c. VIII, octavus codex canonicas epistolas continet apostolorum ; c. IX, igitur codex actus apostolorum ut apocalypsin noscitur continere.¹

On turning to the first quaternion of the Codex Amiatinus, which, as we have seen, was in the main transferred from the 'codex grandior' of Cassiodorus, and especially to the picture there contained of Ezra in his cell, we shall find a representation of a bookcase containing nine large volumes, each one labelled. The labels in question, as Corssen was the first to point out, correspond with one exception to the titles here referred to. They are Oct. lib. ; Hest lib. ; Psal. lib. ; Sal. prof. ; Evangel IIII ; Epist. op. XXI ; Act. ap. ; Apoca. The one mistake is due, no doubt, to the artist, who instead of *Hest* has written *Hagi*.

There cannot be any reasonable doubt that the picture of the bookcase and its contents was either directly copied from the original manuscript of Cassiodorus or formed part of that manuscript.

It is *prima facie* nearly certain that the latter alternative is the right one, and that the manuscript from which the greater part of the first quaternion of the Codex Amiatinus was derived was the original 'codex grandior' of Cassiodorus ; otherwise Bede's language about his having himself seen that codex is unintelligible. At the end of the seventh and the beginning of the eighth century the so-called vulgate text of Jerome had largely supplanted its predecessor, generally known as the *Vetus Latina* and sometimes as the *Itala*, which had become obsolete.² It would therefore be of only remote interest to

¹ White, *Studia Biblica*, ii, p. 291.

² It seems incredible that the copy of the *Vetus Latina* which we know Benedict brought to Jarrow was a new codex. That translation was then obsolete and of no

special interest to anyone except an advanced scholar, and would be a very costly and difficult text to transcribe for merely archaeological purposes.

its Italian custodians, who had themselves become poor judges of such matters, for Italy was then terribly troubled by the Lombards and other invaders, and they would be willing to part with it to a rich Northern traveller anxiously in search of manuscripts for his new monastery. The fact of Jerome's text having become so widely recognised would, we cannot doubt, make it very unlikely that the same Northern traveller would have a new copy made of the older version on this grand scale. Again, both writing and designs in the first quaternion are so Italian in style and so different from anything English written at this time, that it seems conclusive, if it was a copy, and not an original, that it was copied in Italy. I think some of Mr. White's hesitation in the matter is a little strained, and I agree with the paragraph in which he argues that the first quaternion was bodily transferred from the actual 'codex grandior' to its present place. 'The codex grandior was certainly,' he says, 'in north Britain, for Bede saw it there.' It may well have been the 'pandectes vetustae translationis' which Benedict Biscop or Ceolfrid brought from Rome, and it would be quite in keeping with the times that Ceolfrid, in presenting his magnificent new pandect to the holy see, should have tacked to it the quaternion, which had hitherto stood at the beginning of Cassiodorus' Old Latin pandect, and was so handsomely decorated.

A large part of this was in print before I met with Bishop Browne's discussion of the problem in the *Guardian* of 1887. This makes our concurrence at this point more interesting. 'It appears to be supposed,' he says, 'that the three pandects which Ceolfrid caused to be written were all alike, and that the Amiatinus is one of the three copies, pictures and all. An examination of the ornamental part leads to a very different conclusion, namely that at least the Ezra pictures and the Solomon's temple, which is, in fact, the tabernacle in full detail, are not copies made in England but the original pictures of Cassiodorus.'

The next question is as to the time when the codex came to England. The life of Ceolfrid says that it was he who brought it here from Rome. Now the first visit Ceolfrid paid to Italy was in 678,¹ when he accompanied his

¹ Plummer, *Bede*, ii, p. 360.

patron and friend, Benedict Biscop thither. This we learn from Bede's *Ecclesiastical History*, iv, 18, where he says :

Cum enim idem Benedictus construxisset monasterium Britanniae in honorem beatissimi apostolorum principis, juxta ostium fluminis Uiri [i.e. Jarrow], venit Romam cum cooperatore ac socio ejusdem operis Ceolfrido, qui post ipsum ejusdem monasterii abbas fuit.¹

On this (as on other visits to Italy) Benedict Biscop, as Bede tells us, brought home 'innumerabilem librorum omnis generis copiam.' My conclusion, therefore, is, first, that Ceolfrid brought back to England the very manuscript called 'codex grandior' by Cassiodorus, and that it was from its text that Bede obtained so many of the passages which he quotes in different places from 'the Old Latin,' and, secondly, that it was this very manuscript which was decapitated by Ceolfrid, who placed its earlier pages in front of the codex he intended for the pope.

Let us now detach the intrusive first quaternions from the Codex Amiatinus and turn to the text in its original form. According to the anonymous lives of the abbots of Monkwearmouth and of Bede, this codex was one of three copies which Ceolfrid had had made. The opinion widely current is that these copies were written in Northumbria. To this I entirely demur. The notion that they were written in Northumbria at this time seems to me incredible. The two monasteries over which Ceolfrid presided were very young. The books in the libraries, the ornaments for the churches, everything required for the ritual and service of the Church (so far as we can gather from the life of Benedict Biscop), had been brought from Italy or Gaul, and the possibility of such works as these three magnificent codices being turned out of the scriptoria of the two convents *at this date* seems quite incredible. Even Dr. Hort and Mr. White, who hold this view, postulate that Ceolfrid must have brought an Italian scribe with him ; but surely three enormous pandects like these, requiring parchments of very large size and quality, could never have been produced in Northumbria at this time by the hands of one

¹ Plummer, *Bede*, i, 241.

scribe or of two scribes. They must have come from a practised and well-known school of writers and scribes, and such a school could only at this time have been found in south Italy. It must be remembered that it is not only the size and quality of the parchment and the beauty of the writing in this manuscript which are so attractive, but the accuracy and excellence of the text. My readers will remember the plaintive language used by Bede about the very indifferent provision for manuscript-writing that existed in the monasteries with which he had such close ties, and how he himself had had to perform most of the drudgery of copying (*Ipse mihi dictator simul notarius et librarius*¹).

There is another reason against the English origin of the Amiatine codex which I have not seen noticed. The text of the Lindisfarne Gospels is now generally accepted as having been derived from the Amiatine manuscript, and on this point Bishop Browne says: 'There are some remarkable agreements between the first quaternions of the Amiatinus and the Lindisfarne Gospels. The Lindisfarne St. Matthew is Ezra pure and simple in curiously exact detail, stool and all, but the stool is ornamented with little circles in place of the classical scroll on Ezra's stool. . . . The canons in the two manuscripts present a series of striking coincidences from the point of view of ornament and arrangement. As regards their text, Amiatinus breaks down over viii and viii, and does not find it out; Lindisfarne also misread the viii and wrote something wrong in the place of x, but found it out and altered it.'²

Now the Lindisfarne Gospels, as we know, were written for St. Cuthbert and belonged to him. St. Cuthbert died in the year 687, so that they must have been written before that date and after Ceolfrid's first return from Italy in 678. Is it credible that these four manuscripts could all have been written in the same small scriptorium during these same nine years, three purely Italian in script and decoration, and the other the finest existing specimen of Celtic art? I cannot believe it.

¹ Preface to Bede, *St. Luke*.

² *London Guardian*, 27th April, 1887.

Again, if the pandects had been produced in Northumbria we should surely have found traces of Northumbrian art such as we find in what I take to be their real Northumbrian daughter, namely, the Lindisfarne Gospels, a work of much more moderate size, but teeming with that local colour from which the Codex Amiatinus is quite free. Those who claim a Northumbrian origin for the Codex Amiatinus tell us, as I have said, that it was written by Italian scribes. This was first suggested by Dr. Hort in the *Academy* of 26th February, 1887; the view was supported by Sir E. Maunde Thompson.¹ Mr. White also says that as a Roman musician was brought over to teach the English monks to sing, so an Italian scribe may well have come to instruct them in writing, and the Amiatine Bible may be the work of a foreigner though written in England.² This solution, even if it were consistent with the difficulties to be met, leaves an important matter unresolved. If the three pandects of the new version were copied in England some time between 678 and 687, whence was the text derived from which they were copied? I have not seen this question put by anyone. The solution of Mr. White and others that the three copies were made in Northumbria compels the further conclusion that the mother manuscript from which they were taken was at the time in Northumbria. If so, it is not easy to see why Ceolfrid should have gone to the great expense of having three fresh copies made on this scale; for his needs were completely satisfied when he had secured two additional copies, making three altogether, namely, one each for his two monasteries and one for the pope. Nor have we any trace of, or reference to, any other copy but these three. There are other reasons which seem to me to make it difficult to believe that the three copies were made in Northumbria. The writing out of these three enormous pandects was so great a feat that if it had been accomplished by scribes in Northumbria it would in all probability have been recorded by Bede or in the anonymous life of Ceolfrid, which merely say that Ceolfrid had the copies made, without saying where. Again, if Ceolfrid could command scribes in Northumbria capable of writing out these codices, he would assuredly, in preparing

¹ See *Palaeography*, pp. 194 and 245.

² *op. cit.* 285.

the copy for the pope, have also prepared a suitable heading and not decapitated another fine manuscript in order to procure one. It is, lastly, hard to imagine whence the quite unusually large sheets of parchment in such abundance could have been forthcoming in Britain or anywhere else in the West at this time. I have therefore come to the conclusion that the three copies were not only made by Italians, but were made in Italy. The next question is, in which part of Italy were they made, and where was the mother manuscript whence they were taken ?

Upon this problem a good deal of light has recently accumulated, going to show that not only was the mother text in question a south Italian manuscript, but that it was one of the texts described by Cassiodorus as in his possession. Dom Chapman has pointed out that 'the arrangement of the text of the Codex Amiatinus, *per cola et commata*, after the example of St. Jerome himself, is not peculiar to this text, but its divisions seem to have been particularly well preserved in it. Now Cassiodorus had been careful as to this very point, as he tells us in his preface to the *Institutio*. Again, the word *pandectes*, as applied to the Codex Amiatinus both by the anonymous author of the abbots' lives and by Bede, is precisely the word used by Cassiodorus for a complete Bible. Thirdly, the order of the groups of books in the Codex Amiatinus, and in that alone among vulgate texts, is the same as the order which was followed by Cassiodorus (a fact important to note for other reasons). It is plain that the ordering of groups and books within the groups in the Codex Amiatinus and by Cassiodorus is a peculiar and unique one, and that they agree in the peculiarity.' As Dom Chapman again says : 'The Amiatine list is a list of the books in St. Jerome's version arranged in the same nine groups as those of the *antiqua translatio*, or *codex grandior*, and of the nine volumes of Cassiodorus ; but the interior order of the groups is that of St. Jerome. We know that in Cassiodorus' nine volumes this was the case, as in the volume containing Solomon's works ; while in that of the Epistles he certainly put those of St. Paul first and not last, as they were in the *antiqua translatio*. But the number of books is counted as seventy with that list, and not forty-nine with St. Jerome. It seems to be

plain that this grouping in the text can only be due to one cause, namely, that it is derived from that of the nine volumes of Cassiodorus. In these the grouping was obviously due to the necessity of fitting the commentaries into volumes of more or less equal size. It would not have arisen independently in a codex which contained the Hieronymian vulgate only, without the commentaries. The size, again, of the Codex Amiatinus is the same as that which is otherwise known as the codex grandior of Cassiodorus.¹ Without committing myself to every statement in this account, it seems to me to make the conclusion incontestable that the mother manuscript of the text of the Codex Amiatinus was in the library of Cassiodorus in the monastery of Scyllacium in the extreme south of Italy. As we have already seen, Ceolfrid's copy of the older version also came from the same great scriptorium, and was most probably the very copy of the Old Latin version described by Cassiodorus as the 'codex grandior.' This increases the probability that the ultimate source of both texts was the same Cassiodorian collection. We can hardly doubt, therefore, that when Benedict Biscop and Ceolfrid visited Italy (very largely, no doubt, in search of manuscripts and other requisites for their services and for their library), they probably made their way to Scyllacium, whose secluded situation protected it from the ravage which was then overtaking the rest of Italy. Nothing is more natural. It was doubtless from that great manufactory of manuscripts that they secured the 'codex grandior' which they took back with them, and it was there also that they either commissioned the three copies of the new translation which are mentioned by the author of Ceolfrid's biography and by Bede, or else purchased three copies which had been made there and were on sale.

Having traced the later history of the codex presented by Ceolfrid to the pope and known as Amiatinus, a word or two may be said about the other copies given by Ceolfrid to his two monasteries of Jarrow and Monkwearmouth. Until a short time ago these codices were deemed to be

¹ See Chapman, *Notes on the Early History of the Vulgate Gospels*, 19 and 20.

irretrievably lost. A leaf from one of them, however, has been recently recovered by Canon Greenwell, and is described by Mr. Turner in the *Journal of Theological Studies*, vol. x, 540-544. It was picked up in a book-seller's shop at Newcastle.

It has been known for some time that in the library of Lord Middleton at Wollaton in Nottinghamshire there are ten leaves of a Bible which have been supposed with great probability to have belonged to this or to another of Ceolfrid's codices.¹ They once formed the covers for chartularies of the Willoughby estates which were bound not earlier than the reign of Edward VI. They consist, like the Greenwell leaf, of parts of the book of Kings, and agree with the Greenwell leaf in their details.² The publication of these leaves, it is understood, has been undertaken by Mr. Turner. It is a matter of regret that their publication has been so long delayed, for the precious manuscript is one of the first moment to everyone interested in Bible studies.

Some fragments of a codex also exist at Utrecht bound up with the famous Utrecht psalter. They consist of parts of Matthew and John. Scrivener and Miller speak of them as written in an Anglian hand strongly resembling that of the Codex Amiatinus.³ Sir Frederic Kenyon says the fragments are written in a hand closely resembling that of the Amiatine, and *evidently produced in the same scriptorium*.⁴ This points to the Utrecht fragments having also come from one of the two sister manuscripts given by Ceolfrid to his two abbeys.

If, then, the Codex Amiatinus and its companions be traced to Italy and shown to be directly derived from the famous pandect in nine volumes prepared by Cassiodorus, it has a much higher title to our reverence and confidence. We can now confidently affirm of one of the volumes once at Jarrow, namely, the 'codex grandior,' that it represented very faithfully a text of the latter part of the sixth century, and not later than 580; while the text of the three pandects

¹ Described in the *Report of the Historical MSS. Commission for 1911, 196 and 611.*

² See D. S. Boutflower, *The Life of Ceolfrid*, 114-116.

³ *Introd. to the Crit. of the New Testament*, ii, 83.

⁴ *ibid.* 198.

of the new version also dated from the same period and was written under the eye of one of the greatest scholars of the time, possessed of much means and a very ample library, who had devoted great pains to its preparation; and it is plain that by an analysis of the Codex Amiatinus we shall ascertain what the Bible of Cassiodorus really was. It may be, indeed, that this particular copy presented to the pope was in fact the 'Urtext' or original mother manuscript compiled by and representing the syncretic notions of Cassiodorus himself, and that it alone had an ornamented title-page now represented by folio 4 of the Amiatine manuscript, that it alone bore the paintings of Christ and the evangelists with their symbols on the back of folio 79*b*, where the Old Testament ends, and that the other two copies left at Jarrow and Monkwearmouth were not so much decorated.

Let us now shortly analyse the contents of the Codex Amiatinus, or, as we may call it, the Bible of Cassiodorus, omitting the first eight leaves, which, as we have seen, were transferred from another text.

On page 9, which has no title, we find St. Jerome's preface to the Pentateuch, addressed to Desiderius. Then come the words in larger letters which are gilt, 'Explic. prolog. Incip. capit. lib. Genes.' Then follows Genesis in sixty-three chapters. The chapters are generally divided into verses, which are shorter than those in the usual editions. It ends with the words 'Explic. lib. Gen.'

On folio 50 we have 'Liber Exodi. incipiunt capit.' with fourteen chapters: it ends with the words, 'Explic. *Hellesmot* id est Exodus feliciter.'

On folio 86 we have 'Incip. capit. Levitici,' with sixteen chapters. At the end we read, 'Expliciunt capitula. Incipit liber Leviticus qui hebraice dicitur *Vaieera* lege feliciter;' and then, 'Epl. Leviticus qui hebraice dicitur *Vaieera*. Lege felix.'

On folio 110 we have 'Incipiunt capitula libri Numerorum,' with nineteen chapters. At the end, 'Explic. capit. Incipit liber Numerorum qui appellatur hebraice *Vaieddaber* Gloria individuae trinitati Amen.'

On folio 144 Deuteronomy commences without any title. Its chapters are twenty, and it ends with the words in uncials, 'Expliciunt Capitula. Incipit liber Deuteronomium qui hebraice dicitur *Helleaddabarim*. Deo laudes ; Lege feliciter Amen. Ora pro me,' with the letters arranged :

P
O R A
O
M
E

Fol. 174. The prologue to Joshua, after which come the chapters of that book, numbering ten.

Fol. 194. The words 'Capitula Judicum ;' then the chapters, twenty-one in number.

Fol. 215. The words 'Incipit Lib. Ruth,' with four chapters, numbered in the margin.

Fol. 228. Jerome's prologue to the book of Kings, headed 'Praefatio Regnorum. Incipit brevis,' with ninety chapters in a continuous numeration. Chapter xlvii begins with a larger capital than the other chapters, while its first word is written in gold and with a gap as if beginning a new book. Then comes another enumeration of chapters, one in thirty and the other in twenty-four.

Fol. 275. Without any preface, there begin here the chapters of the third and fourth books of Kings, eighty-four in number. At the end of the third book is the word 'Finit,' which belongs properly to chapter lii. Here again we have a larger initial and a space, while all the first verse is gilt.

The former two books are entitled at the tops of the pages 'Samuhel,' and the latter two 'Malachim,' without any distinction into first and second.

Fol. 329. The two books of Paralipomena, with the title and the preface of St. Jerome ; between the two is a space and a gilt capital. At the heads of the pages is the word 'Paralipomenon,' without any distinction into two books.

Fol. 379. Without any title, comes the book of Psalms, with Jerome's preface addressed to Sophronios. Then the words, 'Psalmus David de Joseph dicit qui corpus Christi sepelivit.'

Fol. 419. The proverbs of Solomon, with Jerome's preface, in thirty chapters.

Fol. 437. The book of Ecclesiastes, with twelve chapters.

Fol. 443. Liber Canticum Canticorum, in eight chapters.

Fol. 447. Sapientia or Wisdom, in thirteen chapters.

Fol. 460. Jerome's preface to Ecclesiasticus, then the chapters of the book, twenty-six in number. This book is larger in this text than in the vulgate. At the end we have the words, 'Explicit liber ecclesiasticus Salomonis.'

Fol. 476. Isaiah, preceded by Jerome's prologue and the list of chapters, 158 in number.

Fol. 536. Jeremiah with Jerome's preface and ending with the words, 'Explicit liber Hieremiae prophetae.' In the last chapter are contained the four lamentations and the prayer of Jeremiah.

Fol. 590. Ezekiel, with Jerome's prologue and the index of chapters, 110 in number.

Fol. 633. Daniel bears the title, 'Incip. lib. Danihelis prop.'; then follows, 'Praefatio beati Hieronimi,' followed by thirty-one chapters. The book ends, 'et devorati sunt in momento coram eo. Amen. Expl. Danihel propheta.'

Fol. 650. Then follow twelve 'Prophetae minores,' preceded by Jerome's preface. Then the elenchus of titles, with the number of chapters in each book. The order is: Osea with eight chapters, Joel with five, Amos with ten, Abdea with one, Jonah with two, Micea with seven, Naum with one, Abacuc with three, Sofonia with one, Aggeo with one, Zaccaria with fifteen, and Malachia with three.

Fol. 682. Job with thirty-six chapters, ending 'Expliciunt capitula Job, Incipit ipse liber feliciter.'

Fol. 701. Tobias with prologue, without any division into chapters.

Fol. 709. Judith, preceded by Jerome's prologue and with the enumeration of sixteen chapters.

Fol. 729. Esther, with its prologue and division into sixteen chapters.

Fol. 730. The book of Esdras, preceded by Jerome's preface and forming only one book but divided into two parts, the first of which begins, 'In anno primo Cyri, etc. ;' the second, after an interval of ten lines, in the middle of which in larger letters is written 'Neemia,' the text commencing 'Verba Neemiae.' It ends with the words 'Expl. lib. Ezrae sive Neemiae.' It contains no ancient enumeration of chapters. It will be noted as remarkable that although Cassiodorus in the Codex Amiatinus follows the old Latin Bible in his canon, he apparently fails to do so in ignoring the first book of Esdras and perhaps the fourth. This was doubtless due to the very ruthless language applied to these books by Jerome, which seems to have overpowered the judgment of the great scholar of Scyllacium.

Fol. 750. Two books of Maccabees, the first with sixty-one and the second with fifty-five chapters, and ending with the words 'Explicit Macchabeorum libri duo, Deo gratias Amen, feliciter qui legis amen.'

It seems quite plain from this list of contents that the mother text from which the Codex Amiatinus and its two sisters were copied was a codex written under the superintendence and direction of Cassiodorus and was partially the result of his syncretic work, *and that it does not represent Jerome's unadulterated text at all.* It is clear, in fact, that both in its list of contents and also in the actual books it varies from Jerome's own Bible. It contains several books treated by Jerome as uncanonical, e.g. Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, Tobias, Judith, and two books of Maccabees. The most remarkable evidence that points to the text of the Codex Amiatinus as it stands being other than Jerome's text is to be found, however, in a comparison of its contents with those in Jerome's actual text as it existed in the library of Cassiodorus and as given in the twelfth chapter of his work already cited. It seems impossible, therefore, to claim the Codex Amiatinus as a text of Jerome's version, much less as the best existing type of that version. It is no doubt largely based on Jerome's text, but it seems to me to be really a new edition by Cassiodorus. This conclusion is

very important when we remember that the first Carolingian Bibles were so largely dependent on it.

It is assuredly also a matter of high importance for the criticism of the Latin Bible to realise that we have in the Codex Amiatinus and in Bede's biblical extracts samples of the eclectic Bible text accepted in the sixth century A.D. as the best critical text available by the best biblical scholar of that age, and it greatly enhances the value and importance of Bede's quotations from it.

May I add one further fact which strengthens the view that in the Codex Amiatinus we may have the very copy of the new Bible compiled by Cassiodorus which formed his critical text, and not a mere copy of it made for Ceolfrid, namely, that at the end of the prologue to Leviticus we have a barbarous Greek inscription in the words :

O KTPIC CEPBANΔOC AI ΠOIHCEN.

These words show that, when he wrote them, this Serbandos or Servandus, who was clearly no Englishman but the Italian scribe of the manuscript, was living in a part of Italy where Greek was still understood, and this could only have been in the old land of Magna Graecia in the extreme south of Italy. Bishop Browne says of this entry that 'it is by the same hand as the rest': the separation of AI from ΠOIHCEN (originally, perhaps, ΠOIEI) should not be called a mistake, for we have here other examples of spacing out so as to make one word into two. Another thing occurs to me. Such enormous pandects as these must have taken a long time to write, and could not have been written during Ceolfrid's short stay in Italy. They must either have been sent after him to England, or else, which is more probable, they were copies of this very fine text kept for sale at the scriptorium at Scyllacium.¹

¹ Professor White, who has read this paper, assures me that his main difficulty in accepting my view lies in the suggestion that Ceolfrid should have sent back to the pope as a present what he had himself bought in, and brought back from, Italy. This does not seem to me so strange. As I have shewn

in my history of St. Gregory the Great, perhaps no part of the Mediterranean lands was at this time so poor in books as Rome and the Roman territory. The libraries there had apparently been utterly destroyed, and the great pope, in writing to his correspondents, excuses himself for not being able

I venture to add a further fact suggested to me by Bishop Browne. In the library at Durham (B. II, 30) is a copy of the commentary of Cassiodorus on the Psalms, traditionally said to have been written by Bede.¹ In an early list of the Durham books it is referred to in the margin with the words 'manu Bedae.' This may also have been brought from Scyllacium by Ceolfrid.

to lend them books, because they were so hard to obtain in Rome, and confesses that some very important ones could not be found there, notably the great work of Tertullian, and even such necessary books as authoritative copies of the conciliar Canons. How likely would it be, therefore, that when the great library at Scyllacium was broken up and dispersed, some of its treasures having

fallen into the hands of the book-loving monks from Northumbria, that one of them, Ceolfrid, who had secured treasures from that source should combine two of them into a lordly volume to place at the feet of the great pontiff, his master, as the most valued gift he could make him.

¹ Plummer, *Bede*, i, xx, note 3.