Offcut Zone Parchment in Manuscript Codices from Later Medieval England

Volume 1: Text

by

Stephanie Jane Lahey

B.A., Saint Mary's University (Halifax, NS), 2001

Certificate of Honours Equivalency, Saint Mary's University (Halifax, NS), 2008

M.A., University of Ottawa (Ottawa, ON), 2015

A Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfilment of the

Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in the Department of English

University of Victoria

Offcut Zone Parchment in Manuscript Codices from Later Medieval England

Volume 1: Text

by

Stephanie Jane Lahey

B.A., Saint Mary's University (Halifax, NS), 2001

Certificate of Honours Equivalency, Saint Mary's University (Halifax, NS), 2008

M.A., University of Ottawa (Ottawa, ON), 2015

Supervisory Committee

Dr Iain Macleod Higgins, Co-Supervisor

Department of English, University of Victoria

Dr Erik Kwakkel, Co-Supervisor

iSchool, University of British Columbia

Dr Adrienne Williams Boyarin, Departmental Member

Department of English, University of Victoria

Dr J. Matthew Huculak, Outside Member

University of Victoria Libraries

Abstract

This dissertation engages with the production and use in late medieval England (c. 1200–c. 1500) of manuscript codices copied, in whole or in part, on *offcuts*: cheap, low-quality parchment scraps created as a byproduct of parchment manufacturing. After presenting a method for identifying offcuts, it explores the material through statistical techniques and case studies. Applying this mixed methodology to a corpus of 140 offcut-bearing production units spread across 75 handwritten books, it delineates a range of manuscript production stages, examining the sociocultural contexts of books recruiting offcuts as writing support. The dissertation pursues this study in four chapters. Opening with a terminological discussion, chapter one describes medieval parchment-making, clarifying how offcut traits arose during manufacture, distinguishing offcuts from similar types of parchment, and describing medieval uses for offcuts. Chapter two discusses quantitative codicology, justifying the mixed quantitative–qualitative approach, then delineates its dual-stage methodology: (*i*) establishing offcut diagnostic traits via linear regression analysis; (*ii*) assembling the corpus and analyzing it via a descriptive statistical lens. It finishes with an overview of the analysis' main findings, noting that the corpus is dominated by *Fachliteratur*; lacking in texts often regarded as 'popular' (e.g., vernacular romances); and largely copied for personal consultation in professional, educational, or domestic contexts. Chapters three and four take up the primary subcorpora—one comprising common law books; another, miscellaneous, but chiefly theological and medical, provisionally sorted based on the medieval division of disciplines, quadrivium and trivium—engaging each via descriptive statistical overviews and case studies of representative books: London, British Library, Harley MS 912, Harley MS 1261, Harley MS 6644; Oxford, Bodleian Library, MSS Ashmole 1378, Digby 2, Digby 24.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements

Completing this dissertation would not have been possible without help and support from multiple quarters. To begin, I wish to express my deep gratitude to my supervisors, Erik Kwakkel and Iain Higgins, for their support and mentorship throughout this project, as well as their investment of time and effort into my development as a researcher. I owe an additional debt of gratitude to my other committee members, Adrienne Williams Boyarin and J. Matthew Huculak, for their guidance and encouragement. I owe further thanks to Heather C. Dean and the staff of University of Victoria's Special Collections and University Archives for their support and assistance; staff of University of Victoria's Digital Scholarly Commons, especially Ben Liu (for introducing me to SPSS and helping me make sense of my variables) and Rich McCue (for supporting my initial steps in, inter alia, R and RStudio); and my external examiner, Daniel Wakelin, for his generous and invaluable feedback.

As a first generation, working class scholar, I could not have undertaken this research without extensive, generous financial support from numerous organizations and individuals. In particular, I am grateful to the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada;[1] the funders of the many endowed awards I have had the honour of holding, especially the families of Herbert Betram Falkenstein, Howard E. Petch, Alexander and Helen Stafford MacCarthy Muir, William and Doreen Kerby, M.A. and D.E. Breckenridge, and Melva J. Hanson; and University of Victoria's Faculty of Graduate Studies and Department of English. Thanks are due, as well, to the faculty and staff of

[1] This dissertation was supported in part by Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council, Joseph-Armand Bombardier CGS Doctoral Scholarship, no. 767–2009–1749. | Cette thèse a été en partie financée par le Conseil de recherches en sciences humaines, Bourse de doctorat Joseph-Armand Bombardier CGS, no. 767–2009–1749.

University of Victoria and Leiden University Centre for the Arts in Society (LUCAS) for supporting my 2016–2017 sojourn at LUCAS as a Guest Researcher, as well as to the staff of the Bodleian Library (especially Martin Kauffmann), British Library, Corpus Christi College Cambridge, Harvard Law School Library, Thomas Fisher Rare Book Library, Trinity College Dublin, and Wellcome Library. Further thanks are due to the organizers and fellow participants of the schools, workshops, and conferences I attended, and public talks I gave, for furnishing me with opportunities to present my work, offering helpful advice and suggestions, and providing funding to support my attendance.

I was fortunate to pursue this research amidst vibrant scholarly communities, and I am grateful to all those—too many to mention—who assisted and encouraged me in manifold ways, ranging from the very great to the very small. I remain honoured to count many of these people among my mentors and friends, and have benefitted enormously from their kindness and generosity of spirit. Particular thanks are due to Alison Chapman, Matthew Collins, Sean Cunningham, Lisa Fagin Davis, Paul Dryburgh, Kenneth Duggan, Tony Edwards, Thom Gobbitt, Joseph Grossi, Alvionne Karpinski, Erin Kelly, Kathryn Kerby-Fulton, Julian Luxford, Amanda McVitty, Laura Morreale, Kathleen Neal, Dot Porter, Euan Roger, Hannah Ryley, Daniel Sawyer, Innocent Smith OP, Andrew Taylor, Elaine Treharne, David Watt, and N. Kıvılcım Yavuz. Special thanks are also due to my undergraduate mentors—Cyril Byrne, Terry Gordon, Margaret Harry—who set me on my path; to Ian Dennis, who once guided me through the vale of doubt with words I have never forgotten; and to my friends, especially David Deckard and Matthew Stockhausen, both of whom walked alongside me through rocky territory. Final, greatest thanks are due to my family, for unwavering support I can never repay.

This dissertation is dedicated to the memories of my mother, who had an astonishing talent for numbers and exercised endless patience with my childhood library- and bookstore-wandering, and my grandfather, who sparked my love of history and introduced me to my very first rare book.

Abbreviations and Symbols

attrib.	attributed
CCR 1234–37	Great Britain. Crown. *Calendar of the Close Rolls … Henry III. A.D. 1234–1237*. Edited by H.C. Maxwell Lyte, et al. London: HMSO, 1908.
CCR 1454–61	—. *Calendar of the Close Rolls … Henry VI. A.D. 1454–1461*. Edited by C.T. Flower, et al. London: HMSO, 1947.
CFR 1461–71	—. *Calendar of the Fine Rolls … Edward IV, Henry VI. A.D. 1461–1471*. Edited by A.E. Stamp, et al. London: HMSO, 1949.
CFR 1471–85	—. *Calendar of the Fine Rolls … Edward IV, Edward V, Richard III. 1471–1485*. Edited by David L. Evans, et al. London: HMSO, 1961.
CFR 1485–1509	—. *Calendar of the Fine Rolls … Henry VII. 1485–1509*. Edited by S.S. Wilson, et al. London: HMSO, 1962.
CJ	Chief Justice
CP	Common Pleas
CPR 1327–77	Great Britain. Crown. *Calendar of the Patent Rolls … Edward III. A.D. 1327–1377*. Edited by H.C. Maxwell Lyte, et al. London: HMSO, 1891–1916. 16 vols.
CPR 1416–22	—. *Calendar of the Patent Rolls … Henry V. A.D. 1413–1422*. Edited by H.C. Maxwell Lyte, et al. London: HMSO, 1910–1911. 2 vols.
CPR 1485–94	—. *Calendar of the Patent Rolls … Henry VII, Vol. 1: A.D. 1485–1494*. Edited by H.C. Maxwell Lyte, et al. London: HMSO, 1914.
CPR 1547–48	—. *Calendar of the Patent Rolls … Edward VI, Vol. 1: A.D. 1547–1548*. Edited by H.C. Maxwell Lyte, et al. London: HMSO, 1924.
CPR, 1550–53	—. *Calendar of the Patent Rolls … Edward VI, Vol. 4: A.D. 1550–1553*. Edited by H.C. Maxwell Lyte, et al. London: HMSO, 1926.
CSP 1547–80	—. *Calendar of State Papers … Edward VI, Mary, Elizabeth, and James I, 1547–1625, Vol. 1*. Edited by Robert Lemon. London: HMSO, 1856.
DIMEV	*The DIMEV: An Open-Access, Digital Edition of the* Index of Middle English Verse. Edited by Linne R. Mooney, Daniel W. Mosser, Elizabeth Solopova, et al. S.loc.: S.n., 2010–. www.dimev.net.
diss.	dissertation

edn.	edition
EETS	Early English Text Society
ES	Extra series
OS	Original series
HMSO	Her / His Majesty's Stationery Office
J	Justice / Judge
MED	*Middle English Dictionary*. Edited by Robert E. Lewis, et al. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1995–2001. Online edition in *Middle English Compendium*. Edited by Francis McSparran, et al. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Library, 2000–2018. quod.lib.umich.edu/m/middle-english-dictionary.
MP	Member of Parliament
ODNB	*Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Edited by David Cannadine, et al. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2021.
OED	*Oxford English Dictionary*. Online edn. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016. www.oed.com.
repr.	reprinted
RO	Record Office
SR	Great Britain. Crown. *The Statutes of the Realm. From Original Records and Authentic Manuscripts* …. Edited by T. Edlyn Tomlins, et al. London: G. Eyre and A. Strahan for the Record Commission, 1810–1828. 11 vols. in 12.
STC	Pollard, A.W., and G.R. Redgrave, editors. *A Short-Title Catalogue of Books Printed in England, Scotland, and Ireland, and English Books Printed Abroad 1473–1640*. 2nd edn. Revised and enlarged by W.A. Jackson, et al. 3 vols. London: Bibliographical Society, 1976–1991.
supp.	supplement
TNA	Kew, The National Archives
μ	statistical mean
σ	standard deviation
R	range

INTRODUCTION

There doesn't seem like there should be an artful way
to butcher a cow, but there is …[2]

This dissertation engages material book history via material form—that is, physical manuscripts, their materials, their design, and their production—in tandem with the relevance of this history to the study of certain kinds of medieval British books and their users. Its underlying conviction is that analysis of the physicality of medieval manuscripts facilitates the understanding and evaluation of how scribes and compilers transmitted books, and how readers encountered and used texts. Binding and collation, for instance, reveal stages of a book's construction and development, including reordering and additions; post-production modifications (annotations, defacement, doodles) offer evidence regarding setting and use; format, parchment quality, and decoration elucidate textual status, anticipated uses, and owners' socio-economic standing. Since "the materiality of book production is always part of, and cannot be understood independently from, larger cultural processes and trends",[3] studying these features stands to enhance our understanding of textual, intellectual, and cultural history. In general, research on material book history has tended to fall into one of two camps: qualitative, especially through case studies, or quantitative, focussed on exploration of large (or at least larger) datasets. In contrast, my research aims to merge conventional humanistic

---

2 Maggie Stiefvater, *The Scorpio Races* (London: Scholastic, 2011), 34.

3 Wendy Scase, "The Book in Culture", in *The Production of Books in England 1350–1500*, ed. A. Gillespie and D. Wakelin (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 297.

qualitative work with quantitative analysis, and I will pay close attention both to material details and to the rich, human dimension offered by in-depth case studies of individual books.

My focus is parchment—specifically, a particular type thereof. This project addresses, unprecedentedly, the production and use in late medieval England of manuscript codices copied, in whole or in part, on *offcuts*: low-quality, relatively inexpensive parchment scraps created as a byproduct of parchment manufacturing. Here, since it is not always clear how to distinguish offcuts from other kinds of scrappy- or odd-looking parchment, a caveat is in order. Unusual parchment features may emerge from a variety of sources at all stages of a manuscript's life.[4] This dissertation focusses on traits characteristic of peripheral regions of the treated pelt whether originating in features proper to the raw material or arising during the parchment production process. Insofar as it can be reliably identified, damage caused by natural ageing, human use, preservation and storage issues, and other post-production factors (e.g., scribal erasures, reactions with pigments, improper binding, etc.) is not discussed herein.[5] Against a backdrop of medieval British book making, marketplaces, literacy, and related sociocultural history, I show how books copied on this material not only exhibit striking variety in themselves, but also help paint a new picture of urban literate classes and their interaction with books, and begin to outline a hitherto unacknowledged canon of texts and genres associated with middle- and professional-class readers. With an established dataset

---

4 See, for instance, Jiří Vnouček, "Typology of the Damage of the Parchment in Manuscripts of the Codex Form", in *IDAP: Improved Damage Assessment of Parchment*, ed. R. Larsen (Luxembourg: European Commission, 2007), especially 30–31.

5 For other types of irregularities, their ramifications for conservation, and the materiality of parchment generally, see, *inter al*., René Larsen, ed., *IDAP: Improved Damage Assessment of Parchment* (Luxembourg: European Commission, 2007), particularly "Introduction"; as well as Larsen's *Microanalysis of Parchment* (London: Archetype, 2002).

of 140 offcut-bearing production units spread across seventy-five manuscript codices, making use of both qualitative and quantitative methods, my dissertation delineates a range of book production processes in late medieval England, from parchmenter to post-medieval users, while examining the material and sociocultural contexts of these books.

The present work is an exploratory, proof-of-concept study which strives to develop a straightforward, methodical, and, above all, low-tech[6] method of identifying offcut parchment while also exploring the feasibility of researching this material via, not solely traditional case studies nor biocodicological techniques, but statistical techniques. I aim to show the subject of enquiry (parchment offcuts) worthy of careful scholarly investigation, and foreground the effectiveness of mixed quantitative–qualitative methodology. Very few scholars have considered parchment offcuts at all, let alone as the marker of a distinct subset of manuscripts and genres to be examined in a book-length study. It will be helpful, therefore, to provide information on what constitutes an "offcut" and an "offcut manuscript" (in advance of the fuller discussion to follow in chapter one). I use the word *offcut* to refer to a piece of parchment originating as a remnant created by the parchmenter's second cuts—to wit, those cuts made when the prepared parchment sheet, having been cut down from the herse on which it was prepared, is squared up by pruning away lower-grade material from around its perimeter. Despite the less desirable attributes of these trimmed scraps—namely, their irregular shape, tight dimensions, and a range of distinctive flaws characteristic of a treated hide's perimeter—

---

6 That is, one not requiring any equipment beyond the researcher's own senses.

they were not garbage. As first shown by Erik Kwakkel,[7] far from unprofitable rubbish, these undersized, substandard by-products saw use in a diverse range of contexts. Those escaping reduction in a glue-maker's vat could be upcycled[8] into a multiplicity of items of varying permanence. Medieval garments, for example, were stiffened with parchment strips or fragments; other potential applications more liminal to written culture range from medical or magical textual charms and amulets to electoral ballots to games. Yet, as we will learn, offcuts saw use far beyond these contexts, including as writing support in manuscript codices. Surviving records reveal that medieval manufacturers made and sold discrete grades of parchment, and scribes working in institutional and non-institutional contexts might purchase the material, including the scraps, in

---

7 Erik Kwakkel, "Commercial Organization and Economic Innovation", in *The Production of Books in England 1350–1500*, ed. A. Gillespie and D. Wakelin (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 173–91; idem, "Discarded Parchment as Writing Support in English Manuscript Culture", in *English Manuscript Studies 1100–1700. Vol. 17*, ed. A.S.G. Edwards and O. Da Rold (London: British Library, 2012), 238–61.

8 "To reuse (waste material) to create a product of higher quality or value than the original, and to reduce the need for new raw materials in production" (*OED*, "upcycle, *v*."). On evidence for attitudes of sustainability towards books and book materials in the fifteenth-century, see Hannah Ryley, "Waste Not, Want Not: The Sustainability of Medieval Manuscripts", *Green Letters* 19, no. 1 (2015): 63–74, and "Constructive Parchment Destruction in Medieval Manuscripts", *Book 2.0* 7, no. 1 (2017): 9–19, as well as her forthcoming monograph. My thanks to Dr Ryley for sharing her forthcoming work with me.

multiple grades for different purposes.[9] Offcuts, in other words, enabled one to buy parchment on the cheap—and cheaper parchment could be used in novel as well as established ways, and could in principle expand the scope of access to books.

As noted above, I aim in my work to merge quantitative analysis with more conventional qualitative case studies.[10] Since neither methodology is without its limitations, I conceive of the pair as complementary approaches, best employed in tandem.[11] Strengths of statistical analysis include its power to reveal hidden or unnoticed patterns by treating tiny features in aggregate. Its shortcomings arise from the questionable representativeness of our fragmentary medieval corpora; the difficulties inherent in determining whether and how to quantify specific features; and loss of the rich, human dimension of artefacts revealed through in-depth case studies. In turn, weaknesses associated with

---

9 Michael Gullick, "From Parchmenter to Scribe: Some Observations on the Manufacture and Preparation of Medieval Parchment Based upon a Review of the Literary Evidence", in *Pergament: Geschichte, Struktur, Restaurierung, Herstellung*, ed. P. Rück (Sigmaringen: Jan Thorbecke Verlag, 1991), 147–48, 153; Hockey 195–98; see also: Paul Benoit, « L'Atelier de parcheminier de l'Abbaye Cistercienne de Beaulieu (Hampshire) », in *Matériaux du livre médiéval*, ed. M. Zerdoun Bat-Yehouda and C. Bourlet (Turnhout: Brepols, 2010), 43–54; Joanne Filippone Overty, "The Cost of Doing Scribal Business: Prices of Manuscript Books in England, 1300–1483", *Book History* 11 (2008), 1–32.

10 Quantitative and qualitative studies diverge in how they collect and analyze data, as well as in the amount of data collected. Quantitative techniques let us study a population when collecting data on the whole population is not feasible; this is accomplished by using statistical inference to draw conclusions based on a *sample*. Just like a case study, a sample may not be perfectly representative, and so we must remain attentive to special cases or outliers.

11 "Each of these methods presents limitations and flaws as well as unique methodologies. The choice [of specific approach] is, essentially, arbitrary and does not indicate the primacy of one approach to the exclusion of the others" (A.R. Bennett, "What Do the Numbers Mean? The Case for Corpus Studies", in *Manuscript Culture and Medieval Devotional Traditions*, ed. J.N. Brown and N.R. Rice (Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 2021), 50).

more conventional case study methods include lack of random sampling (we tend, consciously or not, to favour outliers due to the interest generated by their very atypicality), resulting in poor coverage and skewed, unrepresentative results. Somewhat counterintuitively, medieval manuscripts' inherent heterogeneity renders case studies somewhat dangerous for the purposes of generalizing about medieval book production and use: highly irregular feature distribution (even when controlling for date and place of production) limits identification of patterns and makes extrapolation from them unreliable and potentially misleading. So, while it remains important to deploy statistical techniques "sceptically, tentatively",[12] tempering hypotheses by drawing upon deep knowledge of medieval praxis and attending closely to important extant exemplars, the viability of studying a larger corpus using a mixed approach is demonstrated by projects such as Matti Peikola's work on extant Wycliffite Bibles, Daniel Wakelin's survey of scribal corrections in English manuscripts, or Peter Stokes' analysis of the English vernacular minuscule corpus.[13] These projects seek "to achieve a middle way",[14] deploying statistical survey work to inform established methods: aggregate or "'distant reading' … lead[s] back to close reading".[15]

My own stereoscopic approach to the history of the material book through the study of manuscripts incorporating parchment offcuts into their text block is organized as follows. **Volume one** contains the text of the dissertation. After opening with a terminological discussion—in which I

---

12 Daniel Wakelin, *Scribal Correction and Literary Craft* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014), 14.

13 Matti Peikola, "Aspects of *Mise-en-Page* in Manuscripts of the *Wycliffite Bible*", in *Medieval Texts in Context*, ed. D. Renevey and G.D. Caie (New York: Routledge, 2008), 28–67; Wakelin, *Scribal Correction*; Peter Stokes, *English Vernacular Minuscule from Æthelred to Cnut* (Woodbridge: D.S. Brewer, 2014).

14 Stokes, *English Vernacular Minuscule*, 3.

15 Wakelin, *Scribal Correction*, 15.

define ‘offcuts’, cover the origin of the term ‘offcut’, and dive into related historical vocabulary—**chapter one** describes medieval parchment-making, clarifying how and why the traits associated with parchment offcuts arise during the manufacturing process. After distinguishing between the features of this material and those of other types of parchment which might be mistaken for it, the chapter closes by giving a quick rundown of the many ways parchment offcuts were used in medieval Europe.

Primarily converging around methodological and technical considerations, **chapter two** commences with a discussion of quantitative codicology, tabling a response to common criticisms with analogies to work in allied fields, and offering a rationale for this study’s mixture of statistical techniques and (perhaps more expected) codicological case studies. The bulk of the chapter, however, delineates my methodology which, due to the nature of the investigation, comprised multiple phases. Phase one concentrated on establishing a set of offcut diagnostic traits (material features for reliable identification of offcut parchment) via linear regression analysis. In phase two, the diagnostic criteria arising from phase one were applied to identify manuscripts copied, in whole or in part, on offcut parchment. After assembling a corpus of 140 offcut-bearing units, phase two considered the material codicological contexts of offcuts, applying a descriptive statistical lens to the full corpus. The chapter ends with an overview of primary findings arising from this analysis. Briefly, analysis of the collected data identified within my corpus two large subcorpora, the one, consisting of legal (specifically English common law) books and fairly coherent as a body; the other, non-legal in nature and appreciably more heterogeneous. Both subcorpora nevertheless are dominated by *Fachliteratur*, or practical writings, whose material and textual presentation suggest production for some sort of personal use. In addition, one is struck by the relative absence from the

corpus of works typically thought of as ‘popular’, whether religious (devotional texts) or literary (vernacular romances).

Turning first to the more coherent grouping—the corpus’ legal units, which together comprise just over half of the full dataset—**chapter three** touches on the English common law’s emergence and spread, discussing medieval English common law education as a significant site for production of law books. The chapter then turns to common law books themselves, laying out common subtypes with an emphasis on Statuta Angliæ manuscripts (our corpus’ most frequently occurring codicological genre). The chapter then lays out the results of statistical analysis of this half of our dataset, considering associations between offcut writing support and other material characteristics such as ornamentation and script size. Analysis shows that this subcorpus consists mainly of very small, yet very thick, statute books, often with low levels of ornamentation. Showing widespread consistency in contents and organization, plus adherence to aesthetic and paratextual ‘types’, most of these manuscripts were likely produced in a narrow set of cultural and geographical contexts for an identifiable group of users. We close with a pair of closely-related case studies examining London, British Library, Lansdowne MS 475, and Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Ashmole 1152. Aiming to uncover a sense of these books’ owners and users, the investigation points to likely provincial connections for at least some of these codices, suggesting the possible role of production context in motivating recruitment of low-end parchment like offcuts.

Thereafter, **chapter four** engages with the second, much more heterogeneous half of the corpus, comprising all non-legal units. After comparing and contrasting the basic features of the legal and non-legal units, the chapter engages with the unique generic and material complexity of the non-law subcorpus, explaining the complications arising during data-cleaning and analysis; the fiddly, ambiguous nature of the results; and the strategies relied upon to, if not resolve, at least work around

the problems—for now. In sum, I subdivided this convoluted set of units into two generically-based subcorpora, based roughly on the later medieval typology of knowledge and dubbed 'Triv' (from trivium) and 'Quad' (from quadrivium), subjecting each group to independent statistical analysis. The latter revealed that, as a group, Quad units tend to be among the roughest and most turbulent in our entire corpus, whereas Triv units tend towards the more orderly and ornate end of the scale, bearing some similarities to the legal half of our corpus. After exploring the results of these analyses and placing them into context, we end the chapter with two detailed case studies examining manuscripts made partially from parchment offcuts by two book-makers exhibiting very different degrees of 'codicological literacy'—London, British Library, Harley MS 912 (the paratextually sophisticated compilation of a fourteenth-century preacher), and Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Ashmole 1378 (a rough 'billfold' of medical and magical receipts drawn together from about 1500) —exploring what recruitment of offcut parchment in these radically different codices might tell us about the place of this material in later medieval book production.

This dissertation's **conclusion** outlines issues arising during the course of research (in particular, the challenge of creating an inventory of manuscripts likely to contain offcut parchment), explores some limitations of the project (especially pertaining to sampling and representativeness), and lays out a number of directions for future research (for instance, drawing upon the resources of biocodicology and machine learning). In **volume two**, the reader will find the **figures** and **tables** referenced in the text (organized by chapter), plus two **appendices**. The first presents detailed codicological descriptions of those codices discussed in some detail in the body of the dissertation—that is, those comprising the foci of the case studies, along with a handful of others touched on more than in passing. The second, substantially longer, appendix supplies brief descriptions of the remainder of the manuscripts comprising the dataset upon which this study is based.

Chapter 1: Making the Offcut

Life in medieval Europe rested upon biomaterials. Practically everything anybody handled came from something that had once been alive.[16]

1.1. Terminology

Following Erik Kwakkel, I use the word *offcut* to refer to, in the first instance, a piece of parchment originating as a remnant created by the parchment-maker's second cuts—to wit, those cuts made when the prepared parchment sheet is squared up by pruning away lower-grade material from around its perimeter. This particular application of the term seems to be a recent one: as far as I have been able to ascertain, it originates with Kwakkel's 2012 chapter on the topic.[17] Among conservators, offcuts are strips of parchment or other material used in restoration and conservation activities.[18] In this latter context, parchment offcuts tend to be of good quality and may be trimmed from anywhere

---

16 Richard C. Hoffmann, *An Environmental History of Medieval Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014), 215.

17 Erik Kwakkel, "Discarded Parchment as Writing Support in English Manuscript Culture", in *English Manuscript Studies 1100–1700. Vol. 17*, ed. A.S.G. Edwards and O. Da Rold (London: British Library, 2012), 238–61.

18 Jody Beenk, et al., "Archives Conservation Discussion Group 2009: Conservation and Preservation Approaches for Stabilizing Large-Scale Collections", *Book and Paper Group Annual* 28 (2009), 100; Anthony G. Cains, "Techniques of Preservation Based on Early Binding Methods and Materials", *Paper Conserv.* 1, no. 1 (1976), 8; Walter Henry, "Resizing Following Aqueous Treatment: Current American Practice", *Book and Paper Group Annual* 5 (1986): n.p.; Jen Lindsay, "A Limp Vellum Binding Sewn on Alum-Tawed Thongs", *New Bookbinder* 11 (1991), ¶¶ 29, 39.

in a regular sheet, rather than arising as substandard waste pruned away by the maker or subsequent user. In addition, a few scholars have used *offcut* (or *off-cut*) to denote a piece of parchment or paper, of any quality, cropped from a larger leaf for any reason.[19] Neither of these senses of the word appears to be in wide usage among scholars of medieval books and manuscripts, and I will not be deploying the term in either sense.

By contrast, 'offcut' is widely attested in the archaeological literature. To archaeologists, an offcut is a scrap of waste material generated as a byproduct of craftwork, such as leather-making,[20]

---

19 Anthony G. Cains and Maria Fredericks, "The Bindings of the Ellesmere Chaucer", *Huntington Library Quarterly* 58, no. 1 (1995), 129; Philip Gaskell, *A New Introduction to Bibliography* (New Castle: Oak Knoll, 1972), 196, 107; John Southward, *Dictionary of Typography and its Accessory Arts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), *s.v.* "Off-cut".

20 Timothy Easton, "Spiritual Middens", in *Physical Evidence for Ritual Acts, Sorcery and Witchcraft in Christian Britain*, ed. R. Hutton (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015), 159; John Hines, "From **Anleifr* to *Havelok*: The English and the Irish Sea", in *Celtic–Norse Relationships in the Irish Sea in the Middle Ages 800–1200*, ed. J.V. Sigurðsson and T. Bolton (Leiden: Brill, 2014), 213; John Schofield, *London 1100–1600* (Sheffield: Equinox, 2011), 72.

metal-working,[21] wood-working,[22] bone- and antler-working,[23] or clothing production.[24] This sense of the term is attested as early as 1663–1664,[25] and remains the dominant meaning in archaeology. Historically, these manufacturers' scraps often saw reuse in other applications. For instance, although the fourteenth-century artisans who produced the Thornham Parva Retable had easy access to local and imported oak in standard lengths, they elected to use multiple short pieces from "26 different trees … for a relatively small job", leading conservator Spike Bucklow to suggest that they pieced the object together out of "offcuts from timbers used in the [Thetford] Priory".[26] Similarly, in his discussion of the Macclesfield Psalter (Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum, MS 1-2005), Bucklow notes that its producers compensated for a dearth of "shell gold by recycling … gold leaf offcuts [or using] mosaic gold".[27] While Kwakkel does not seem to have consciously adopted the archaeological usage, his definition of offcut extends that use of the word to another craft—parchment-making—

---

21 Helena Hamerow, *Early Medieval Settlements* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 189; David A. Hinton, *Gold and Gilt, Pots and Pins: Possessions and People in Medieval Britain* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 9.

22 James H. Barrett, "The Pirate Fishermen: The Political Economy of a Medieval Maritime Society", in *West over Sea: Studies in Scandinavian Sea-Borne Expansion and Settlement Before 1300*, ed. B. Ballin Smith, et al. (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 317; Easton, "Spiritual Middens", 155–56, 161.

23 Gitte Hansen, "Itinerant Craftspeople in 12th Century Bergen, Norway—Aspects of Their Social Identities", in *Everyday Products in the Middle Ages*, ed. G. Hansen, et al. (Oxford: Oxbow, 2015), 36, *et pass.*; Ian D. Riddler and Nicola I.A. Trzaska-Nartowski, "Chanting upon a Dunghill: Working Skeletal Materials in Anglo-Saxon England", in *The Material Culture of Daily Life in Anglo-Saxon England*, ed. M.C. Hyer and G.R. Owen-Crocker (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2011), 126.

24 Elisabeth Crowfoot, *Textiles and Clothing,* c. *1150*–c. *1450* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2001), 75–76, 115, 119, 157; Hinton, *Gold and Gilt*, 228.

25 *OED*, "offcut, *n.*, def. 1".

26 Spike Bucklow, *The Riddle of the Image* (London: Reaktion, 2014), 207.

27 Bucklow, *Riddle of the Image*, 86.

and his 2012 chapter on the topic seems to be the first application of the term in this particular sense. For the remainder of this dissertation, *offcut* will be used exclusively to refer to parchment offcuts.

One context in which we do not encounter 'offcut' is medieval England: the word's earliest attestation dates to the mid-seventeenth century.[28] Yet the lack of the word does not necessarily indicate a lack of the thing itself. Indeed, despite their less desirable attributes, parchment offcuts found a variety of applications in written culture throughout medieval Europe, and medieval makers and users of parchment developed their own vocabulary to refer to this material. Primary sources provide numerous references to small waste scraps of parchment under diverse terminology ranging from Latin *cedule* or *sceda* (usually denoting a loose sheet) and *cedula* or *schedula* (usually denoting a scrap) to rough vernacular equivalents such as German *zedel* and Middle English *scrow*.[29] Unfortunately, these designations occupy a capacious semantic space, and polysemy regularly obscures the precise intended meaning. Generally speaking, however, the semantic scope of the Latin terms and their vernacular counterparts encompassed small-format writing supports, while extending, metonymically, to the texts written on them.[30] For instance, the Middle English *scrow* bore a narrow, explicitly physical, meaning—to wit, small parchment remnants of the kind used in glue-making.[31] Yet *scrow* also signified "a scrap or strip of parchment" more broadly,[32] together with texts which might fit on such a scrap. The Smaller Vernon Legendary (Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Eng. poet. a. 1; c. 1350(?)×1390) describes Saint Bernard bearing to the husband of a woman plagued by

---

28 *OED*, "offcut, *n.*".

29 Kwakkel, "Discarded Parchment", 241; *MED*, "scrow, *n.*".

30 Kwakkel, "Discarded Parchment", 241.

31 *OED*, "scrow, *n.*, def. 4"; *MED*, "scroue, *n.*, def. d".

32 *MED*, "scroue, *n.*, def. c".

the devil “a luyte bok, / A scrouwe iwriten on” (‘a little book, / a scrow written upon’),[33] and a gloss on Matthew 22:5 in the early version of the Wycliffite Bible (c. 1382) defines “filateries” as “smale scrowis”, a rendering followed by Trevisa’s 1387 Middle English version of Higden’s *Polychronicon*.[34] Both uses reinforce the link between a snippet of parchment and a snippet of text. This sense of *scrow* makes it roughly commensurate with *sceda* or *schedula* (and variants) which, similarly, might designate a scrap; a short enclosure or attachment affixed to a missive, bill, or other legal document; as well as a broad range of short compositions.[35] For example, Wynkyn de Worde’s 1500 edition of *Ortus vocabulorum*—a Latin dictionary by the Flemish-born Parisian printer and grammarian Jodocus Badius (1462–1535), but sometimes attributed to Galfridus Anglicus (*fl.* 1440)—defines *sceda* simply as “scriptu*m* vel carta”.[36] Most likely this sense arose because such drafts and brief jottings were initially composed on cheap offcut remnants.[37]

Numerous medieval texts treat the terms as synonyms. *Medulla grammatice* or *Medulla grammaticæ* (c. 1425), a collection of Latin–Middle English glossaries extant in at least ten manuscripts, asserts “[s]ceda, carta uel scriptum: a scrite or a scrowe”;[38] the *Promptorium parvulorum* (c. 1440) translates *cedula* as *scrow*;[39] and the Middle English–Latin glossary *Catholicon Anglicum* (c. 1483) proffers *cedula* and *scedula* as equivalents to *scrawe* and *scrowe*.[40] This

---

33 Carl Horstmann, ed., *Sammlung Altenglischer Legenden* (Heilbronn: Henninger, 1878), 56.

34 Don C. Skemer, *Binding Words: Textual Amulets in the Middle Ages* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2010), 11 n.24, 37 n.51.

35 *MED*, “scedule, *n*., def. b”, “cedule, *n*.”; *OED*, “schedule, *n*., def. †1–2”.

36 Jodocus Badius, *Ortus Vocabulorum* ([Winandu*m* de worde], 1500), sig. LL.vi^{r}.

37 Kwakkel, “Discarded Parchment”, 241, see also 257 n.20, 259 n.46.

38 *MED*, “cedule, *n*.”.

39 A.L. Mayhew, ed., *The Promptorium Parvulorum* (London: Henry Frowde, 1908), 403.

40 Sidney J.H. Herrtage, *Catholicon Anglicum* (London: Trübner, 1881), 325, 326.

congruence persists outside of reference works, too. For instance, a mid-fifteenth-century English translation of the early fourteenth-century *Alphabetum narrationum*—attributed now to Arnold de Liège (d. c. 1308)[41] and formerly to Etienne de Besançon (c. 1250–1294)—uses the terms interchangeably: "He [þe preste] prayed hym write his confession in a *scrow*, and at he wold giff it vnto þe bisshopp … And þe preste offerd þis *cedull* vnto þis bisshopp".[42]

No matter the terminology employed, offcuts which escaped reduction in the glue-maker's vat could, like other parchment, be upcycled into a multiplicity of items of varying permanence. Medieval garments, for example, were stiffened with parchment: in 2011, vestments for statues, produced by the Cistercian convent of Wienhausen, Northern Germany, in the fifteenth century were found to have (non-offcut) manuscript fragments sewn into their hems.[43] The same technique reinforced liturgical garments, particularly mitres. Copenhagen's Arnamagnæanske Samling holds a bishop's mitre made from a recycled c. 1270 Norwegian translation of Old French *lais* (MS AM 666 b 4to); another example from Minden, Lower Saxony (c. 1425–1430) survives in Berlin's Kunstgewerbemuseum (K 6156), and Nürnberg's Germanisches Nationalmuseum boasts a similar Venetian mitre dating to c. 1325 (KG709). Larger offcuts, which are often much stiffer than recycled parchment writing support, could have been put to the same purpose at a very reasonable price. Other potential applications more liminal to written culture range from medical charms and textual amulets to games. Both Latin and vernacular terms associated with offcuts prove particularly common in

---

41 Arnoldus Leodiensis, *Alphabetum Narrationum*, ed. E. Brilli, et al. (Turnhout: Brepols, 2015).

42 Etienne de Besançon, [attrib.], *Alphabet of Tales*, ed. M.M. Banks (Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 1904), 58, emphasis added.

43 Henrike Lähnemann, « Text und Textil. Die Beschriebenen Pergamente in den Figurenornaten », i n *Heilige Röcke: Kleider für Skulpturen in Kloster Wienhausen*, ed. C. Klack-Eitzen, et al. (Regensburg: Schnell + Steiner, 2013), 71–78+79–173.

discussions of charms and amulets,[44] suggesting exploitation of waste parchment for magical applications. Medieval authorities, of course, frowned on such practices. Doctrinal guidance offered in *Dives and Pauper* (c. 1405–1410) incorporated a denunciation of using "charmys in gaderyng of herbis or hangyng of scrowis aboutyn man, woman, child, or beste for ony seknesse",[45] and the Parisian-trained German theologian Heinrich von Gorkum (c. 1386–1431) fulminated against persons affirming the magical efficacy of using "aliquam cedulam insignitam nominibus ignotis et per caracteres" ('a sheet marked by some unknown names and characters') in his c. 1425 *Tractatus de superstitiosis quibusdam casibus*.[46] Apparently these vilifications went unheeded. A generation later, a medico–magical receipt in London, British Library, Additional MS 33996 (c. 1450), directed the reader to "[w]ryte þis charme on a skrowe".[47]

From at least the mid- to late-1300s, *scrow* seems to have carried stronger connotations of small size and poor quality than *schedula*, perhaps due to *scrow*'s other, more explicitly material definition. The c. 1382 Wycliffite Prologue to Job notes that "þei suffren to han pore scrowys *and* not as myche faire bookis".[48] As for *schedula* / *cedula*, despite designating a "literary trifle" throughout the 1100s, by the end of the 1200s, the word held both the legal–administrative meaning given

---

44 Skemer, *Binding Words*, 13, *et pass*.; idem, "Magic Writ: Textual Amulets Worn on the Body for Protection", in *Schriftträger – Textträger: Zur Materialen Präsenz des Geschriebenen in Frühen Gesellschaften. Vol. 6*, ed. A. Kehnel and D. Panagiotopoulos (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2015), 127–49; Mary Agnes Edsall, "*Arma Christi* Rolls or Textual Amulets?: The Narrow Roll Format Manuscripts of 'O Vernicle'", *Magic, Ritual, and Witchcraft* 9, no. 2 (2014): 178–209.

45 Priscilla Heath Barnum, ed., *Dives and Pauper. Vol. 1, Part 1* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1976), 158.

46 Quoted: Skemer, *Binding Words*, 164, see also 14.

47 Fritz Heinrich, ed., *Ein Mittelenglisches Medizinbuch* (Halle: Max Niemeyer, 1896), 99.

48 *MED*, "scroue, *n*.".

above, and two additional, narrower meanings. The first of these is an electoral ballot, as in the "*parvæ schedulæ*" electors used to cast their votes during the Convocation held at St Paul's, London in 1419.[49] Nicholas of Cusa's *De concordantia Catholica* (1433–1434) also describes pressing *cedulæ* into service for voting, a practice already employed by municipal guilds and councils[50] and by papal electors, who cast written secret ballots prior to the beginning of the thirteenth century.[51] Although Cusanus' *cedulæ* possibly denoted slips of paper—a writing support which had already reached Europe[52]—parchment would have served equally well, with small, cheap, oddly-shaped offcut snippets constituting a very sensible choice for such an application. The second more specific meaning of *schedula* is a rough draft or the preliminary stage of a composition.[53] Hugh of St Victor's

---

49 David Wilkins, ed., "Convocatio Prælatorum et Cleri Provinciæ Cant. 30 Die Octobris in Ecclesia S. Pauli London", in *Concilia Magnæ Britanniæ et Hiberniæ … Vol. 3* (London: R. Gosling, 1737), 394.

50 Günther Hägele and Friedrich Pukelsheim, "The Electorial Systems of Nicholas of Cusa in the *Catholic Concordance* and Beyond", in *The Church, the Councils, and Reform: The Legacy of the Fifteenth Century*, ed. G. Christianson, et al. (Baltimore: Catholic University of America Press, 2008), 232–35; Kwakkel, "Discarded Parchment", 257 n.23.

51 Arthur M. Wolfson, "The Ballot and Other Forms of Voting in the Italian Communes", *Amer. Hist. Rev.* 5, no. 1 (1899), 18–19. Ramon Llull's *Artificium electionis personarum* described written ballots 150 to 200 years earlier than Cusanus (Hägele and Pukelsheim, "Electorial Systems", 245; idem, "The Electoral Writings of Ramon Llull", *Studia Lulliana* 41, no. 97 (2001): 3–38).

52 Orietta Da Rold, *Paper in Medieval England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2020), 36–37, *et pass*.

53 Skemer, *Binding Words*, 13.

(c. 1096–1141) *Didascalion*—likely drawing on Isidore of Seville[54]—informs the reader that "dicitur scheda proprie quod adhuc emendatur, et necdum in libris redactum est":[55] "[w]hat is still being corrected and has not yet been bound in books is properly called a *scheda*",[56] and Ælred of Rievaulx's (1110–1167) *De spirituali amicitia* lingered so long in draft form that the author came to dub it his 'scheda'.[57] Centuries later, Johannes Trithemius (1462–1516) would use *cedule* in identical fashion in *De laude scriptorum*.[58]

It remains centrally important to note that, while the materials discussed in any of the foregoing examples *could* be scraps of offcut parchment, the linguistic ambiguity mentioned earlier (p. 13 *ff.*) warns us that apparent textual references to remnants of the parchmenter's craft need to be approached with considerable caution. Neither a "scrow" nor a "scedula" are necessarily offcuts in the archaeological sense, nor should use of the terms be taken as certain evidence of parchment quality. Fortunately, as we will see below, we also find numerous extant physical examples corroborating the documentary evidence. These material specimens demonstrate that parchment offcuts saw use in two primary forms: unfolded and folded—that is, as singletons and as bifolia.

---

54 Isidore defines *scheda* as "a thing still being emended, and not yet redacted into books" (*The Etymologies of Isidore of Seville*, tr. S.A. Barney, et al. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 6.14.8). Intriguingly, in the same section, Isidore claims that a book's folia "are so called from their likeness to the leaves (*folium*) of trees, or because they are made of leather sacks (*follis*), that is, of the skins that are customarily stripped from slaughtered livestock" (ibid., 6.14.6).

55 Charles Henry Buttimer, ed., *Hugonis de Sancto Victore* (Washington D.C.: Catholic University Press, 1939), §§ 4.16.788D–789A.

56 Jerome Taylor, tr., *The Didascalion of Hugh of St. Victor: A Medieval Guide to Arts* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1961), 118–19.

57 Kwakkel, "Discarded Parchment", 241.

58 Johannes Trithemius, *In Praise of Scribes; De Laude Scriptorum*, ed. K. Arnold (Lawrence: Coronado, 1974), 80–81, quoted: Skemer, *Binding Words*, 13 n.31.

Before turning to offcut use and identification, however, we need to make sense of how parchment is made.

1.2. Parchmentry

Generically, the word *parchment* (from *Pergamum*, a city in Asia Minor traditionally, albeit erroneously, thought to be the place where parchment originated[59]) designates a laminate material made from specially-prepared animal integument and, in medieval Europe, traditionally used as a writing support.[60] The term entered English before approximately 1300, with *vellum* appearing nearly a century and a half later. Etymologically-speaking, *vellum* (from Old French *velin*, from *vel* 'veal') refers to writing support made from calf, with parchment either reserved for the equivalent product made from sheep or goat skins, or acting as a more general term. From at least the late medieval era, however, terminological conflation seems to have been the order of the day—as Tudor headmaster and Grammarians' War antagonist William Horman (c.1440–1535) noted in his 1519 Latin–English phrasebook, *Vulgaria*, "[t]hat stouffe that we wrytte vpon : and is made of beestis skynnes : is somtyme called p*ar*chement / somtyme velem / somtyme abortyue / somtyme me*m*braan"[61]—and the strict distinction between *parchment* and *vellum* appears to have arisen fairly late. Notwithstanding, or perhaps due to, lingering "inconsistency in common terminology", modern scholars and conservators tend to employ the term *parchment* in a broad, neutral sense, *viz*. to

---

59 The story appears to arise with Pliny the Elder (*Naturalis historia*, 13.21), but was widely repeated, including by Isidore of Seville (*Etymologies* 6.11.1).

60 Much of this paragraph draws upon the *OED*, entries "parchment, *n*." and "vellum, *n*.", together with Lee W. Ustick, "'Parchment' and 'Vellum'", *The Library*, 4th ser., 16, no. 4 (1936), 439–42.

61 William Horman, *Vulgaria Viri Doctissimi Guil* ([Richard Pynson], [1519]), f. 80v; see also William Shakespeare, *Hamlet*, 5.1.114–15, in *The Norton Shakespeare*, 3rd edn., ed. S. Greenblatt, et al. (New York: Norton, 2015).

indicate writing support created from any or "all of these different hide types"[62]—a convention followed in this dissertation. Fortunately for us, the confusion surrounding this material's nomenclature does not extend to the processes used to create it. So how did medieval artisans transform "beestis skynnes" into viable writing support?

Production of parchment for use as writing support comprised two broad stages.[63] The finishing stage, termed *preparation*, encompassed post-manufacture scribal preliminaries: sanding or scraping the surface; pouncing or rubbing it with substances like pumice, chalk, or sandarac (powdered *Tetraclinis articulata* rosin); applying surface sizing such as *gesso sottile* (a suspension of powdered gypsum in animal-based adhesive); pricking and ruling the leaves; and assembling them into quires.[64] By the later medieval era, preparation had become "an independent activity … separately charged for", and responsibility for it might lie with the parchment-maker[65] or with the scribe. Even when undertaken by the producer, preparation costs often remain hidden in parchment's

---

62 Christopher S. Woods, "The Conservation of Parchment", in *Conservation of Leather and Related Materials*, ed. M. Kite and R. Thomson (Amsterdam: Elsevier, 2006), 201; see also: Raymond Clemens and Timothy Graham, *Introduction to Manuscript Studies* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2007), 9–10; Roy Bishop Stokes, *Esdaile's Manual of Bibliography*, ed. S.R. Almagno, 6th edn. (Lanham, MD: Scarecrow, 2001), 114.

63 For medieval depictions of various stages of these processes, see: Bamberg, Staatsbibliothek, MS Patr 5 (B.ii.5), f. 1r–v; Bologna, Biblioteca Universitaria, Cod. Bonon. 963, f. 4r; Copenhagen, Kongelige Bibliotek, MS GKS 4 2°, v. 2, f. 183v; and Nürnberg, Stadtbibliothek, Amb. 317.2°, ff. 34v, 62r.

64 Michael Gullick, "From Parchmenter to Scribe: Some Observations on the Manufacture and Preparation of Medieval Parchment Based upon a Review of the Literary Evidence", in *Pergament*, ed. P. Rück (Sigmaringen: Jan Thorbecke Verlag, 1991), 148; Daniel V. Thompson, "Medieval Parchment-Making", *The Library*, 4th ser., 16, no. 1 (1935), 113–17; Ronald Reed, *The Nature and Making of Parchment* (Leeds: Elmete, 1975), 87–95.

65 In medieval England, variously termed a *parchmenter*, *parcheminus*, *pyrmetter*, *pergamenter*, or *membranarius*, among other names. Further complicating matters, tanners likely also made parchment.

overall price rendering them challenging to determine. More importantly, such practices have but a trivial impact upon parchment's underlying character: the end product's quality instead hinges upon raw material characteristics (e.g., animal condition, age, sex, etc.), the maker's skill, and "local habits of manufacture".[66] In light of this, our discussion mainly focusses on preparation's precursor, *manufacture*—a process long, gruelling, messy, and reeking to judge by the frequency of criticisms against, and ordinances addressing, the craft and its practitioners.[67]

While manufacturing techniques vary both geographically and temporally,[68] all parchment consists of specially-treated animal skin. References to parchment-makers are somewhat rare, especially early on, although a few notable centres boasted designated producers of the material. For instance, the Abbey of Corbie retained a parchment-maker from 822, per the orders of Abbot Adalhard;[69] as at Bobbio, Corbie's percamenarius was a layman.[70] Techniques deployed by western European parchment-makers during the Middle Ages have been reconstructed using accounts from

---

66 Gullick, "From Parchmenter to Scribe", 147–51, quotes at 149, 147.

67 Parchment-making, as one of the "nuisance industries" (Dolly Jørgensen, "'All Good Rule of the Citee': Sanitation and Civic Government in England, 1400–1600", *J. Urban Hist.* 36, no. 3 (2010), 309) which "consumed significant quantities of water and … generated noxious wastes", drew many complaints and was a target of special taxes and legislation (eadem, "Local Government Responses to Urban River Pollution in Late Medieval England", *Water Hist.* 2, no. 1 (2010), 49). See also: Ernest L. Sabine, "City Cleaning in Mediaeval London", *Speculum* 12, no. 1 (1937), 34–35; idem, "Butchering in Mediaeval London", *Speculum* 8, no. 3 (1933), 344; John Cherry, "Leather", in *English Medieval Industries: Craftsmen, Techniques, Products*, ed. J. Blair and N. Ramsay (London: Hambledon, 1991), 296; Jane Chedzey, "Manuscript Production in Medieval Winchester", *Reading Medieval Studies* 29 (2003), 8–10.

68 Marina Bicchieri, et al., "Inside the Parchment", *e-Journal of Nondestructive Testing* 13, no. 9 (2008–2009), 1; Barbara A. Shailor, *The Medieval Book* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1991), 9.

69 Leslie Webber Jones, "The Scriptorium at Corbie: I. The Library", *Speculum* 22, no. 2 (1947), 196 n.31.

70 Josef Semmler, ed., "Consuetudines Corbienses", in *Corpus Consuetudinum Monasticarum I* (Siegburg: F. Schmitt, 1963), 422, 367.

the period, the first of which—copied sometime between 787 or 796 and 816, probably in Lucca, Tuscany—survives in *Compositiones Lucenses*, a collection of alchemical and artisanal texts in Lucca, Biblioteca Capitolare, MS 490, ff. 211^{v}+217^{r}–231^{r}.[71] We find the earliest extant European set of written instructions for parchment-making at f. 219^{v} of this codex; they describe a lime-based process. As the dominant pelt depilation method in western Europe, particularly north of the Alps,[72] lime processing sits at the core of most pre-modern European parchmenting receipts,[73] including

---

71 For details of the codex, see: Hjalmar Hedfors, ed. and tr., « Compositiones ad tingenda musiva: herausgegeben, übersetzt und philologisch erklärt » (Uppsala: Almqvist och Wiksell, 1932); Rozelle Parker Johnson, "Compositiones Variae", in *Compositiones Variae from Codex 490 Biblioteca Capitolare, Lucca, Italy: An Introductory Study* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1939), 18–29; L. Schiaparelli, « Il Codice 490 », *Studi e Testi* 36 (1924): 4–7; on its convoluted reception history, see: Guido Frison and Giulia Brun, "*Compositiones Lucenses* and *Mappæ Clavicula*: Two Traditions or One? New Evidence from Empirical Analysis and Assessment of the Literature", *Heritage Science* 6, no. 24 (2018): art. 24. Both Leandro Gottscher ("Ancient Methods of Parchment Making. Discussion on Recipes and Experimental Essays", in *Ancient and Medieval Book Materials and Techniques*, ed. M. Maniaci and P. Munafò (Città del Vaticano: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1993), 1:47) and H. Saxl ("An Investigation of the Qualities, the Methods of Manufacture, and the Preservation of Historic Parchment and Vellum with a View to Identifying the Animal Species Used", MSc thesis, University of Leeds, 1954, 23–24) provide parallel texts of the parchmenting receipt.

72 Vnouček, "Illustrations for Instruction", 203.

73 Other traditions have developed limeless techniques, e.g., Ethiopia's water-based process (Sean Michael Winslow, "Parchmenting", *Online Exhibit: Ethiopic Manuscript Production*, 2011, larkvi.com/mss/eth/production/parchmenting.php; idem, "Ethiopian Manuscript Culture: Practices and Contexts", PhD diss., University of Toronto, 2015, chapter three and sources therein), and the so-called 'tanned parchments' produced via enzymatic depilation in the late antique (3rd century BCE–2nd century CE) Middle East (Ira Rabin, "Building a Bridge from the Dead Sea Scrolls to Mediaeval Hebrew Manuscripts", in *Jewish Manuscript Cultures: New Perspectives*, ed. I. Wandrey (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2017), 309–22; Ira Rabin and Oliver Hahn, "Characterization of the Dead Sea Scrolls by Advanced Analytical Techniques", *Analytical Methods* 5, no. 18 (2013), 4648–654). Such methods fall beyond the scope of this study.

those of the pseudonymous Theophilus Presbyter's (*fl*. c.1070–1125) *Schedula diversarium artium* (West Germany, s. xii in.; London, British Library, Harley MS 3915, f. 148r) and the *Libellus de naturis animalium* attributed to Conradus de Mure (c.1210–1281) (Zurich, c.1255: Berne, Burgerbibliothek, Cod. 462, f. 219v), along with the Middle English receipts found in Cambridge, Trinity College Library, MS R.14.45, f. 57r (s. xv), and MS O.8.36, f. 22v (c.1500).[74]

---

74 For the *Schedula* receipt, see: Gottscher, "Ancient Methods", 53–54; Ronald Reed, *Ancient Skins, Parchment, and Leathers* (London: Seminar Press, 1972), 133–34; Saxl, "An Investigation", 24–27; Thompson, "Medieval Parchment-Making", 114; or Jiří Vnouček, "Illustrations for Instruction, the Book as Evidence. The Story of the Production of a Medieval Codex as Recorded in the Hamburg Bible", in *From Nature to Script*, ed. H. Þorláksson and Þ.B. Sigurðardóttir (Reykholt: Snorrastofa, 2012), 203 n.10; for that of the *Libellus*, see: Conradus de Mure, *De natura animalium*, in G. Morel, « Zur Kunde des Schriftwesens im Mittelalter », *Anzeiger für Kunde der Deutschen Vorzeit* 19, no. 10 (1872), col. 314; Saxl, "An Investigation", 27–29; or Thompson, "Medieval Parchment-Making", 116. Mark Clarke gives the Middle English receipts in *The Crafte of Lymmyng and The Maner of Steynyng*, EETS OS 347 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016) at 134, 289–90. Universität zu Köln maintains a digital critical edition of the *Schedula diversarum artium* at: schedula.uni-koeln.de/.

A parchmenter working in medieval western Europe mainly relied upon the pelts of domestic ruminants.[75] As an initial step, animals would be slaughtered and their carcasses flayed,[76] removing as much hide as possible, with only the finest selected for transformation into writing substrate.[77] Although skins could be preserved for later processing,[78] fresh material was preferred. Calfskin, with

---

75 Orietta Da Rold, "Materials", in *The Production of Books in England 1350–1500*, ed. A. Gillespie and D. Wakelin (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 17–18; Sarah H. Fiddyment, et al., "Animal Origin of 13th-Century Uterine Vellum Revealed Using Noninvasive Peptide Fingerprinting", *PNAS* 112, no. 49 (2015), 15069–070.

76 In addition to the foregoing medieval receipts, this outline draws upon Gottscher, "Ancient Methods"; Alexis Hagadorn, "Parchment Making in Eighteenth-Century France: Historical Practices and the Written Record", *J. Inst. Conserv.* 35, no. 2 (2012), 173–82; Jesse Meyer, "Parchment Production: A Brief Account", in *Scraped, Stroked, and Bound*, ed. J. Wilcox (Turnhout: Brepols, 2013), 94–95; Reed, *Nature and Making*, 71–87; Jiří Vnouček, "The Manufacture of Parchment for Writing Purposes and the Observation of the Signs of Manufacture Surviving in Old Manuscripts", in *Care and Conservation of Manuscripts 8*, ed. G. Fellows-Jensen and P. Springborg (Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum, 2005), 74–92; and Jiří Vnouček and Daniela Králová, "Parchment During the Process of Manufacture", in *IDAP: Improved Damage Assessment of Parchment*, ed. R. Larsen (Luxembourg: European Commission, 2007), 23–26. All but Hagadorn constitute 'hands-on' accounts by experienced parchmenters. For special attention to modern English praxis, see: J. Visscher, "Looking back on a Lifetime in Parchmentmaking at William Cowley", in *Pergament*, ed. P. Rück (Sigmaringen: Jan Thorbecke Verlag, 1991), 345–48, 353–54. See also: B.M. Haines, "The Manufacture of Parchment", in *Conservation of Leather and Related Materials*, ed. M. Kite and R. Thomson (Amsterdam: Elsevier, 2006), 198–200; Claire Chahine, « De la peau au parchemin: Évolution d'un support de l'écriture », *Quinio* 3 (2001), 17–50; Michael L. Ryder, "The Biology and History of Parchment", in *Pergament*, ed. P. Rück (Sigmaringen: Jan Thorbecke Verlag, 1991), 25–33; idem, "Parchment—Its History, Manufacture, and Composition", *J. Soc. Archivists* 2, no. 9 (1964), 391–99.

77 Visscher, "Looking back", 344.

78 Craig Kennedy and Tim J. Wess, "The Structure of Collagen within Parchment—A Review", *Restaurator* 24, no. 2 (2003), 68; Gottscher, "Ancient Methods", 48, 54–56.

smaller proportions of sheepskin and goatskin, was the rule in much of western continental Europe, excepting Spain (mainly sheep with some goat) and Italy (over half goat, with the remainder primarily sheep); by contrast, throughout the British Isles, artisans overwhelmingly created parchment from sheepskin, and only occasionally calfskin.[79] Regardless of its source, the future parchment would be soaked in clean, ideally running, water for one to two days—longer if preserved[80] or "old slayn".[81] Once free of blood, the pelts underwent *liming*: soaking in a highly-alkaline liquor or paste of water and unslaked lime (CaO). This stage lasted anywhere from three days to a month depending on the age and quality of both pelt and lime, and ambient environmental conditions. Taking care to concentrate the paste on the flesh side, ensure even penetration, and avoid creasing, the artisan regularly interrupted the soaking by removing the hides from the bath for suspension on a rod.[82] After the liming stage, hides might or might not undergo a second rinse (receipts vary), but all underwent some form of *fleshing* or *scudding*: removal of lingering hair, fat, flesh, and connective tissue by draping the hide over a beam or trestle and working the surface with a hand, stone, or a dull, dual-hafted blade.[83]

Thereafter, each individual hide was laced onto a wooden stretching frame, known in English as a *herse* or *harrow*, for scraping and stretching under progressive tension. Special attachment systems helped fend off tearing when pressure was exerted on the damp skin. The most common

---

79 Matthew J. Collins, "Biomolecular Codicology: Books, Beasts, and Bees", Lecture given at *ManuSciences'19*, Fréjus, France, 14 March 2019. On claims of parchment made from small animals such as leporids or rodents, see Fiddyment, et al., "Animal Origin", SI1–SI2.

80 Gottscher, "Ancient Methods", *op. cit.*

81 Clarke, *Crafte of Lymmyng*, 289.

82 Gottscher, "Ancient Methods", 42.

83 Gottscher, "Ancient Methods", 41; Reed, *Nature and Making*, 81.

entailed wrapping a bit of hide around a pippin or pebble at regular intervals along the hide's perimeter, looping slipknots around the resultant bundles; the opposite ends of the cords could then be threaded through attachment points on the stretching frame.[84] With the hide thus secured, the craftsman arduously planed and scraped the hide. Focussing on the flesh-side, occasionally strewing powdered chalk on the surface, he shucked off a froth of shavings with the *lunellarium* or *lunellum*, a crescent-shaped blade somewhat reminiscent of the Inuk *ulu* (ᐅᓗᓄ), a type of all-purpose knife. When suitably thin and dry, the surface was further ground down with pumice. In this fashion, the stench and disarray of parchment-making culminated in sheets of pristine, creamy-smooth substrate.

The substrate's end-quality "heavily depend[ed]" upon this final, labour-intensive phase of the process,[85] and the outcome varied considerably. Surviving records show that medieval makers and consumers of parchment recognized distinct grades of the material. While we cannot be certain of the specific features characterizing them, a qualitative hierarchy clearly existed and mattered. For instance, the 1269–1270 account books for Beaulieu Abbey, a Cistercian house near Southampton, reveal that the Abbey's parchmenter manufactured four discrete grades each of calfskin and sheepskin parchment. All were sold externally at prices per dozen sheets (the English standard) ranging from 2 *s*. 6 *d*. (grade one) through 1 *s*. 4 *d*. (grade four) for calfskin, and 1 *s*. (grade one)

---

84 Possible representations of hides laced on frames appear in a series of twelfth-century decorated initials from Corbie, an important centre of manuscript production: Amiens, Bibliothèque municipale, MS 0042, f. 56^{v}; MS 0043, ff. 50^{v}, 77^{r}. Thanks are due to Erik Kwakkel for bringing them to my attention.

85 Jonathan Wilcox, "Introduction: The Philology of Smell", in *Scraped, Stroked, and Bound*, ed. J. Wilcox (Turnhout: Brepols, 2013), 5.

through 3 *d*. (grade four) for sheepskin.[86] Scribes working in institutional contexts bought parchment in multiple grades for different purposes. By way of example, for 1300, the royal wardrobe and household records at Winchester list purchases of book-making parchment at prices per dozen sheets of 12 *d*. and 18 *d*.; at London in 1311, they record 15 *d*., 14 *d*., and 10 *d*.[87] Similarly, at its founding later in the century, Winchester College hired several scribes to produce books for the new library;[88] their initial 1395–1396 expense accounts document the acquisition of three grades of parchment at 60 *d*., 54 *d*., and 48 *d*. Two years onwards, at a later stage in their copying activities, the College's scribes again purchased "velym", this time for 54 *d*. and 69 *d*.[89] Other sporadic references demonstrate that similar stratification persisted throughout the later Middle Ages. But which attributes defined each grade, and how did the differences arise? Before speculating any further, we need to consider not only the techniques used to transform skin into an effective writing support, but also the physical nature of skin itself.

---

86 Gullick, "From Parchmenter to Scribe", 147–48, 153; Stanley F. Hockey, ed., *Account-Book of Beaulieu Abbey* (London: Royal Historical Society, 1975), 195–98; see also: Paul Benoit, « L'Atelier de parcheminier de l'Abbaye Cistercienne de Beaulieu (Hampshire) », in *Matériaux du livre médiéval*, ed. M. Zerdoun Bat-Yehouda and C. Bourlet (Turnhout: Brepols, 2010), 43–54; Joanne Filippone Overty, "The Cost of Doing Scribal Business: Prices of Manuscript Books in England, 1300–1483", *Book History* 11 (2008), 1–32. That is, calf: 2 *s*. 6 *d*., 2 *s*., 1 *s*. 8 *d*., and 1 *s*. 4 *d*.; sheep: 1 *s*., 9 *d*., 6 *d*., and 3 *d*. (Gullick, "From Parchmenter to Scribe", 153). Sheet size may play a role in some cost discrepancies; see the discussion of Cambridge, Peterhouse, MSS 88, 110, 114, 142, and 192 at p. 88.

87 Gullick, "From Parchmenter to Scribe", 154–55.

88 [Beriah Botfield], ed., *Librarum Ecclesiæ Cathedralis Dunelm* (London: J.B. Nichols & Son, 1838), xxvi–xxvii.

89 Gullick, "From Parchmenter to Scribe", 154–55.

1.3. The Beasts in the Book

The leaves of medieval manuscripts offer more to the observer than textual and decorative content. Even a casual glance shows that they also host a striking range of irregularities: blotches and splotches, cuts, holes, pockmarks, stains, scratches, and so on. Although reminiscent of damage arising from regular wear and tear or outright maltreatment, many such features antedate a given codex's creation. Instead of tattling on irresponsible owners, they present testimony from the beasts in the book, bearing silent witness to their lives and the processes through which they were transmuted into parchment. Adopting a forensic approach towards such marks—"read[ing folia] like maps full of … symbols and contour-lines"[90]—can help shed light on the individual animals making up a particular manuscript—their species, health, quality of life, and manner of death—along with the methods and skillfulness of those who worked with their remains. And, as we shall see, such details provide significant aid in reconstructing a book's initial context of use.[91]

The skin from which parchment is created is a component of the integumentary system. Across mammalian species, skin structure comprises several main layers.[92] Parchment production

---

90 Vnouček, "Manufacture of Parchment", 76.

91 For discussion of this process, which Erik Kwakkel dubs "reading the material book", see his "Decoding the Material Book: Cultural Residue in Medieval Manuscripts", in *The Medieval Manuscript Book*, ed. M. Johnson and M. van Dussen (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), 60–76.

92 Augustus Schummer, et al., *The Anatomy of the Domestic Animals, 3*, tr. W.G. Siller and P.A.L. Wight (Berlin: Springer-Verlag, 1981), 182, 503–05, 537, *et pass.*; see also Peter J. Jarman, "On Being Thick-Skinned: Dermal Shields in Large Mammalian Herbivores", *Bio. J. Linn. Soc*. 36, no. 1–2 (1989): 169–91; Gedeon A. Matoltsy, "Structure and Function of the Mammalian Epidermis", in *Biology of the Integument 2*, ed. J. Bereiter-Hahn, et al. (Berlin: Springer-Verlag, 1986), 255–71.

processes remove both the outermost stratum—the thick, highly keratinized *epidermis*[93]—and the innermost stratum—the *hypodermis*, a fibrous matrix loosely joining the skin to underlying fascia[94]—leaving only the *dermis* or *corium*. Consisting of over 95% collagen, a structural protein comprised of amino acids wound into triple-helices, the corium amounts to a complex weave of elongated fibrils, the alignment and orientation of which vary depending upon a range of factors, including the anatomical region they occupy.[95] As we shall see, variance in collagen structure is integral to the study of offcuts because it determines the mechanical properties of living tissue, as well as the visual and physical features (e.g., transparency, texture, flexibility, tensile strength, and tear resistance) of products made from it.[96] Generally speaking, the collagen in skin adopts a somewhat random, roughly "two-dimensional felt-like network",[97] the structural stability of which weakens during the liming stage of parchment production (see p. 25).[98] Thereafter, application of

---

93 Schummer, *Anatomy of the Domestic Animals*, 448; Matoltsy, "Structure and Function", 255; Kennedy and Wess, "Structure of Collagen", 61.

94 Schummer, et al., *Anatomy of the Domestic Animals*, 445.

95 Kennedy and Wess, "Structure of Collagen", 62–63, 67.

96 Kennedy and Wess, "Structure of Collagen", 67–70; Hanna A. Szczepanowska, *Conservation of Cultural Heritage* (New York: Routledge, 2013), 172.

97 Kennedy and Wess, "Structure of Collagen", 62.

98 For in-depth discussion of these changes, see: Clark A. Maxwell, et al., "X-Ray Diffraction Study into the Effects of Liming on the Structure of Collagen", *Biomacromolecules* 7, no. 8 (2006): 2321–326; Christopher S. Woods, "From Skin to Parchment: A Short Description of the Nature of Skin, the Chemical and Physical Changes Brought about When Turning Skin into Parchment, and Their Implications for Conservation", *PapierRestaurierung* 3, no. 4 (2002): 13–18.

progressive tension on the herse stretches the skin, forcing the fibres into a parallel configuration; drying fixes the new alignment into place.[99]

At least, this is the theory. Practice, however, proves another matter entirely. First, the skin's uneven silhouette elicits inconsistent traction on the stretching frame. Thus, directional tension draws out the attachment points into jagged, unscrapeable prolongations separated by scooped hollows.[100] Compounding this, some collagen fibres—notably those in the spinal, axillary, and inguinal regions—show more pronounced preferential orientation due to the prevalent stresses they endured in life.[101] This trait blunts their response to the liming and stretching such that they obstinately resist realignment, and take on a more overtly rawhide-like quality.[102] By contrast, areas of heightened flexibility, such as those that overlay a creature's flanks, realign with relative ease, resulting in over-stretching. As a result, distortions and inconsistencies emerge in the finished parchment, especially around the sheet's edges and at gaps left by the animal's extremities—points returned to below.

Especially critical to this study is the final step in the manufacturing process: once the parchment attains the desired degree of thinness and smoothness, the maker slices it to pieces. An initial cut, or series of cuts, removes the treated skin from the herse, amputating much of the irregular perimeter and its spiky extensions. We will call this step the *first cut*. While the contorted parchment

---

99 Kennedy and Wess, "Structure of Collagen", 69–71; Christopher Clarkson, "Rediscovering Parchment: The Nature of the Beast", *Paper Conserv.* 16, no. 1 (1992), 5; Hagadorn, "Parchment Making", 178.

100 Kwakkel, "Discarded Parchment", 240.

101 Kennedy and Wess, "Structure of Collagen", 62–65; see also Clarkson, "Rediscovering Parchment", 8.

102 Jennifer Borland, "Unruly Reading: The Consuming Role of Touch in the Experience of a Medieval Manuscript", in *Scraped, Stroked, and Bound*, ed. J. Wilcox (Turnhout: Brepols, 2013), 103.

morsels and ribbons left hanging from the herse—confusingly termed *scrows* or *scroues*[103] (p. 13 *ff*.) —often went into the manufacture of adhesives and sizing,[104] the newly-liberated *plano* sheets proved ideal for large projects not requiring strict orthogonality, such as maps and diagrams like the Hereford Mappa Mundi of c. 1300, the 1457 Carta Genovese (Firenze, Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale, Portolano 1), and Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Pal.lat.1993, a volume of the works of early fourteenth-century Italian cartographer Opicinus de Canistris dating to c. 1335–1350. Scribes also purchased plano parchment, some wielding it as-is without further ado. One such scribe, the late twelfth-century English Augustinian canon Ormin or Orrm (Jack "Orm") chose just such a support. Notable for its unconventional dimensions and format, the eponymous *Orrmulum* (Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Junius 1), his c. 1175–1200 heavily-corrected, autograph draft of biblical exegesis, consists of prepared but untrimmed plano sheets—that is, sheets which have only

---

103 *MED*, "scroue, *n*., def. d"; *OED*, "scrow, *n*., def. 4"; Hagadorn, "Parchment-Making" 182 n.161; Marion Kite, "Collagen Products: Glues, Gelatine, Gut Membrane, and Sausage Casings", in *Conservation of Leather and Related Materials*, ed. M. Kite and R. Thomson (Amsterdam: Elsevier, 2006), 192–93; Kwakkel, "Discarded Parchment", 241.

104 *Sizing*: a treatment that modulates the absorbency of paper to prevent running and feathering of ink. Timothy Barrett has done extensive work on animal-based sizing in historic papers; see his *Paper through Time* (University of Iowa Center for the Book, 22 December 2011, paper.lib.uiowa.edu/)—especially the section "European Papermaking Techniques 1300–1800"—as well as Timothy Barrett and Cynthea Mosier, "The Role of Gelatin in Paper Permanence", *J. Am. Inst. Conserv.* 34, no. 3 (1995), 173–86; and John Baty and Timothy Barrett, "Gelatin Size as a pH and Moisture Content Buffer in Paper", *J. Am. Inst. Conserv*. 46, no. 2 (2007), 105–21.

undergone the first cut—stacked and folded down the middle to yield a rough-and-ready codex of approximately 195 × 500 mm.[105]

Orrm's choice was remarkably unorthodox. Given plano sheets' crooked outlines—plus other factors we will examine in a moment—most book producers chose to await the *second cut*. Here, either parchmenter or scribe squared up the sheet, pruning away strips of lower-grade material from around the perimeter[106] to produce a *prime cut*[107] sheet: a large parchment rectangle ready for shearing into oblong leaves (*figs. 1.01a–b*).[108] Craftsmen trimming parchment in precisely this fashion appear in a marginal sketch adjacent to the Beaulieu Abbey parchment accounts (London, British Library, Additional MS 48978, f. 43r),[109] as well as in illuminations in Bamberg,

---

105 Kwakkel, "Discarded Parchment", 254; Mark Faulkner, "Oxford, Bodleian Library, Junius 1: The *Orrmulum*", in *The Production and Use of English Manuscripts 1060 to 1220*, ed. O. Da Rold, et al. (University of Leicester, 2013), www.le.ac.uk/english/em1060to1220/mss/EM.Ox.Juni.1.htm.

106 At this stage, as with the first cut, the contour of the skin's edge can encourage multiple cuts, creating a series of smaller pieces (versus a single strip running the entire length or width of the hide).

107 That the second set of cuts yields a *prime* ['first'] *cut* may strike the reader as counterintuitive; the term, however, does not signal temporal precedence. Rather, the analogy is to a prime cut of steak, i.e., the best cut: the originator of the term, Erik Kwakkel, indicates that it sprang to mind while he was barbecuing (personal communication, October 2016).

108 Kwakkel, "Discarded Parchment", 240–41. Scribes copied onto these undivided prime cut sheets, as well; see: Graham Pollard, "Notes on the Size of the Sheet", *The Library*, 4th ser., 22, no. 2–3 (1941), 107–08; Daniel Wakelin and Christopher Burlinson, "Evidence for the Construction of Quires in a Fifteenth-Century English Manuscript", *The Library*, 7th ser., 9, no. 4 (2008), 383–96; and especially Gumbert, "The Tacketed Quire: An Exercise in Comparative Codicology", *Scriptorium* 65, no. 2 (2011), 299–320, and citations therein.

109 James France, *Separate but Equal: Cistercian Lay Brothers, 1120–1350* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2012), 111.

Staatsbibliothek, MS Patr 5 (B.ii.5), f. 1r–v; and in Bologna, Biblioteca Universitaria, Cod. Bonon. 963, f. 4r.

Contrary to what we might assume, the scraps trimmed away by the second cut were not garbage. As first shown by Erik Kwakkel,[110] far from unprofitable rubbish, these undersized, substandard by-products saw use as writing supports in a diverse range of contexts. These scraps are what we will call *offcuts*, and the substandard but very usable perimeter area of the plano parchment sheet in which they occur, may be dubbed the *offcut zone*.[111] To explore the reception and use of offcuts, of course, we must first identify them, and doing so requires the ability to recognize attributes of offcut zone parchment. Determining which of the attributes associated with the offcut zone are most strongly and reliably diagnostic entails construction and analysis of a sizeable dataset. Analytically-minded readers will find methodological details, plus a statistical overview of the corpus, in chapter two, with case studies and discussion of the most significant findings in subsequent chapters. The next section, however, aims to offer a general impression of offcut zone parchment based on visual and tactile cues. To this end, we now turn to the topic of the particular material traits associated with offcut parchment in the existing literature. Broadly speaking, these

---

110 Kwakkel, "Commercial Organization"; idem, "Discarded Parchment".

111 As explained above, by definition, the genesis of an offcut lies in the parchmenter's second cuts. And yet, although we can make informed guesses, usually we cannot know with complete certainty that a given piece of parchment arose in this fashion—after all, we cannot travel back in time to watch a scribe or parchmenter cut the plano. Instead, we make inferences based on the parchment's attributes, with a particular focus on traits that cluster in the regions of the treated hide from which offcuts arise. (In other words, in this study certain parchment traits—namely, those I dub *edge-effects* (see § 1.4, *infra*, along with the methodological discussion at § 2.2)—function as *proxy variables*: measurable entities used to study phenomena impossible to observe directly). I refer to this region of the treated hide with the terms *offcut zone* and *offcut zone parchment*.

features allow one to identify parchment that comes from the offcut zone—though, as we shall see, not all offcut characteristics are created equal.[112]

1.4. Creature Features

When we seek offcut parchment *in situ*, our most foundational consideration is size. As we have seen, offcuts arise from the second set of cuts made to the full sheet of parchment. The producer's need to exploit as much of the plano as possible by eking out larger (and more profitable) prime cut sheets means reduced waste at the skin's edge. Such tight selvage tends to confine offcuts' largest dimensions to an upper limit of perhaps 150 mm.[113] While rare examples may slightly exceed this measurements, most identifiable offcuts prove somewhat smaller.[114] Be that as it may, even minuscule snippets of parchment are not necessarily offcuts: pristine, high-end parchment can always be trimmed down. Since small format is a necessary but insufficient criterion, other indicants are needed to determine offcut status.

By far the most reliable of these is the edge-gap: a deviation from orthogonality as a result of diagonal and/or curved cavities or dents along one or more sides of the sheet, sometimes consuming a large percentage of its area (*figs. 1.02–1.03*). As we will see, edge-gaps provide very strong evidence of offcut status, but may be troublesome to spot: some scribes eliminated the trait by trimming gapped sheets to square. While strict trimming successfully concealed offcut origins, minor

---

112 In addition to Erik Kwakkel's groundwork ("Discarded Parchment") and my own research, descriptions in the ensuing discussion are indebted to my personal conversations with Dr Jiří Vnouček and Mr Jesse Meyer during the Biocodicology workshop held at Washington D.C.'s Folger Institute, 29–31 May 2019, under the auspices of the ERC-funded *Beasts2Craft* project. I remain grateful to Dr Matthew Collins for inviting me to this workshop, and for providing funding to support my attendance.

113 Kwakkel, "Discarded Parchment", 247.

114 See discussion in §§ 1.5–1.6, along with chapter two's in-depth analysis.

gaps sometimes survived the intervention.[115] Regardless of size, gaps prove centrally important in identification of offcuts, both as stand-alone traits and as jumping-off points for more in-depth investigation since gap-adjacent regions show an elevated incidence of surface and structural irregularities. Systematic examination of areas bordering on edge-gaps (and comparison with non-offcut parchment) thus unmasks additional traits—which I dub *edge-effects*—from which we can extrapolate.[116] For instance, occasionally evincing an unusually fragile, papery state reminiscent of onionskin, parchment adjacent to edge-gaps most typically takes the form of a smooth, hard, translucent band, somewhat akin to rawhide,[117] which arises from keratinization or gelatinization of collagen.[118] Both extremes are strongly diagnostic of offcut parchment, as are the poor ink adherence; visible tool marks, such as knife strokes, stippling, and other signs of shaving;[119] striae (stretch marks); and wheals or 'sheep-windows'[120] commonly encountered in these areas. Flay-cuts

---

115 Kwakkel, "Discarded Parchment", 248–52.

116 An overview follows here, with reference to images illustrating multiple features at once. Close-up images of many of these characteristics can be found in volume two (*figs. 1.02–1.14*). Note that figures have not been provided for all offcut features, as some are not amenable to photography. We will revisit the full set in chapter two.

117 Borland, "Unruly Reading", 103.

118 Vnouček, "Manufacture of Parchment", 86.

119 Vnouček, "Illustrations for Instruction", 214.

120 *Wheals*, or 'sheep-windows', are rounded, unusually rough, occasionally discoloured irregularities with discrete boundaries. Commonly occurring in parchment made from sheep hide, they may partially or completely drop out of the finished parchment, mutating into holes. The term 'sheep-windows' arose in the Bodleian Libraries' Conservation Centre (Bodleian Digital Library Systems and Services, "Sheepskin defects that don't quite produce holes are called 'sheep windows' by @BodCons …", *Twitter*, 21 March 2019. twitter.com/BDLSS/status/1108729921717919744?s=20). 'Wheals', by contrast, is my own coinage.

—irregular scars stepped into the thickness of the hide and created during slaughter and flaying[121]—also huddle along the hide's perimeter, persisting even after aggressive grinding of the parchment surface. Other cuts, holes, and tears, of varying sizes and placement, can emerge from an inauspicious slip of the knife, or stretch out from bites, wounds, or scars on the living animal. Occasionally, offcuts show evidence of parchmenter—less often, scribal—attempts to repair more conspicuous examples through sewing (a step usually taken prior to stretching)[122] or patching, and some short or lopsided offcut bifolia have been extended via scarfing.[123] Concomitantly, a few of these traits should evoke caution during assessment, especially when working with English manuscripts. Sheepskin, the raw material for the majority of parchment produced in the British Isles, is highly defect-prone.[124] Since it shows more pronounced grain patterning and discolouration,[125] and

---

121 Vnouček, "Illustrations for Instruction", 209; idem, "Manufacture of Parchment", 83.

122 Vnouček, "Manufacture of Parchment", 77, 82*ff*.

123 Amending a leaf by stitching or glueing parchment to it, usually end to end with edges bevelled to fit smoothly. The twelfth-century Eadwine Psalter (Cambridge, Trinity College Library, MS R.17.1) boasts multiple examples of the practice (Nicholas Pickwoad, "Codicology and Palaeography", in *The Eadwine Psalter*, ed. M.T. Gibson, et al. (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1992), 4). Thanks are due to Mr Peter Kidd for bringing this term, which originates in woodworking, and the previous reference to my attention during the 2017 London International Palaeography Summer School.

124 Matthew J. Collins, "Biomolecular Codicology: Books, Beasts, and Bees", lecture given at *ManuSciences'19: Manuscripts from Fragments to Books, from Identification to Interpretation*, Fréjus, France, 14 March 2019.

125 *Grain patterning* is a texture or pattern of small, irregular marks or bumps occurring in the surface of parchment (or leather). Natural *discolouration* in parchment is typically brownish or yellowish.

delaminates[126] and tears more readily than that of other domestic ruminants, extensive peeling, separation, holes, and other such characteristics in sheepskin parchment are not necessarily indicative of an offcut.

Finally, as we noted earlier, discrepancies at the cellular level diminish or augment the effects of liming across a hide, even as the hide's uneven contour places sections of its perimeter beyond easy reach of the parchmenter's tools. As a result, stubborn hairs and prominent follicle patterns congregate in these peripheral regions of the prepared hide: the offcut zone. Other features associated with liming-related issues and inadequate scraping and levelling include a rough and porous surface, or a slickly vitreous one with a greasy feel reminiscent of heavy sizing; uneven weight or thickness; variable hyalinity, i.e., patches of either heightened translucency or opacity; atypical rigidity, whether as exceptional stiffness or floppiness; and strong discolouration. (Most of these attributes are not photographically reproduced in this dissertation as they can be discerned only through handling the parchment). Many of these features are not strongly diagnostic of offcuts, especially when occurring in isolation (though, as we shall see in chapter two's detailed analysis, the co-occurrence of more

---

126 To medieval English Exchequer scribes this 'bug' was a feature. *Dialogus de scaccario*, a late twelfth century treatise outlining Exchequer practices, comments on the phenomenon, but also advocates sheepskin parchment for legal or financial documents as its propensity to delaminate during erasure attempts makes it a tamper-resistant substrate: "Quod si forte per negligentiam, uel alium quemlibet casum, contigerit eum errare in scriptura rotuli ... non presumat abradere, set linea subtili subducta cancellet et scribat in serie quod oportet. Habet enim rotuli scriptura hoc commune cum cartis et aliis scriptis patentibus, quod abradi non debet et ob hoc cautum est ut de pellibus ouinis fiant, quia non facile nisi manifesto uitio rasure cedunt" (Richard FitzNigel, *Dialogus de Scaccario*, rev. edn., ed. and tr. E. Amt and S.D. Church (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 31; see also: Fiddyment, "Animal Origin", 15069).

than one of these less strongly diagnostic traits makes it more likely that the parchment in question originates in the offcut zone).

1.5. When 'Offcuts' Aren't

Another caveat is in order. Presence of offcut features is not always diagnostic of an offcut. Some leaves share multiple offcut traits (e.g., peripheral gaps or lacunae, visible stippling, keratinous ridges, discolouration), but cannot be categorized as offcuts because they do not originate as remnants left behind by the parchmenter's second cut. Until researchers can time-travel to watch a scribe select and slice up the writing support for a given manuscript, we must rely upon clues to distinguish the real offcuts from the fakes. One of the most crucial tip-offs is size.

According to the calculations of J.P. Gumbert, full skins in medieval Germany and France typically measured 440–800 mm in length (only rarely exceeding 1000 mm), with a proportional width of, at the utmost, 680 mm—dimensions we might safely extrapolate to their English counterparts.[127] Imagine a scribe receiving a commission to create a large, deluxe book; he duly plans a volume measuring, say, 350 × 240 mm. Since the fundamental structural unit of a manuscript is not the leaf, but the bifolium—i.e., a sheet of parchment folded in half to yield two leaves (four pages)—our scribe knows that he needs sheets measuring 700 × 480 mm. The figures listed above show that the largest skins readily accommodate these dimensions.

---

[127] Peter Gumbert, "Skins, Sheets, and Quires", in *New Directions in Later Medieval Manuscript Studies*, ed. D. Pearsall (Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 2000), 82. While "most Italian skins are smaller, with maxima at 52 and 42 cm", English skins probably followed Gallo–Germanic norms (ibid., 82). The largest extant medieval books reach c. 500–600 × 350–425 mm, suggesting a *plano* of approximately 1000–1200 × 700–850 mm (Thomson, "Parchment and Paper, Ruling and Ink", in *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain, Vol. 2*, ed. N.J. Morgan and R.M. Thomson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 75). Such gargantuan volumes constitute outliers.

Here, however, Mother Nature raises an irrefutable objection. Ruminants are not square. The hide's irregular perimeter means that the maximum figures listed above apply only to its longest and widest points—so a truly orthogonal 700×480 mm sheet must be cut from an even larger plano. Further, slicing perfect rectangles out of the centre of each skin and discarding the rest—or selling it at a reduced price-point[128]—slices into the parchmenter's bottom line, as well. Accommodating very large codices whilst still using materials efficiently thus sometimes entails extending the second cut towards the skin's edge, into the flawed regions normally trimmed away—that is, slightly into the offcut zone. Although very large, the resultant sheet's edges can thus show gaps, staining, marks from the artisan's tools, and so on—just like an offcut. Leaves created in this fashion crop up in some medium- and larger-format books, including Oxford, Jesus College Library, MS 22 (c.210 mm), a fifteenth-century Welsh medical manuscript with clear examples at ff. 11, 12, 26, 27, 66, and 68; and Merton College Library, MS 248 (c.320 mm), a sermon-based miscellany compiled by Bishop of Rochester John Sheppey OSB (d. 1360), with examples at ff. 23, 24, 180, and 181. Even producers of the most *de luxe* volumes resorted to close-to-the-edge cuts: London, British Library, Harley MS 1758, a generously proportioned (340×235 mm), highly ornate copy of Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales*, includes them at ff. 41, 68, 151, 200, and 205.[129] Masquerading as offcuts, these not-so-prime prime cuts point to the complex relations amongst size, quality, and economy underpinning manuscript production, especially during the book-trade's rapid, late-medieval expansion. For the moment, it suffices to note the importance of observing the size restrictions—as well as, in combination with size, the multiple visual and tactile features—inherent to offcuts. Making

---

128 See the discussion of parchment grades at pp. 26–27, *supra*.

129 Other examples can be found in Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Digby 93 (ff. 7, 8, 67, 75, 81, 88, 89), and MS Digby 84 (ff. 4, 5, 29, 31, 43); as well as New York, Pierpont Morgan Library, MS M.761 (ff. 2, 17, 22, 34, 38, 48, 72, 143).

inferences from available evidence permits us to establish at least the strong probability that a piece of parchment is an offcut (rather than something superficially similar).

Damage, especially to initial leaves, also potentially mimics offcut zone attributes, as seen at the opening leaf (f. 1ᵇ) of the aforementioned Harley MS 1758, a codex which elsewhere does incorporate edge cuts. Related examples appear in London, British Library, Harley MS 1245, a sizeable (380 × 270 mm) volume of Lydgate, and in London, British Library, Stowe MS 68, a 270 × 180 mm *Brut Chronicle*. Smaller formats may thus coax the unwary manuscript scholar to interpret as evidence of offcuts disfigurement due instead to heavy handling,[130] mould, or exposure to water or fire. For instance, Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Wood empt. 25's measurements (a mere 95 × 64 mm), in tandem with its other offcut zone parchment hallmarks, encourages us to construe its mangled corners as diagnostic features. The codex does, indeed, incorporate some offcuts, but closer inspection shows us that those leaves in the worst condition were marred after the codex's completion, likely through exposure to extreme heat or open flame (see *figs. 1.16a–b*). Warping of the scribe's work, along with near-identical blemishes across a series of adjacent leaves, gives away the post-completion timing of the injury. In like fashion, while Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Douce 25 contains multiple offcuts, the gaps at ff. 41–43 arose from vandalism: the scribe or owner aggressively trimmed the lower corners, perhaps to remove accidental damage, mould, or singularly execrable cartilaginous patches (*figs. 1.17a–c*). Unusually square edges, overlapping cut marks, and restoration of cut words in nearby margins, reveal the deliberate nature of the gaps. Even when multiple diagnostic features (including small size) are present, therefore, close attention *in situ*

---

130 See: Kathryn M. Rudy, "Dirty Books: Quantifying Patterns of Use in Medieval Manuscripts Using a Densitometer", *J. Historians Netherlandish Art* 2, no. 1–2 (2010), n.p.

must help distinguish offcut traits from mere soiling, environmental damage, or the ravages of hungry mice and careless owners or scribes.

1.6. How to Do Things with Offcuts

Due to their origins at the edges of irregularly-shaped hides, offcuts come in a surprisingly diverse range of formats. Consistently, however, they are characterized by relatively constrained dimensions and peculiar shapes—attributes which limit the contexts in which they might be used. By way of illustration, a random sample of modern offcuts ($n = 25$) obtained from the Fairbank Calligraphy Society, Victoria, Canada, by Erik Kwakkel, showed mean widths of 5–115 mm at the narrowest point through 38–150 mm at the broadest point, and lengths of 10–445 mm at the shortest point through 111–460 mm at the tallest point. Trimmed strictly (i.e., with no tolerance for gaps), they elicited rectangles from 25 mm to 120 mm long and from 80 mm to 275 mm wide. Permitting gaps of up to 20 mm increased the range to 25–140 mm long by 80–275 mm wide (*table 1.01*).[131]

These data warrant some caution. Although average size varied from region to region, domestic livestock in medieval Britain were smaller than their twenty-first century counterparts. Osteological evidence reveals several shifts in the morphology of European cattle[132] with the high to late Middle Ages marking a low point. For instance, British cows in this period dwindled to under

---

131 Raw width, narrowest point: μ 40.6 mm (σ ±33.9; *R*: 5–115 mm), broadest point: μ 86.9 mm (σ ±32.2; *R*: 38–150 mm); length, shortest: μ 156.1 mm (σ ±96.4; *R*: 10–445 mm), longest: μ 204.5 mm (σ ±73.8; *R*: 111–460 mm). Strict trim (no gap tolerance), length: μ 59.3 mm (σ ±26.9; *R*: 25–120 mm), width: μ 139.4 mm (σ ±45.9; *R*: 80–275 mm). Loose trim, length: μ 70.1 mm (σ ±34.4; *R*: 25–140 mm), width: μ 148.4 mm (σ ±43.0; *R*: 80–275 mm).

132 Richard Thomas, Matilda Holmes, and James Morris, "'So Bigge as Bigge May Be': Tracking Size and Shape Change in Domestic Livestock in London (AD 1220–1900)", *J. Archaeol. Sci.* 40, no. 8 (2013), 3309–325.

110 cm at the withers with a weight of probably around 275–300 kg,[133] making them roughly three-quarters the size of average modern commercial cows, or roughly in line with more petite members of the Australian Lowline or Dexter breeds.[134] Smaller cattle yield smaller hides, and this must be borne in mind when considering evidence from present-day parchment,[135] along with the fact that parchment is made not from adult cows, but from *calves*. Tension on the parchmenter's stretching frame does increase the size of the skin—Jesse Meyer estimates that, using modern techniques, overall area may increase by approximately 10%.[136]

Nonetheless, irrespective of the exact measurements involved, medieval people embraced the material's challenges, finding uses for remarkably tiny snippets. As we slowly approach our primary topic—manuscript codices from later medieval England copied (in whole or in part) upon offcut zone parchment—let us first look at some other examples of these applications of offcuts.

---

133 Simon J.M. Davis, *The Archaeology of Animals* (New York: Routledge, 2002), 178; A.J.S. Gibson, "The Size and Weight of Cattle and Sheep in Early Modern Scotland", *Agric. Hist. Rev.* 36, no. 2 (1988), 166.

134 Stephen J.G. Hall and Lawrence Alderson, "Cattle", in *Mason's World Encyclopedia of Livestock Breeds and Breeding*, 6th edn., ed. V. Porter, et al. (Boston: CAB International, 2016), 1:169, 233. The average size of British cattle began to rebound in the sixteenth century, or possibly as early as the late fifteenth in some regions (Umberto Albarella, "Size, Power, Wool, and Veal: Zooarchaeological Evidence for Late Medieval Innovations", in *Environment and Subsistence in Medieval Europe*, ed. F. Verhaeghe and G. De Boe (Zellik: Institut voor het Archeologisch Patrimonium, 1997), 19–21; Thomas, Holmes, and Morris, "'So Bigge as Bigge May Be'").

135 Based on proportions typical of modern cattle (see G.L.H. Alderson, "The Development of a System of Linear Measurements to Provide an Assessment of Type and Function of Beef Cattle", *Animal Genetic Resources Info.* 25, no. 3 (1999), 45–55), a height of 1100 mm at the withers suggests a probable trunk length of up to c.1200–1250 mm, with a chest up to c.600 mm deep and c.400 mm wide. These dimensions corroborate Rodney M. Thomson's estimates of the maximum size of medieval plano sheets (note 127, *supra*).

136 Personal communication, 31 May 2019.

1.6.1. Labels, Letters, and Legal Documents

Some of the smallest extant offcuts survive in the form of labels and tags such as *authentica* (literally 'authentics'), brief descriptions of relics penned on tiny scraps of parchment and kept with the objects to attest to their identity and provenance.[137] True to their name, they functioned like an early form of product certification,[138] attesting to an artefact's legitimacy and curtailing misidentification lest the faithful take the skull of Naomh Bríd for that of a village milkmaid.[139] Veracity also carried institutional ramifications with the status, authority, and even the very identity of many religious establishments predicated upon the relics they held.[140] Authentica survive in abundance from the seventh through fifteenth centuries, undergoing "only modest qualitative changes" during the period, despite occasional "replace[ment] when they tore, became detached, or were no longer legible".[141] While their minuscule scale and oft ratty character complicate assessment, it is clear that at least some surviving relic labels are written on offcuts. Examples include the Carolingian-era authenticum now known as Sens, Musées de Sens, Trésor de la Cathédrale Saint-Etienne, J 36 (obverse,

---

137 Nicole Hermann-Mascard, *Les reliques des saints* (Paris: Klincksieck, 1975), 120–22; Michael McCormick, *Origins of the European Economy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 283–318 at 285–87.

138 Frans van Waarden, "Varieties of Private Market Regulation: Problems and Prospects", in *Handbook on the Politics of Regulation*, ed. D. Levi-Faur (Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, 2011), 475 (§ 34.5.1); see also Cynthia Hahn, "What Do Reliquaries Do for Relics?" *Numen* 57, no. 3/4 (2010), 284–316.

139 Now, publicly venerated relics must be verified by the Vatican's Congregatio de Causis Sanctorum (founded 1588) which issues authentica when warranted (Vatican, « Instructio », *s.v.* Appendix).

140 Julia M.H. Smith, "Portable Christianity: Relics in the Medieval West (*c*.700–1200)", *Proc. Brit. Acad.* 181 (2012), 151–54, especially 153–54; see also Patrick J. Geary, *Furta Sacra* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991).

141 Smith, "Portable Christianity", 162, 147–48 at 147.

reverse).[142] Measuring a mere 54 × 20–23 mm, the stub bears faint but suggestive striations, plus a corner-gap surrounded by a tell-tale arc of corneous staining: clear symptoms of an offcut. Perversely, in this instance the authenticum confesses to an inability to authenticate: "hic sunt reliquas / nescimus quales" ('here are relics of an unknown kind'). Conceivably this labelling technique spread beyond spiritual contexts to secular ones. When specifying that "parchment tag" summaries be affixed to the outside of records for ease of identification, the drafters of the Treaty of Medina del Campo (1489)—which, among other things, laid out strict guidelines for the archives at the Royal Audience and Chancery of Valladolid[143]—perhaps wrote with offcuts and other minuscule parchment oddments in mind.

Offcuts also saw substantive use in more dynamic communicative contexts with slightly larger examples put to use as letters—indeed, it appears that letters were a primary offcut genre. Jean Leclercq observes that offcuts' constrained sizes played a role in determining the length of the missives they bore, and this "curtail[ment of] any effusions" was in keeping with the brevity regarded as central to the *modus epistolaris*,[144] distinguishing the genre from those found in books.[145]

---

142 Images available at: Genevra Kornbluth, "Historical Archive: Manuscripts", *Kornbluth Photography*, 21 March 2015, www.kornbluthphoto.com/Manuscripts.html; more information at: Eugène Chartraire et Maurice Prou, « Authentiques de Reliques Conservées au Trésor de la Cathédrale de Sens », *Mémoires de la Société Nationale des Antiquaires de France*, sér. 6, 59 (1900): 129–72, no. 156. For another example, see the eleventh-century Sens, Musées de Sens, Trésor de la Cathédrale Saint-Etienne, J 50 (obverse, reverse) (Kornbluth, "Historical"; Chartraire et Prou, « Authentiques », n°. 33).

143 Antonio Castillo Gómez, "The New Culture of Archives in Early Modern Spain", *European Hist. Quarterly* 46, no. 3 (2016), 550.

144 "[B]revity … was sometimes treated almost as the synonym of the *modus epistolaris* and … was a stylistic ideal" (Giles Constable, *Letters and Letter-Collections* (Turnhout: Brepols, 1976), 19).

145 Jean Leclercq, *The Love of Learning and the Desire for God*, tr. C. Misrahi (New York: Fordham University Press, 1982), 177.

Aside from generic convention, pragmatic concerns also underpinned the concision: parchment "being scarce and costly, it was used with the greatest economy".[146] Although letter-writing necessarily entailed some degree of expense, writers mitigated costs by using the physical document as an opening move in a more extensive oral transaction between a missive's recipient and the messenger conveying it. Erik Kwakkel identifies several excellent supporting examples in both material and textual forms,[147] such as Anselm of Canterbury's gesture towards use of a physical letter as a conversational prompt when he remarks to his uncles, Lambert and Folcerad, "Sed ea per huius schedulæ latorem plenius poteritis discere et notificare, quam brevitas epistolaris sufficiat intimare" ('But you will be able to learn more about this through the bearer of this document [schedulæ] than the brevity of this letter permits me to say').[148] That letter-writers relied on offcuts as a cost-saving strategy is suggested by extant examples, such as the letter sent to Hermann of Katzenellenbogen, Bishop of Münster (1174–1203) in 1188, consisting of a short text squeezed onto a snippet with "a distinct follicle pattern and … dark patches—signature features of the off-cut".[149] A similar case is Paris, Bibliothèque historique de la ville de Paris, MS n° 125 Réserve,[150] an irregularly-shaped,

---

146 Leclercq, *Love of Learning*, 177.

147 Kwakkel, "Discarded Parchment", 242–43.

148 Anselm, *Sancti Anselmi Cantuariensis Archiepiscopi Opera Omnia*, ed. F.S. Schmitt (Edinburgh: Nelson and Sons, 1946), 6:168 (ep. 54, lines 9–11); cited: Kwakkel, "Discarded Parchment", 242.

149 Kwakkel, "Discarded Parchment", 242. Ludwig Schmidt (« Zwei Original-Briefe von c. 1188 », *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung* 24, no. JG (1903), 353) provides an illustration of the document.

150 Discussed and reproduced in Sylvie LeFèvre, « La lettre et ses adresses », in *Medieval Letters—Between Fiction and Document*, ed. E. Bartoli and C. Høgel (Turnhout: Brepols, 2015), at 348–351; see also: Mario Roques, « Le billet de Jean de Gisors à Aélis de Liste », in *Mélanges dédiés à la mémoire de Félix Grat*, éd. É.A. Van Moé, 2:277–91 (Paris: En dépôt chez Mme Pecqueur-Grat, 1946–1949).

follicle-pocked parchment scrap (c. 100–110 × 26–36 mm) discoloured at one end and bearing Johan de Gisors' love letter to Aelés de Listes, « com a la fenme el monde / que il plus ainme » ('the woman in the world he loves the most') (lines 1–2). Pried out of its hiding spot within a pillar in l'eglise Saint-Pierre de Montmartre during June 1905 works, it was copied for its author by a scribe —« et cil qui les escrist ne vos conut unques ne mei deu vos en jur » ('and its copyist never knew you, any more than he knows me, I swear to you by God!') exclaims its closing (translation mine)— in eight cramped lines of a late twelfth- or early thirteenth-century bookhand.[151] Such tight dimensions occasionally prompted meta-commentary from letter-writers, as when Charles d'Orléans declared in one missive "For lack of space, I am writing no more to you",[152] and likely played a role in shaping some epistolary subcategories. Letters of recommendation, in particular, could be as "brief [as] a postcard or a calling card".[153] One recommendation sent to Pope Eugene III by St Bernard consists of but a single line: "Mittimus ad te iuvenem pudicum, ut aiunt, litteratum pro aetate. Cetera sunt in spe" ('We send to you a young man quite decent, as they say, of learning consistent with his age. The rest is to come').[154]

Scribes penned a number of related genera, such as petitions, upon various types of scrap parchment, although the associated spatial constraints posed a challenge. An irregular outline, hole, and striations reveal that TNA, SC 8/331/15669, the c. 1300 petition of Margaret le Wyte, daughter of John le Wyte of Cashel, to King Edward I, is written on an offcut. Nearly running out of room, the scribe just manages to squeeze onto the tiny scrap le Wyte's request for redress against her enemies,

---

151 LeFèvre, « La lettre », 348–51.

152 Kwakkel, "Discarded Parchment", 243, citing: A.C. Spearing, *Textual Subjectivity* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 222.

153 Leclercq, *Love of Learning*, 180.

154 Quoted: Leclercq, *Love of Learning*, 180; translation mine, with assistance from Dr Iain Higgins.

including the Archbishop of Cashel, Stiamna Ó Brácáin (generally anglicized as Stephen O'Brogan, d. 25 July 1302), who had ordered the death of her father. Offcuts' smaller format, unusual dimensions, and likely lower price made them a sensible choice in this type of legal or administrative context. This especially holds for single-sheet documents like writs or charters, such as University of Victoria's Doc.Brown.2, a 1226 grant to the Monastery of Saint John of Calvary made by Petrus Veremudi of Andradi (*figs. 1.18–1.19*). The scribe of this document unapologetically deployed a severe, lengthy (410 × 140 mm) offcut for writing support, making not the slightest attempt to conceal its nature.[155]

Other insular examples prove equally instructive. Measuring c. 145 × 35 mm, with overt discolouration and keratinization, the 1067 Charter of Liberties or 'William Charter' (London, London Metropolitan Archives, MS COL/CH/01/001A), granted to London by William I between his coronation at Westminster and his entrance to the City,[156] bears clear signs of its offcut origin.[157] Sharing numerous features with charters produced during the reigns of Cnut, Harthacnut, and Edward,[158] the document suggests a continuity of royal administrative praxis, indicating that, in England, use of offcuts for official legal documents predated the Norman Conquest. It is worth noting that at least one early charter, South Saxon ealdorman Oslac's grant to the church of St Paul

---

155 For additional offcut charters, see Armando Petrucci, *Writers and Readers in Medieval Italy: Studies in the History of Written Culture* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995), 70.

156 Felix Liebermann, ed., *Die Gesetze der Angelsachsen* (Halle: Max Niemeyer, 1903), 1:486; David Anthony Edgell Pelteret, *Catalogue of English Post-Conquest Vernacular Documents* (Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 1990), 47–48; David Bates, *Regesta Regum Anglo-Normannorum* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), no. 180.

157 London, London Metropolitan Archives, MS COL/CH/01/001/B, a fourteenth-century Latin translation formerly attached to the original, may also be copied on an offcut.

158 See: Bates, *Regesta*, no. 78; Pelteret, *Catalogue*, no. 33.

the Apostle in c. 780,[159] was written on a contemporary upcycled psalter fragment,[160] demonstrating either supply issues or an economizing impulse. Surviving evidence of drafting techniques employed by early English administrative scribes reflect similar concerns. Some Anglo-Saxon charters, for instance, were written in stages, with the body of the text copied out before the formal granting ceremony, and the witnesses added either as part of the ceremony, or during subsequent recopying. In the latter case, witnesses could be listed, for the scribe's reference, on a parchment scrap affixed to the draft.[161] Two examples of reference schedulæ survive, sewn to a pair of Canterbury charters dating to the ninth century: Sawyer nos. S 163 and S 293.[162] Their disposable nature led Christina Deutsch to describe such schedulæ as a form of scribal « kurzlebige Zwischenspeicher » or 'short-lived cache storage'.[163] Given the cost of parchment, composition strategies harnessing these disposable slips undoubtedly depended upon lower-end writing supports, including offcuts.

---

159 Chichester, Diocesan Record Office, Cap/I/17/2; Sawyer no. S 1184; Dorothy Whitelock, ed. *English Historical Documents 1*, 2nd edn. (New York: Routledge, 1979), 464–65.

160 Pierre Chaplais, "Some Early Anglo−Saxon Diplomas on Single Sheets: Originals or Copies?", *J. Soc. Archivists* 3, no. 7 (1968), 333–35 at 334.

161 Susan Kelly, "Anglo-Saxon Lay Society and the Written Word", in *The Uses of Literacy in Early Mediaeval Europe*, ed. R. McKitterick (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 44.

162 Edward Augustus Bond, ed., *Facsimiles of Ancient Charters in the British Museum* (London: Chiswick, 1873), 2:9; and William Basevi Sanders, et al., eds., *Facsimiles of Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts* (London: Ordnance Survey Office, 1884), 3:17, respectively. Chaplais, "Some Early Anglo−Saxon Diplomas", 333; see also Mary Prescott Parsons, "Some Scribal Memoranda for Anglo-Saxon Charters of the 8th and 9th Centuries", *Mitteilungen des Österreichischen Instituts für Geschichtsforschung* 14 (1939), 15–19, 21–22.

163 Christina Deutsch, « Vom Zettel zum Gerichtsurteil: Aufzeichnungspraxis und Mediale Transformation Gerichtlicher Kommunikation im Spätmittelalter », *Frühmittelalterliche Studien* 40, no. 1 (2007), 294; cited in Kwakkel, "Discarded Parchment", 246, 259 n.48.

Recruiting offcut parchment as substrate for rough or preliminary versions of texts persisted into the late medieval period. Later English Chancery scribes certainly drafted documents, many of which survive, in this fashion. Pronounced follicle patterns, striations, discolouration, holes, and irregular shapes attest to the offcut origins of TNA, SC 8/337/15947 (a c. 1310 draft writ of Edward II to the bailiffs of England ordering the arrest of the Flemish merchant Walter de Scotes), and TNA, SC 8/194/9700 (a draft letters patent, dated 17 October 1421, appointing commissioners to inquire into the theft of a ship and merchandise from two other Flemish merchants).[164] Scribes working outside of the royal administration seem to have made similar use of lower-quality remnants. In 1370, Edward III's butler, William Strete, wrote to the Lord Chancellor of England requesting letters patents on behalf of two ship's masters out of Bristol, Thomas Clare and Roger Poule, attesting that they had paid the requisite prise of two tuns of wine.[165] Strete's missive survives in two versions with only very minor differences: TNA, SC 8/297/14828 (endorsed) and TNA, SC 8/297/14830 (unendorsed). The endorsed version is written on a relatively good, neatly squared-off strip of parchment; irregularly shaped with a scooped silhouette, a stiff and discoloured end, and faint grain patterning, its unendorsed sibling—likely either a draft or a copy kept for personal reference—may be written on an offcut.

1.6.2. Notes and Memoranda

Of course, purely functional texts and ephemeral writing were not confined to administrative and legal contexts. In addition to ever-growing numbers of lay professionals such as merchants and lawyers, students and their masters scribbled profusely in the margins of manuscripts, and made

---

164 See *CPR 1416–22*, 2:418 for enrolment of the latter commissions.

165 For the 16 October 1370 response to Strete's petition, see *CPR 1327–77*, 15:9.

ample use of wax tablets. They also took notes on offcuts and other *membra disjecta*. Such small-format parchment remnants played a central role in one of Oxford theologian Robert Grosseteste's (c. 1175–1253) "preferred methods of composition".[166] According to Oxford's 1316–1317 regent-master, the Franciscan William of Alnwick (c. 1275–1333), Grosseteste, like a modern researcher recording bibliographical details on index cards, transcribed *obiter dicta* on "multas cedulas" which he then employed as a foundation for his essays and sermons.[167] Physical proof of Grosseteste's cedula-based system has not survived, but ample evidence for similar practices can be gleaned from multiple sources, especially those discussing the art of taking notes.

Note-taking "from oral events was usually a multi-stage process" in medieval Europe.[168] Disorganised, perfunctory jottings made during an event, termed *Mitschriften* in German, tended to be revisited for neater recopying, reorganization, and supplementation (from others' notes or one's own memory) thereby producing a second-order version, known as *Reinschriften* or *Nachschriften*. For *Mitschriften*, wax tablets were in wide usage, but these preliminary notes were made on parchment scraps as well.[169] Cistercians copied abbatial instructions both on wax tablets and on schedulæ during the 1100s, and Bernard of Clairvaux (1090–1153) employed the same method for sermon revision.[170] In the following century, with increased preaching in the universities together

---

166 Joseph Goering, "Introduction: Editing Robert Grosseteste", in *Editing Robert Grosseteste*, ed. J.W. Goering and E.A. Mackie (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2003), xii.

167 Richard William Hunt, "The Library of Robert Grosseteste", in *Robert Grosseteste, Scholar and Bishop*, ed. D.A. Callus (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1955), 127; R.W. Southern, *Robert Grosseteste* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1992), 37–41.

168 Ann Blair, "Student Manuscripts and the Textbook", in *Scholarly Knowledge: Textbooks in Early Modern Europe*, ed. E. Campi, et al. (Genève: Librairie Droz S.A., 2008), 40.

169 Blair, "Student Manuscripts", 40.

170 Blair, "Student Manuscripts", 42.

with expanded outreach by Benedictines and mendicant orders, "surviving evidence [for such practices] becomes abundant".[171] The Pseudo-Boethian *De disciplina scholarium*, a popular study-guide and handbook on training scholars written c. 1230, urges the pupil to expedite note-taking by "always … hav[ing] at his hand by his side, a wax tablet ['dipticæ'] or a scrap of parchment ['cedulæ']".[172, 173] Students' propensity for jotting on leftover parchment, however, extends back to at least the early medieval era. Ælfric Bata's *Colloquies* (Oxford, St John's College Library, MS 154; c. 1000), a textbook designed to teach Latin through realistic conversational scenarios, includes a dialogue with a pupil accused of shiftlessness for refusing to "write on [his] tablet or on a vellum scrap or on a parchment [sheet] or in a quire" ('nec scribere in tabula, nec in scedula, nec in ullo pergaméno nec in nulla <f. 161v> quaternione').[174]

Without question, memory was highly esteemed and "deliberately cultivated" in medieval Europe.[175] Nevertheless, as Augustine notes in his *Soliloquium*, the memory is too small to retain

---

171 Blair, "Student Manuscripts", 43.

172 *De disciplina scholarium*, 2, cap. 7; Charles Burnett, "Give Him the White Cow: Notes and Note-Taking in the Universities in the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries", in *History of Universities. Vol. 14*, ed. P. Denley (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), 15.

173 "Felicis discipuli discretio magistratu gaudeat eumque metuendo diligat fidelisque existat, ne sub picturatae dilectionis obtentu Albinus existat detrahendo …. Venienti autem assurgat, pro loco et tempore salutando inclinet eumque, si iubeat, assequatur mansionique eius, si potest, se inserat cohabitando, ut sic castigatus non solum se remordeat, verum etiam, cum locus fuerit, ad eum confluat inquirendo. Si autem discipulus specialiter magistro suo, ut necessarium est, nequeat exhibere praesentiam, tum propter mansionis distantiam, tum propter alterius rei causam, dipticas semper lateri promptiores habeat cedulamve, quibus diligenter imprimat, quod conscientiae suae senserit intimatum eiusque explicite inquirat dubitatum" (*De disciplina scholarium*, 2:4,6–7).

174 F. 161r–v, no. 13 in Scott Gwara and David W. Porter, *Anglo-Saxon Conversations* (Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 1997), 84, see also 53, 205; discussed in Kwakkel, "Discarded Parchment", 243–45.

175 Burnett, "Give Him the White Cow", 1.

everything one learns; "[t]herefore one must write things down".[176] We know that at least a portion of medieval pupils and masters agreed because some student class notes have survived. One example is Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek, BPL 191 D, a moderately-sized (206–221×141–160 mm, 166 ff.) notebook from thirteenth-century France comprised chiefly of heavily glossed educational texts, interspersed with herbal and mathematical works. Between this manuscript's boards lurks a c. 100×50 mm shred of parchment originally mislabelled as a fragment, but properly identified as an offcut by Erik Kwakkel,[177] and discussed in his *Books before Print*.[178] Open space between the scrawled text and the edges of the strip preclude classification of the piece as a fragment of a larger leaf. Instead, its odd shape, flaws, and quick, highly abbreviated cursive show a pupil struggling, somewhat ineptly, to take down on an offcut a lesson or discussion regarding the relationship between sin and personal choice or self-will ("propria voluntas"). Appropriately, the volume in which the note appears opens with *De disciplina scholarium*. Evidently our student followed the text's advice to carry schedulæ to class for note-taking, tucking the slips between the leaves of his notebook for future reference.

Yet not all offcuts stand alone as discrete slips. Jotting memoranda on individual bits and pieces gives rise to a problem, after all—namely, how to organize the resultant unwieldy stack of randomly-sized leaves. Upon completion, notes could be recopied and amended into *Nachschriften*. In the interim, it seems that at least some students simply rolled them up: Ælfric's *Colloquies* use both *scheda* (loose sheet) and *schedula* (scraps) as equivalents to 'roll', perhaps reflecting a way of

---

176 Quoted: Burnett, "Give Him the White Cow", 1–2 at 2.

177 Personal communication, 02 August 2019.

178 Kwakkel, *Books before Print*, 184–85; see also: Erik Kwakkel, "Classics on Scraps: Classical Manuscripts Made from Parchment Waste", in *Manuscripts of the Latin Classics 800–1200*, ed. E. Kwakkel (Leiden: Leiden University Press, 2015), 124 and plate 18 (211) (available via OAPEN).

storing lengthy, awkwardly-shaped strips of parchment refuse—to wit, spooled into convenient coils.[179] Significantly, the Diepenveen *zusterboek* ('sisterbook', a collection of *viten*[180] produced by a Windesheim-based female religious order) referred to *rapiaria*—personal collections of notes and reflections kept within the *Devotia moderna* movement—as *rollekens* 'rolls'.[181] Perhaps long slender parchment offcuts' propensity for helical warping inspired the latter term.[182] Regardless, those preferring a tidier parcel sewed their snippets together to form a rough notebook: according to Michael Lapidge, a thirty-leaf example of this solution to the 'corkscrew notes' problem survives bound into a manuscript now in Universitätsbibliothek Würzburg.[183] Madrid, Archivo Histórico Nacional, Clero Regular-Secular, carpeta 1082, nº 18 appears to be another small offcut notebook.[184]

---

179 Scott Gwara and David W. Porter, eds., *Anglo-Saxon Conversations: The Colloquies of Aelfric Bata* (Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 1997), 113 n.96.

180 A Latin-influenced Dutch term for devout biographies. The *zusterboek* survives as: Deventer, Stadsarchief en Atheneumbibliotheek, Suppl. 198 / 101 E 26, and Zwolle, Historisch Centrum Overijssel, Coll. Van Rhemen inv. 1.

181 Wybren Scheepsma, *Medieval Religious Women in the Low Countries*, tr. D.F. Johnson (Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 2004), 135; Ann Blair, *Too Much to Know* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2010), 68; Thom Mertens, « Rapiarium », in *Dictionaire de spiritualité: Ascétique et mystique, doctrine et histoire. Vol. 13*, éd. M. Viller, et al. (Paris: Éditions Beauchesne, 1988), col. 114–19. The order's *Chronicon Windesemense* dubs them *parvæ scedulæ* (Johannes Gerhardus Rijk Acquoy, *Het Klooster te Windesheim* (Utrecht: Gebr. van der Post, 1876), 2:301), a phrase which also crops up in the *liber memorialis* or confraternity book of Reichenau (Paul Piper, ed., *Libri Confraternitatum Sancti Galli, Augiensis, Fabariensis* (Berlin: Weidmannos, 1884), 149). I remain indebted to Erik Kwakkel for directing my attention to this material.

182 A relationship between this trait and the English vernacular term *scrow*, itself the origin of *scroll* (*OED*, "scrow, *n*."), may be plausible.

183 Michael Lapidge, "The Origin of the Collectanea", in *Collectanea Pseudo-Bedæ*, ed. M. Bayless and M. Lapidge (Dublin: School of Celtic Studies, Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies, 1998), 6.

184 I am grateful to Dr Ainoa Castro for bringing this manuscript to my attention.

Generally, however, it seems that scholars kept offcuts loose or deployed them in the fashion of the addendum slips examined earlier: pasting or stitching the scraps into a book at the appropriate locations.

1.6.3. Not-so-Foul Papers

Inserted into existing codices, offcuts could not only mark a reader's place, but facilitate textual commentary, expansion, and revision. Some writers plied them in the editing of autograph manuscripts by attaching offcut 'addenda slips' to the leaves like modern-day yellow 'sticky notes'. We see this in Bibliotheca Apostolica Vaticana, MS Vat.lat.955, a volume of works by Ockham pupil turned Oxford philosopher Adam de Wodeham, OFM (c. 1298–1358). Marginal *signes de renvoi* pepper its leaves, explicitly directing the reader towards inserted addenda slips—e.g., f. 21^{av}: "Quaere in alia parte istius cedulæ ibi ‡"—the contents of which appear to be constrained by the insertions' physical size.[185] Pains taken by their scribe, probably Wodeham himself,[186] to manage the limited space suggest that the slips' dimensions were fixed from the start, rather than cut to suit, and thus point to offcuts.[187] Both Richard Beadle and Robert Adams have discussed this approach to authorial revision in later Middle English texts, as well. English examples from across the broader period thus range from the *Orrmulum* (see pp. 31–32), with its "inserted, odd-shaped leaves" and slips,[188] through London, British Library, Harley MS 6579: London Charterhouse's c. 1450 working

---

185 William J. Courtenay, *Adam Wodeham* (Leiden: Brill, 1978), 20–23 at 22.

186 Courtenay, *Adam Wodeham*, 20–21.

187 Kwakkel, "Discarded Parchment", 244.

188 Robert Adams, "The R/F MSS of *Piers Plowman* and the Pattern of Alpha/Beta Complementary Omissions: Implications for Critical Editing", *Text* 14 (2002), 118. Also: Richard Beadle, "English Autograph Writings of the Later Middle Ages: Some Preliminaries", in *Gli Autografi Medievali: Problemi Paleografici e Filologici*, ed. P. Chiesa and L. Pinelli, 248–68 (Spoleto: Centro Italiano di Studi sull'Alto Medioevo, 1994).

exemplar of Walter Hilton's (d. 1396) *Scale of Perfection*, known as 'MS H',[189] which features both a stitched-in cedula and added malformed leaves.[190] Similar scraps could be used to make additions to volumes created by others, such as the approximately 85–130×150 mm offcut inserted (as f. 15) into Wolfenbüttel, Herzog August Bibliothek, Cod. Guelf. 42 Gud. lat., a much larger (315×230 mm) twelfth-century codex.[191]

In addition to facilitating the process of creating, then revising or annotating notes and compositions, second-rate parchment could form the basis of a composition as a whole. Audrey L. Meaney posits that many scriptoria "used offcuts from the edges of expensive and elaborately prepared (but irregularly shaped) skins for their rough work, which usually would have been thrown away afterwards".[192] Like Meaney, Ian Doyle hypothesizes that "foul papers", or early draft versions of a text, "must sometimes have depended on scraps patched together".[193] But not all ostensibly 'foul papers' were destined for the scrap heap. Not all books are de luxe copies and not all texts are formal, highly structured affairs. Over the course of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, increasing literacy rates and a growing mercantile class expanded the manuscript market, encouraging book producers

---

189 Barry Windeatt, *English Mystics of the Middle Ages* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 150.

190 Adams, "R/F MSS", 118.

191 Thumbnail view for comparison: diglib.hab.de/wdb.php?dir=mss/42-gud-lat&distype=thumbs.

192 Audrey L. Meaney, "Variant Versions of Old English Medical Remedies and the Compilation of Bald's *Leechbook*", in *Anglo-Saxon England 13*, ed. P. Clemoes, et al. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984), 253.

193 Cited in Adams, "R/F MSS", 118. For an example of a 'Franken-folio' constructed by stitching together a fistful of parchment scraps, see London, British Library, Harley MS 172, f. 1b.

to introduce price-reduction strategies.[194] Among the new, more affordable alternatives were cut-rate writing supports, including offcuts. On top of this, persons with an adequate degree of scribal proficiency could produce a volume for personal use at a considerably attenuated cost by copying a text on their own. Doing so on low-end parchment enabled the copyist to almost entirely waive production costs.[195] Many surviving professional and student notebooks clearly fall into this last category. For instance, the third booklet of Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek, VLO 92 (ff. 122–54), a student notebook dating from the first quarter of the eleventh century, shows heavy reliance upon

---

194 On rising literacy rates and the expanding book market, see: C. Paul Christianson, "The Rise of London's Book-Trade", in *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain, Vol. 3: 1400–1557*, ed. L. Hellinga and J.B. Trapp (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 128–47; K. Harris, "Patrons, Buyers, and Owners: The Evidence for Ownership, and the Role of Book Owners in Book Production and the Book Trade", in *Book Production and Publishing in Britain 1375–1475*, ed. J. Griffiths and D. Pearsall (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 163–99; Kwakkel, "Commercial Organization"; Malcolm B. Parkes, "The Literacy of the Laity", in *Scribes, Scripts, and Readers: Studies in the Communication, Presentation, and Dissemination of Medieval Texts* (London: Hambledon, 1991), 275–97; Michael A. Michael, "Urban Production of Manuscript Books", in *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain, Vol. 2*, ed. N.J. Morgan and R.M. Thomson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 168-94; Rodney M. Thomson and Nigel Morgan, "Language and Literacy", in *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain, Vol. 2*, ed. N.J. Morgan and R.M. Thomson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 22–38; J.B. Trapp, "Literacy, Books, and Readers", in *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain, Vol. 3: 1400–1557*, ed. L. Hellinga and J.B. Trapp (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 31–44. See also § 2.4, *infra*.

195 Jean-Pascal Pouzet, "Book Production Outside Commercial Contexts", in *The Production of Books in England 1350–1500*, ed. A. Gillespie and D. Wakelin (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 220.

offcuts.[196] Though not as handsome as its professionally-produced kin, this copy most certainly flattered its owner's student budget.

1.7. Conclusion

As we have seen, while allusions to drafting on schedulæ made by Hugh of St Victor (pp. 17–18) and others remain ambiguous, contemporary references and material evidence bolster the hypothesis advanced by Doyle and by Meaney. Offcuts saw use outside medieval books, but also within them, whether as smaller, oft ephemeral inserts—as in Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, MS Vat.lat.955—or on a more permanent basis as folded or singleton components of quires[197]—as in London, British Library, Harley MS 6579. Finally, despite one late-fifteenth-century German dictionary's dismissal of offcuts as too small for incorporation into codices,[198] medieval writers also recruited offcut parchment as the primary writing support for more substantive texts—as in part III of Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek, VLO 92. In subsequent chapters, we will examine this phenomenon in greater depth for high- and late-medieval English manuscripts.

We now know both how offcut parchment was produced and what it looks like. We also have a sense of some of the ways in which those involved in the creation, transformation, circulation, and reading of medieval books made use of this material. When not transformed into adhesive, these parchment scraps might have stiffened hats and bodices, and sometimes offered a base for items as

---

196 For discussion, see: Kwakkel, "Classics on Scraps", 107–29+204–11 (available via OAPEN); for images, see figs. 106, 206–210 therein.

197 Kwakkel, "Discarded Parchment", 241, 245–55; Borland, "Unruly Reading", 103.

198 "Cedula, zedel, est pars pergameni, de qua propter sui parvitatem non potest fieri liber aptus" ('An offcut, or zedel, is a bit of parchment out of which, because it is too small, no proper book can be made') (Wilhelm Wattenbach, *Das Schriftwesen im Mittelalter*, 3rd edn. (Leipzig: S. Hirzel, 1896), 194 n.4; see also Kwakkel, "Discarded Parchment", 239, 256 n.7).

diverse as amulets, electoral ballots, and identification tags. Students took lecture notes on offcuts, authors and editors plied them like yellow 'sticky-notes', and scribes recruited them as writing support for letters and charters. Yet, however lengthy, this list fails to tell the whole story of this material. Each of the foregoing applications made use of offcut singletons, i.e., parchment remnants in an unfolded state. As we saw towards the end of chapter one, however, despite their constrained dimensions, offcuts could also be folded. It is in this configuration, as bifolia, that we most frequently encounter them in books. Even here the evidence proves surprisingly complex. As Daniel Wakelin observes, "one of the most distinctive features of manuscripts is the regular irregularity of them",[199] a heuristic which extends to the subclass of manuscripts incorporating offcut zone parchment within their textblock.[200]

Although, at first blush, the fine details of a codex's writing support may not seem especially informative to researchers, parchment quality speaks to the changing nature of book production, and the reach of, or audience for, certain types of text. This dimension of a manuscript has the potential to shed light on a book's production context, as well as the status and reception of the texts it contains, offering material evidence to either bolster or undermine more strictly text-based hypotheses. For all that book producers used offcuts in diverse ways, studying that variety still reveals certain underlying patterns. In subsequent chapters, we shall see that the heterogeneity clusters in subtle yet revealing ways which furnish us with vestiges of the choices faced by scribes, and have the capacity to illuminate attitudes towards this material. Why did scribes incorporate

---

199 Daniel Wakelin, "Writing the Words", in *The Production of Books in England 1350–1500*, ed. A. Gillespie and D. Wakelin (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 37.

200 Offcut zone parchment was often recruited for flyleaves, e.g., London, British Library, Lansdowne MS 348, f. 127. Since flyleaves are not integral components of the textblock, and may not have been added at the time a manuscript was copied, I excluded them from analysis.

offcuts into books, and why does their use of this material show such diversity? What does recruitment of offcut zone parchment as writing support suggest about views towards offcuts, books, and shifting socio-economic circumstances and networks of knowledge production? Before investigating these questions, we will layout the methodology employed in this study, and put it to use taking a closer look at this unique type of parchment.

Chapter 2: Counting Codices

Data does not speak for itself. I have been in rooms with data and listened very carefully. The data never said a word.[201]

It is easy to lie with statistics. But it is easier to lie without them.[202]

2.1. On 'Flattening' Books: An Apologia

As noted in chapter one, this dissertation focuses on a particular type of parchment—namely, offcuts—investigating its use as writing support in handwritten books from later medieval England. Some codicological genres are disproportionately well-represented in the research literature, either due to perceptions of greater 'interestingness' or preservational bias. Offcut books are not among these genres. To my knowledge, this project constitutes the first extended study focused on these manuscripts. In addition to engaging with a topic not previously researched in depth, I approached the present work as a proof-of-concept, endeavouring to (*i*) establish a well-grounded, low-tech[203] method of identifying offcuts; and (*ii*) demonstrate the feasibility of researching parchment, not solely through traditional case studies nor biocodicological techniques, but via statistical methods. I commenced from fairly simple questions. What distinguishes offcut zone parchment from other types

---

201 Milford H. Wolpoff, in M.H. Wolpoff, et al., "Discussion", in *Paleoanthropology: Morphology and Paleoecology*, ed. R.H. Tittle (Den Haag: Mouton, 1975), 15.

202 Frederick Mosteller, cited: Thomas E. Mann and Gary R. Orren, "To Poll or Not to Poll … and Other Questions", *Media Polls in American Politics*, ed. T.E. Mann and G.R. Orren (Washington D.C.: Brookings Institute, 1992), 6.

203 That is, one not requiring any equipment beyond the researcher's own senses.

of parchment? How can we recognize it? Can we identify patterns of use, e.g., was recruitment of this material as writing support confined to certain classes of manuscripts, types of scribes, regions and contexts of production? To investigate these questions, I relied upon outputs and methods from several fields: manuscript catalogues and case studies, research in intellectual and social history, recent findings in biocodicology,[204] and statistical techniques. Openness towards drawing upon cognate disciplines is one of the strengths of codicology; pursuing investigations via triangulation helps us create rich, multidimensional studies. Arguably, however, "[t]he most important, and debated methodological innovation" in manuscript studies has been the development of quantitative codicology, an approach which "aim[s] to compile a history of the book through the use of statistical analysis of large samples of data".[205] Adoption of quantitative analysis among humanities scholars has lagged somewhat in some regions, perhaps due to lower levels of statistical and data literacy arising from poor coverage of these techniques in undergraduate and postgraduate training,[206]

---

204 "Biocodicology [is] the study of the biological information stored in manuscripts" (Sarah Fiddyment, et al., "So You Want to Do Biocodicology? A Field Guide to the Biological Analysis of Parchment", *Herit. Sci*. 7 (2019): art. 35). Sarah Fiddyment and colleagues (op. cit.) provide an excellent overview of the field; see, as well, the related: Jessica Hendy, et al., "A Guide to Ancient Protein Studies", *Nat. Ecol. Evol.* 2, no. 5 (2018), 791–99.

205 Orietta Da Rold and Marilena Maniaci, "Medieval Manuscript Studies: A European Perspective", *Essays and Studies* 68 (2015), 7; see also: Ezio Ornato, "L'histoire du livre et les méthodes quantitatives: bilan de vingt ans de recherches", in *La face cachée du livre médiéval*, ed. E. Ornato and C. Bozzolo (Rome: Viella, 1997), 607–79; as well as: Carla Bozzolo, and Ezio Ornato, *Pour une histoire du livre manuscrit au moyen âge: Trois essais de codicologie quantitative* (Paris: Éditions du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1983).

206 "[Q]uantitative codicology, which necessitates the analysis of data collected through long and patient survey and encoding, requires the mastery of basic statistical concepts virtually absent from the humanities curricula" (Da Rold and Maniaci, "Medieval Manuscript Studies", 8).

possibly in tandem with a measure of skepticism towards data-driven methodologies—particularly, it seems, among manuscript scholars in the anglosphere.[207] As Orietta Da Rold and Marilena Maniaci lament, "[d]etailed quantitative work, based on systematic collection and exploitation of medieval evidence, is still very much needed in the study of medieval book production", and this lack has been described as more conspicuous for books produced in Britain.[208] Even the total number of extant medieval British manuscripts remains unknown. Working out the full number "is not a trivial mathematical exercise, but it is essential to discuss the unique multilingual and diverse position that Britain had in the medieval European book market"—as is "the need [for] detailed and meticulous research" of surviving British codices.[209] "The statistical approach, however, still continues to prove its great potential".[210]

That said, while quantitative analyses compel researchers to "define the parameters of what is meaningful to their inquiry[, those parameters will necessarily be] restricted by the available data and the pragmatics of collecting and using it".[211] Data availability is a central concern for us, and criticisms of quantitative approaches to early books sometimes point to the questionable

---

207 Da Rold and Maniaci, "Medieval Manuscript Studies", 12. Yet exceptions exist—e.g., Orietta Da Rold, *Paper in Medieval England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2020); Michael Johnston, "Copying and Reading *The Prick of Conscience* in Late Medieval England", *Speculum* 95, no. 3 (2020): 742–801; Daniel Sawyer, *Reading English Verse in Manuscript c.1350–c.1500* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2020); Jacob Thaisen, "Secretary Letter Forms in Country Durham", *Folia Linguistica Historica* 38, no. s38-s1 (2017), 263–80—and such work continues to grow in popularity.

208 Da Rold and Maniaci, "Medieval Manuscript Studies", 11.

209 Da Rold and Maniaci, "Medieval Manuscript Studies", 12.

210 Da Rold and Maniaci, "Medieval Manuscript Studies", 8.

211 A.R. Bennett, "What Do the Numbers Mean? The Case for Corpus Studies", in *Manuscript Culture and Medieval Devotional Traditions*, ed. J.N. Brown and N.R. Rice (Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 2021), 49.

representativeness of surviving corpora. How accurately do the survivals represent past prevalence? Amidst ongoing attempts to address the question,[212] I concur with Michael Sargent and with A.R. Bennett: the "argument for their use boils down to blunt pragmatism".[213] We rely upon what survives "simply because we must. Surviving manuscripts constitute the bulk of the evidence … we pursue them as a source of information because they are what we have to excavate".[214] Here, it is worth noting that codicology and palaeography are not the only fields to struggle with the challenge of incomplete or partial data. Archaeological disciplines, such as palaeontology, "necessarily involve[] a choppy and incomplete dataset", but, as Mark McMenamin observes, such spottiness may constitute "a great advantage. The incompleteness of the fossil record is a strength, not a weakness, because it forces us to 'think outside of the box'".[215] Certainly it has not hindered researchers in the latter fields from significantly advancing our knowledge of even the extremely distant past. More to the point,

---

212 A recent, statistically-driven example is Eltjo Buringh's *Medieval Manuscript Production in the Latin West: Explorations with a Global Database* (Leiden: Brill, 2011). For a different angle of approach to survival rates, with a focus on the British context, see: Daniel Sawyer, "Missing Books in the Folk Codicology of Later Medieval England", *The Medieval Journal* 7, no. 2 (2017): 103–32.

213 Bennett, "What Do the Numbers Mean?", quote at 50; Michael Sargent, "What Do the Numbers Mean? A Textual Critic's Observations on some Patterns of Middle English Manuscript Transmission", in *Design and Distribution of Late Medieval Manuscripts in England*, ed. M. Connolly and L.R. Mooney (York: York Medieval Press, 2008), 205–44.

214 Bennett, "What Do the Numbers Mean?", 50. A more productive consideration might be the question of "*how* we can use [the] surviving manuscripts … to deduce information" (ibid., emphasis mine).

215 Mark A.S. McMenamin, *Dynamic Paleontology: Using Quantification and Other Tools to Decipher the History of Life* (New York: Springer, 2016), 220. Darwin himself "compared the [incomplete] rock record to a damaged folio volume, for which we have only a page here and a paragraph there" (ibid., 222).

however, while it is sound to worry about what has been lost, "we don't fully understand what is left!"[216] Let us then engage with what is left.

Criticisms of quantitative codicology also converge on statistics' tendency to reduce or 'flatten' complex artefacts—"narrowing [a subject of study] to one cross-comparable facet [and/or] limiting the information one takes into consideration to a single axis of analysis"[217]—such that resultant datasets, predicated on an imposed ontological stability, fail to fully represent the complex subjects of humanistic research. The subjects of scientific inquiry are no less complex than those pursued by humanists, however, and scientists show keen awareness that real world phenomena do not fit cleanly into neat, ontologically stable categories. The imposition of such categories is provisional for the purposes of analysis. Moreover, imperfect surrogacy, reductionism, and decontextualization are far from the unique purview of scientific fields. Established humanistic methods themselves impose 'flattening': "production of a text from manuscripts is a kind of flattening. It is the extraction of one kind of information (linguistic, written, symbolic, textual) from a much larger material phenomenon, whether that be a single manuscript or a collection of manuscripts".[218] Caution is warranted, certainly. We might think of data as 'unfleshed' skeletons,

---

216 Orietta Da Rold, "The Tacit Knowledge of Medieval Paper", Annual Riddy Lecture (Centre for Medieval Studies, University of York [online], 16 June 2021).

217 Bennett, "What Do the Numbers Mean?", 52.

218 Bennett, "What Do the Numbers Mean?", 52.

open to a range of reconstructions and interpretations, some admittedly sounder than others.[219] Viewing a corpus in aggregate does result in (temporary) loss of detail—indeed, that is the purpose of extraction and aggregation. Sometimes we are inclined to treat data as *facta*, given things, yet they may be better understood as *capta*, things we lure out of an object—and occasionally even as *ficta*;[220] we do well to exercise care in how we go about seizing them. Extracting masses of data to view in aggregate, however, affords opportunities for new ways of seeing. We use these techniques in order to let individual details fade into the background, revealing broader connections, along with hidden patterns and new objects of study. In this, the 'zoomed-out' perspectives offered by aggregate analyses of manuscript corpora function analogously to aerial surveying methods used in archaeology, such as LiDAR (Light Detection and Ranging) and kite aerial thermography. Abandoning close detail for a distant frame of reference—and, increasingly in aerial surveying, a doctored one exploiting light beyond the spectrum perceptible to the unaided human eye—shows the significance of features invisible or meaningless at ground level, sheds fresh light on existing finds, and directs researchers to new sites for investigation. In analogous fashion, quantitative analyses of medieval manuscript corpora draw codicological attention to hitherto ignored features, invite us to

---

219 Palaeontologists John Conway and Darren Naish, with palaeoartist C.M. Kosemen, provide a vivid illustration of the issue in *All Yesterdays: Unique and Speculative Views of Dinosaurs and Other Prehistoric Animals* ([S.l.]: Irregular, 2012), in which they explore the ways palaeontologists from a distant future might erroneously reconstruct animal species from our own time (including humans) if they worked from equally spotty fossil remains and used techniques similar to those currently deployed in dinosaur reconstruction. The text offers an amusing, yet sound, corrective to misguided overconfidence. For a short, open-access, accessible overview of the basic premise, see: Eric Grundhauser, "The Bad Hair, Incorrect Feathering, and Missing Skin Flaps of Dinosaur Art: Inside the Pitfalls of Illustrating Prehistoric Creatures", *Atlas Obscura*, 21 September 2017. www.atlasobscura.com/articles/dinosaurs-art-paleoartists-mistakes.

220 I am indebted to Dr Iain Higgins for this metaphor.

posit new questions, and open potential new lines of inquiry. A zoomed-out perspective helps flag areas warranting closer inspection, providing opportunities for fruitful case studies—telling us, in effect, "dig here". And dig down we can—for, in the end, the individual manuscripts still await our visits, snug in their repositories. "The particularity and nuance that are exchanged for this big-picture view are … only temporarily sacrificed".[221] In the end, 'flattening' is merely a metaphor, but the process it references furnishes us with another set of lenses, revealing wider perspectives.

Much of the work of humanities scholarship is fundamentally comparative in nature. Statistics and computers simply enable us to conduct comparative analyses at scale and with greater consistency. We are left with the questions of what it means to compare—what are we comparing, and across which lines? Difference and similarity occupy a spectrum, with multiple options available. Which measures a researcher chooses to employ—i.e., the metrics they deem most appropriate for their purposes—will have real consequences, shaping the direction and outcome of their research. Similarly, once the analyses have been completed, the significance of the findings must be interpreted and placed in context. None of these concerns are antithetical to humanistic study. With that in mind, how, then, does a humanist go about applying statistical methodologies to the study of medieval manuscript codices?

2.2. Methodology

This project considers the use of often (though not always) conspicuously low-end parchment in manuscripts produced in later medieval England. As discussed in chapter one (pp. 26–27), medieval

---

221 Bennett, "What Do the Numbers Mean?", 55. Each manuscript's idiosyncrasies "can be brought back into view with any individual inscription or shift of focus to a particular object or detail. Th[ey] do not disappear; they simply slide in and out of focus as we adjust the scale of our gaze" (ibid.).

parchment makers and consumers acknowledged diverse grades of parchment, and, with writing support constituting one of the largest components of a codex's cost, ugly-but-cheap offcuts likely appealed to economizing impulses. Yet how widespread was recruitment of offcut zone parchment as writing support? Was the practice confined to particular settings, or associated with specific languages or genres? How might offcut use inform our understanding of book production contexts or readership? Since exploring such questions first required a reasonably reliable strategy for identifying offcuts, **stage one** of my investigation focussed on establishing a set of offcut diagnostic traits (see §§ 1.3–1.4). In **stage two**, I used the diagnostic criteria developed in stage one to identify books copied, in whole or in part, on this material, analyzing that corpus in search of patterns. (I discuss these stages in detail below.) At the outset, we should note that, since full manuscripts copied entirely on offcut zone parchment are rare, this project did not study offcuts *per se*, nor 'offcut manuscripts', but rather the *use of offcut zone parchment within manuscripts*. Pursuing this inquiry entailed a multi-part investigation, with a slight shift in emphasis between the different phases. Since stage one sought to pin down parchment features that identify offcuts, it made sense to take individual bifolia as the unit of analysis. For stage two, which considered the codicological contexts of offcuts, my primary analytical focus shifted to the production unit (with a secondary focus on manuscript codices during case studies). Throughout, these are referred to simply as 'units', and referenced, in order, by alphabetical code.[222] In both stages, much of my effort went into compiling copious quantities of data.

One might wonder what came next: 'What does one do with such a mass of data?' In this study, the answer is *descriptive statistics*. Statistical work is akin to detective work. When we lack

---

[222] That is, if a codex contains four units, they are designated units A–D, e.g., the second unit in London, British Library, Harley MS 912 is unit B. For further details, see "Manuscript Corpus" in volume two.

full information—an all-to-common state of affairs in medieval codicology and palaeography—analyzing what is available can uncover patterns which then guide our conjectures, leading to significant conclusions. We use the 'known' (i.e., available data), to help steer deduction about what remains 'unknown'.[223] Alas, anyone who has worked with large quantities of information knows that more data often muddies the waters. Statistics enable us to take an unwieldy, complex mass of data and generate a more manageable synopsis or abridgement, condensing mayhem into a handful of descriptive numbers. As so often in research, caution is warranted. The mathematics underlying statistics may be precise; statistical description is not. Loss of detail and nuance is inevitable, and any simplification can be at once accurate and misleading. Further, complex, real-world phenomena typically resist perfect description via single statistics. This holds especially true of biological phenomena admitting of natural variation—such as parchment features. We might adopt manifold approaches to characterizing a given feature, and when an object of study is amenable to diverse descriptions, the way(s) we choose to describe it, the metrics we rely upon in studying it, and how we define those metrics necessarily influence the conclusions we draw.[224] Consequently, precisely how one tackles a descriptive statistical analysis will vary in the details, though researchers adhere to a few basic steps: **collection**, **cleaning**, and **analysis**. My *data collection* procedures are described in detail below (see §§ 2.2.1–2.2.2). *Data cleaning* (also called *data cleansing*) is the process of detecting inaccurate, incomplete, or irrelevant elements of a database—e.g., typographical errors, empty fields, and so on—then rectifying, replacing, or deleting as needed. Batch processing or data

---

223 That is, neither data nor statistics 'speak for themselves'. Rather, we deploy analysis of (inevitably imperfect) data as a tool or resource to help build a circumstantial case based on informed inference.

224 Several viable approaches would suit this kind of study, each providing a distinct lens. Intellectually honest scholars can disagree in good faith about analytical methods, outcomes, and implications.

wrangling tools can expedite the task; for both stages of this study, I elected to use Open Refine.[225] Finally, after collection and cleaning, I manually entered my data into a spreadsheet, and conducted my *data analyses* using the statistical computing language R via the third-party graphical user interface RStudio Desktop.[226]

---

225 Initially v. 3.2, then v. 3.4.1; see: openrefine.org/, github.com/OpenRefine/OpenRefine.

226 R: www.r-project.org (first v. 3.6.0, then vv. 4.0.0, 4.1.0); RStudio: www.rstudio.com, github.com/rstudio/rstudio. *Note*: I ran initial analyses in stage one with IBM SPSS Statistics, v. 24 (a proprietary software package for batched or interactive statistical analysis), but switched to R for ethical reasons, R being available libre under the GNU General Public License, specifically GNU GPL v2. Post-switch, I replicated my analyses for verification.

2.2.1. Stage 1

To begin, after surveying the extant literature on parchment, with a particular focus on the western European tradition,[227] I directed attention to the material proper. Kwakkel's work on offcuts ascribed an upper size limit of approximately 150 or 160 mm, noting a basic series of associated traits or

---

227 The parchment-related literature engages with several disciplines and is well-scattered, complicating orientation to the subject. In addition to the work cited throughout this dissertation—especially that of René Larsen and of Ronald Reed, Peter Rück's *Pergament* volume, and the output of Matthew Collins' Beasts2Craft group (see Bibliography items by Fiddyment; Saxl; Teasdale; Vnouček)—see: Frank M. Bischoff, « Observation sur l'emploi de différentes qualités de parchemin dans le livre médiéval », in *Ancient and Medieval Book Materials and Techniques*, ed. M. Maniaci and P. Munafò (Città del Vaticano: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1993), 1:57–94; Marina Bicchieri, et al., "Microscopic Observations of Paper and Parchment: the Archaeology of Small Objects", *Herit. Sci.* 4 (2019), art. 7, and "Non-Destructive Spectroscopic Characterization of Parchment", *Vib. Spectrosc*. 55, no. 2 (2011), 267–72; Marc Fourneau, et al., "Histological Study of Sheep Skin Transformation During the Recreation of Historical Parchment Manufacture", *Herit. Sci*. 8 (2020), art. 78; Robert Fuchs, et al., *Pergament: Geschichte, Material, Konservierung, Restaurierung* (München: Siegl, 2001); Lee G. Gonzalez and Timothy J. Wess, "The Importance of Understanding the Terminology of Collagen and Gelatine in the Study of Parchment", *J. Inst. Conserv.* 36, no. 2 (2013), 104–08, and "The Effects of Hydration on the Collagen and Gelatine Phases within Parchment Artefacts", *Herit. Sci*. 1 (2013), art. 14; Jean-Pierre Gumbert, "The Bearable Lightness of Parchment", *Gazette du livre médiéval* 59, no. 2 (2012), 70–72; Robert Halleux, « Les Adhésifs dans les recettes de l'antiquité et du moyen âge », in *Matériaux du livre médiéval*, ed. M. Zerdoun Bat-Yehouda and C. Bourlet (Turnhout: Brepols, 2010), 269–73; M. [Jérôme] De la Lande, *Art de faire le parchemin* (Saillant et Nyon, 1761); Gaël Latour, et al., "Correlative Nonlinear Optical Microscopy and Infrared Nanoscopy Reveals Collagen Degradation in Altered Parchments", *Sci. Rep.* 6 (2016), art. 6:26344; Alenka Možir, et al., "Material Properties of Historic Parchment: A Reference Collection Survey", *Stud. Conserv.* 59, no. 3 (2014): 136–49; Nancy K. Turner, "The Materiality of Medieval Parchment: A Response to 'The Animal Turn'", *Revista Hispánica Moderna* 7, no. 1 (2018), 39–67.

features similar to those outlined briefly in chapter one:[228] irregular shape (edge-gaps, non-squared perimeter) and small size relative to adjacent bifolia; tool marks; holes;[229] marked stiffness or limpness, thickness or thinness, weakness, or translucency; cockling or buckling; lingering hair follicles, or outright patches of hair; 'staining' or discolouration; striations (i.e., 'stretch marks'); an atypically rough or oily surface; keratinization or gelatinization (which manifests as a vaguely translucent, often thickened strip reminiscent of rawhide chew toys for dogs); poor ink adhesion; and some types of medieval repairs (i.e., sewn-up tears, patches, scarfing).[230] To begin, in order to acquire familiarity with the aforementioned visual and tactile characteristics, develop provisional

---

228 See discussion in § 1.4, as well as note 111.

229 Among offcut traits, Erik Kwakkel reports "pebble holes": round holes ostensibly created when the parchmenter cut the peripheral anchor pippins from the treated hide ("Discarded Parchment as Writing Support in English Manuscript Culture", in *English Manuscript Studies 1100–1700. Vol. 17*, ed. A.S.G. Edwards and O. Da Rold (London: British Library, 2012), 240–41, 248; see also §§ 1.3–1.4, *supra*). Pebble holes are not listed here since, while holes in offcut zone parchment tend to be rounded and often pebble *sized*, the hypothesis lacks a solid evidentiary base. No modern parchmenter I consulted endorsed such a practice, nor does the medieval or early modern literature report it. Typical praxis is for the first cut (freeing hide from frame) to leave behind the attachment points, often with a thin strip tracing the hide's full perimeter. To minimize wasted hide, parchmenters situate pippins as close to the edge of the skin as possible, leaving little to no selvage on the frame-side of the attachment point. The wet hide is wrapped closely around the pebble and tied-off, creating a puckered, unscrapeable rawhide ridge. Thickness and texture of parchment surrounding the small, rounded holes fails to match this profile; entirely excising the zone would yield a significant gap. Holes cut into finished parchment with sharp implements show characteristic sharp, irregular edges which deviate from those of the small, round holes oft congregating in offcuts. In "Classics on Scraps", Kwakkel reports slender channels occasionally cut in parchment, stretching from hole to sheet edge, and related to the practice (115). I have never encountered the feature, and the latter article gives no shelfmark, but Kwakkel has directed me to a suspected example (personal communication, 21 June 2021). Follow-up awaits post-COVID reopening of the repository in question.

230 Kwakkel, "Commercial Organization"; idem, "Discarded Parchment".

descriptions for them, and identify other potential diagnostic traits, I conducted *in situ* analyses of those manuscripts copied on offcuts referenced by Kwakkel—including Oxford, Bodleian Library, MSS Douce 25 and Rawlinson B.467; London, British Library, Hargrave MS 433 and Harley MS 2851; and Oxford, Jesus College Library, MS 20—as well as of modern samples of offcut parchment.

I augmented this list with addition of a number of small-format codices known to have been produced in later medieval England, subjecting this β corpus to preliminary assessment for bifolia exhibiting suggested offcut characteristics. This yielded a short-list of *core manuscripts*, exhibiting at least some target features; from these manuscripts,[231] I gathered the data which underpinned the next stage of the process. Guided by further in situ observations of the parchment in those codices, together with reference to the relevant literature,[232] I refined the original feature list, yielding twenty potential 'offcut diagnostic traits', listed below.[233] Given that I intended to conduct statistical analyses, I then established my *variables* (a concept we might gloss as analytical 'placeholders' for particular features). Variables may be of several types. The value of a *continuous variable* is scalar and determined via counting or measurement, e.g., height, extent of folia, or degree of gelatinization of a given parchment bifolium. By contrast, a *categorical variable* encompasses two or more categories which evince no intrinsic hierarchy, e.g., hair colour, primary textual genre, or presence or absence of medieval repair attempts on a given parchment bifolium. I coded the twenty traits as either categorical (CAT) or continuous (CON) variables,[234] as follows:

---

231 To wit: London, British Library, Egerton MS 613, Hargrave MS 433, Harley MS 3817; Oxford, Bodleian Library, MSS Digby 2, Digby 4, Digby 5, Douce 16, Douce 25, and Rawlinson C.22.

232 Of necessity, these stages of the project were highly iterative.

233 See § 1.4 for additional discussion, and *figs. 1.02–1.14* in volume two for images.

234 Most of these traits were coded as continuous, and evaluated based on extent or severity.

1. SZE: undersized[235] (CON)
2. GAP: edge-gaps (CON)
3. KER: keratinization / gelatinization (CON)
4. WHL: wheals[236] (CON)
5. TLN: tool-marks / 'tooling'[237] (CON)
6. GRN: grain patterning (CON)
7. STR: striae (stretch marks) (CON)
8. FLH: hair follicles, lingering hair (CON)
9. PLQ: plaque-type blemishes[238] (CON)
10. HOL: holes (CAT)
11. DLM: delamination or peeling (CON)
12. HYL: variable hyalinity[239] (CON)
13. INK: poor ink adherence[240] (CON)
14. DSC: staining or discolouration (CON)
15. TXR: rough or porous texture (CON)
16. SRF: slickly vitreous, greasy (CON)
17. TCK: uneven thickness or weight (CAT)
18. ONS: 'onionskin' weight, texture (CAT)
19. RGD: rigidity (stiffness, limpness) (CON)
20. REP: medieval repair attempts[241] (CAT).

After coding, I created a suitable data-entry form and data-entry protocol. Following the latter protocol, I revisited my core manuscript set *in situ*, carefully reassessing each codex, bifolium by bifolium. For every bifolium, I recorded presence (or absence) and/or intensity or extent for all twenty variables, finishing by assigning a provisional 'verdict': a rating of confidence in each bifolium's offcut status (negative, uncertain, possible, positive).

The above process generated 8 940 data points across 447 bifolia. I subjected this mass of data to preliminary statistical testing, specifically, a type of multiple linear regression analysis known

---

235 *Size* refers to smaller size (i.e., narrowness and/or shortness), gauged relative to adjacent bifolia.

236 *Wheals*: See n. 120, *supra*.

237 *Tool-marks*, or tooling, include flay-marks, stippling, knife strokes, signs of shaving.

238 *Plaques*: small, slightly-raised, rough, discoloured patches on the parchment, almost resembling scabs.

239 *Variable hyalinity* refers to patches of heightened translucency or opacity.

240 Signs of *ink adherence* issues include flaking and blurring.

241 On *medieval repair attempts* (i.e., sewn-up rips, patching, scarfing), see p. 36 and n. 123, *supra*.

as ANOVA (ANalysis Of VAriance).[242] In this case, the analysis was used to identify correlations between offcut status and each of the twenty proposed diagnostic traits (i.e., to predict the offcut status of a given bifolium based on that bifolium's physical traits). Results revealed that many hypothesized offcut traits—specifically, holes, hyalinity, plaque-type blemishes, delamination, rough or greasy surface texture, atypical thickness, 'onionskin' thinness, limpness, and medieval intervention attempts—show exceptionally low diagnostic power: that is, they do not reliably identify offcut zone parchment. Discolouration (which approaches significance) and hair follicles (weakly significant) also may not be reliable markers of offcut zone status. Instead, the most robustly predictive attributes appear to be shape (i.e., edge-gaps), grain patterning, and striations, along with gelatinization, wheals or sheep-windows, poor ink adhesion, tool marks, and size (*table 2.01*). For ease of reference, I designated this latter, more robustly predictive set of characteristics *primary diagnostic traits*.

2.2.2. Stage 2

Having established the most reliable features to keep an eye peeled for during an offcut-hunt, I compiled a list of several hundred manuscript codices[243] produced in England between c. 1200 and c. 1500, and measuring roughly 150 mm or less along their tallest dimension. I visited these codices

---

242 Statistical tests use data taken from samples of a population to make inferences about that population. ANOVA is statistical method used to test hypotheses by modelling the relationship between explanatory variables.

243 This was accomplished via consultation of printed, manuscript, and digital finding aids for target repositories; see § 5.2.1, *infra*, for further discussion. Finding aids consulted included the open-shelf, unpublished indexes in the British Library Manuscript Reading Room, the various repositories' in-house digital catalogues, and items listed in the "Finding Aids" section of the Bibliography. Not listed are the numerous finding aids I consulted for repositories not included in this study's final corpus.

in situ and, following production of a conventional codicological description, assessed each book for offcut zone parchment by, as previously, paging through, leaf by leaf, recording traits and assigning a verdict of offcut status for every bifolium. Rejecting codices that appeared completely devoid of offcuts yielded the present corpus: 140 production units (= 5 895 bifolia) distributed across seventy-five codices. Many members of this corpus evince elevated structural complexity. Composite manuscripts and messy extended production units[244] are common, along with erratic admixtures of writing supports (e.g., offcut parchment, non-offcut parchment, and paper in a single codex, in no particular order), and sometimes downright anarchic collation patterns.[245] In light of these characteristics—and, as noted above, due to a dearth of fully offcut manuscripts, and resultant focus on offcut use *in* manuscripts—this second stage of the project analyzed production units (hereafter 'units'). For each unit, in addition to percentage of offcut zone bifolia, I recorded textual contents, assigning a basic primary genre (see discussions in §§ 2.3 and 4.2, *infra*), along with a range of other (mostly material) characteristics, including approximate production date(s); dimensions (i.e., height and width) and writing area dimensions;[246] number of folia; collation formula; scripts, hand(s), and line height;[247] presence or absence of paratextual features (e.g., running heads, foliation, etc.), as well

---

244 Respectively, manuscripts "consist[ing] of several independently produced parts" drawn together into a single codex in one or more compilation stages, and those consisting of a set of quires initially created as a codicological unity, then expanded in subsequent production stage(s) (Erik Kwakkel, "Late Medieval Text Collections: A Codicological Typology Based on Single-Author Manuscripts", in *Author, Reader, Book*, ed. E. Kwakkel and S. Partridge (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2012), 58, 60–61).

245 I take these features as signs of what I dub 'open' or 'recursive production' (i.e., persistent, heavy intervention or supplementation, by one or more hands, likely over an extended period of time); see chapter four's discussion of London, British Library, Harley MS 912 for an example of such a case.

246 Width and height, both in millimetres.

247 This value was calculated by measuring the height of ten lines and dividing the result by ten.

as of rubrication and other visual emphatics (e.g., line-fillers, coloured paraphs, etc.), with number of colours used therein; and hierarchy of initials (i.e., number of levels in hierarchy, initials types included) (see §§ 2.3.1–2.3.3, *infra*). Analysis of these characteristics underpinned the next phase of the project.

2.3. Overview of Findings

Nearly two-thirds of our 140 units dated from the fourteenth century, with just over one-quarter dating from the fifteenth, and the remainder dating from the thirteenth or (rarely) slightly earlier.[248] Preliminary analysis of the corpus' textual scope manifested a distinct generic skew with half of the units (*n*=70) holding legal materials, and the other half (*n*=70) bearing a broad range of content including scientific and medical materials; grammar, rhetoric, philosophy, and logic; works of history and canonical literature; devotional and theological texts; calendars and other Fachliteratur; magic and astronomy; and so on, including some unclassifiable or strongly miscellaneous collections (see, e.g., Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Douce 52). These two halves of the corpus will be unpacked and analyzed in depth in chapters three and four, respectively. Here it suffices to note that, since the many generic categories represented among the non-legal units proved too small for viable statistical analysis, I merged more or less complementary topics into larger sets, generating two roughly balanced (albeit imperfect) groups: one, 'Triv' (*n*=34), based on the trivium, with addition of a few related miscellaneous units; the other, 'Quad' (*n*=36), based on the quadrivium, with the addition of

---

248 Twelfth century (*n*=2): 1.4% of corpus, thirteenth century (*n*=15): 10.7%, fourteenth century (*n*=83): 59.3%, fifteenth century (*n*=38): 27.1%. Several of units hovered around the dividing line between centuries, and could, potentially, have been dated slightly later or earlier. This study took c.1200 as a (very) loose terminus a quo for inclusion.

medical texts and some other materials.[249] Thus our corpus consists of three loose subcorpora: Legal, Triv, and Quad.

These subcorpora diverged in the proportion of offcut zone parchment found within their constituent units (*table 2.02*). As a whole, the writing support of units in our corpus consisted of an average of close to one-third (29.6%) offcut zone parchment. In aggregate, neither the legal units nor the non-legal units deviated especially far from this figure, coming in at 27.8% and 31.3% offcut, respectively. Yet the percentage for non-legal units conceals a secret. When split into its constituent subcorpora, we find the lowest and highest percentages of offcuts in our study: 24.4% for Triv and 37.8% for Quad. In other words, whereas less than a quarter of constituent bifolia in Triv units are offcuts, nearly four-in-ten Quad bifolia meet the criteria: our medical and scientific manuscripts are nearly half as offcut again as our books of theology and *belles lettres* (with our law books falling in the middle, albeit much closer to the second, Triv, group). These groups of units differ in other material features, as well—that is, the English offcut corpus is not homogenous. To acquire a sense of the differences, we will explore these subcorpora, and the corpus as a whole, via overarching 'families' of related physical characteristics—**format**, **structure**, and **ornament**—each, in turn, consisting of several distinct metrics (explained below).

2.3.1. Format

Our first family of material features, **format**, encompasses variation in the length and width of units (i.e., of the text block as a whole, excluding the binding), both across the corpus and within the main

---

[249] Quad and Triv are synthetic categories loosely based upon the medieval disciplinary division of the quadrivium and trivium. The contents of the present subcorpora do *not* map cleanly to the trivium and quadrivium. For full discussion of these groupings, see chapter four.

subcorpora, along with related metrics based on writing area length and width. The former set (i.e., based on unit length and width) consists of the following metrics (*table 2.03*):[250]

- *dimension* (DM): each unit's longest dimension (in millimetres);
- *ratio* (RT): a value arrived at by dividing a unit's width by its height;[251]
- *taille* ('size') (TL): a value arrived at by adding a unit's height and width.[252]

Since current dimensions of a manuscript may deviate from original measurements (as a result of trimming during rebinding and other factors), I also considered the dimensions, ratio, and taille for each unit's writing area, again in millimetres (*table 2.04*).

In evaluating these metrics, we most immediately notice differences in size. The average manuscript in our corpus has a longest dimension of about 126 mm; our legal subcorpus sits very close to this figure, with members of the scientific and medical subcorpus averaging ever so slightly shorter. Our Triv units offer a small surprise; they average nearly half a centimetre longer than the corpus average, almost a full centimetre longer than our smallest units (Quad), and show a relatively small range of sizes. The ratio and taille metrics reveal similar, though not identical, patterns, as do the writing area metrics (albeit somewhat less dramatically): Triv units trend rather large compared to units in the other subcorpora, and especially as compared to Quad units (they are also more

---

250 This measurement excludes bindings: it is based on folia size, as measured along edges. Dimensions were rounded to the nearest 5 mm.

251 On *ratio*, see: Peter Gumbert, "Sizes and Formats", in *Ancient and Medieval Book Materials and Techniques*, ed. M. Maniaci and P. Munafò (Città del Vaticano: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1993), 1:227–63.

252 On *taille*, see: Denis Muzerelle, « Pour revenir sur et à la ‹ taille › des manuscrits » (in *Les débuts du codex*, éd. A. Blanchard (Brepols: Turnhout, 1989), 125–56), but *cf*. Gumbert « Livre grand, livre petit: Un problème de taille » (*Gazette du livre médiéval* 38 (2001): 55–58) on the issues arising from taille, and his proposal to classify manuscripts based solely on height.

consistent in size). This finding of greater size is intriguing given Triv units' relatively lower reliance on offcut zone parchment. With larger bifolia, we might expect to identify offcut diagnostic traits on more leaves (i.e., as overtly low-quality edges are trimmed away, the overall manuscript grows smaller). Yet this does not appear to be the case; perhaps producers and users of Triv units were less complacent about parchment quality.

2.3.2. Structure

In like fashion, variation in our units' basic codicological **structure**, both across the corpus and within the subcorpora, was quantified and evaluated through three different metrics (*table 2.05*):

- *quire count* (QC): 'count' or overall number of quires per unit;
- *quire types* (QT): number of distinct quire structures (e.g., quaternions, sexternions, etc.);
- *quire median* (QM): median quire type, that is, the average quire structure.

These metrics yielded rather less striking outcomes. The number of quires per unit showed by far the greatest variability, with the mean law unit containing an unusually high number of quires—over another third as many as the mean of the entire corpus, twice as many as the mean for Triv, and nearly four times as many quires as the mean Quad units. That is, the law units in our corpus tend to hold forth at length. One might assume that this discrepancy arises from legal units being copied in larger hands than the rest of the corpus, yet the opposite proves true: legal units are copied in the smallest hands of the entire corpus; the largest appear in Quad units (*table 2.06*).[253] Law units show a slightly elevated diversity of quire types, as well, i.e., these units tend to contain a greater variety of types of quire. Nonetheless, the mean legal gathering sits quite close to a standard quire of eight,

---

253 Mean line height, legal units: 3.5 mm, Quad units: 3.9 mm, Triv units: 3.8 mm (corpus mean: 3.7 mm).

whereas Quad and Triv gatherings are more likely to incorporate longer quires. The reasons for these fairly trivial discrepancies remain unclear, as do possible links to use of offcut zone parchment.

2.3.3. Ornamentation

Finally, **ornamentation** measures encompassed post-copying aesthetic–paratextual additions, such as decorative initials and coloured rubrics, specifically (*tables 2.07–2.13*):

- *gilding* (GL): use of (shell or leaf) gold in decorative elements;
- *hierarchy of initials* (HI): uppermost level in the unit's hierarchy of initials;
- *rubrication* (RB): presence or absence of rubrics, and number of colours therein.

Across our 140 units, twenty-seven boast gold decoration. With but a sole pair of exceptions,[254] all of these gilded units contain legal materials, and so will be considered in greater detail when we turn our attention to the pertinent cluster in chapter three. For the moment, note that the current study found non-legal offcut units are almost never gilded. Other more ostentatious forms of decoration, such as miniatures or elaborate borders, prove in even shorter supply.[255] Yet the English offcut corpus is not entirely devoid of ornament. As has been explained more comprehensively by other researchers, far from solely aesthetic in nature, decoration in medieval manuscripts plays a role in signalling textual structure (i.e., distinctions in formal and/or functional importance of constituent parts) via a hierarchy of elements, such that greater size and formal complexity correlate with elevated importance. At the heart of this system sits the "hierarchy of initials" in which ornamental

---

254 Namely, Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 476 [A] and [B] (ff. 1–40 and 41–120). Strikingly, MS 476's final two production units (ff. 121–160 and 161–172) *do* belong to the legal cluster. Thus, while most of the codex does not contain legal materials, the above units nonetheless travel with such content.

255 The corpus contains one miniature (in Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 476 [A]). Diagrams and tables, by contrast, are not uncommon in these units; see descriptions in the appendixes.

or 'painted' initials[256] of varying style and size mark different levels of textual subdivision. While most manuscripts seem to make do with only a few, less complex kinds of initials, a full hierarchy might run,[257] in decreasing order,

1. *historiated initial*: major initial, usually in colours and gold, depicting an identifiable figure(s) or narrative, often one connected to the text;
2. *decorated initial*: major initial, usually in colours and gold, depicting a non-identifiable figure(s) or narrative;
3. *foliate initial*: initial rendered in colours on a gold ground, typically with foliate motifs;
4. *dentelle initial* (a.k.a. *champ initial*): initial in gold on a coloured ground;
5. *littera duplex* (pl. *litteræ duplices*; a.k.a. *puzzle initial*): initial composed of interlocking forms in colours separated by white negative space, usually with penwork flourishing (in which case it may be termed a *filigree puzzle initial*);
6. *littera florissa* (pl. *litteræ florissæ*; a.k.a. *filigree initial*): plain initial, flourished, usually in a contrasting colour, with geometric and foliate motifs;
7. *Lombard initial*: plain initial, preceded by a line-break, enlarged and usually in colour, but lacking further embellishment.

---

256 Following Peter Gumbert, I use *initial* to denote "a display letter which opens a major section of the text, and is preceded by a line break (unless it is itself the very first letter of the text)", as distinct from a *littera notabilior* which does not follow a line-break and is designed to clarify syntax ("Times and Places for Initials", *Quærendo* 39 (2009), 304–05).

257 I borrowed "decorated" from Michelle P. Brown, *Understanding Illuminated Manuscripts* (London: British Library, 2004), 47, to account for initials deviating from the types listed by Albert Derolez, *The Palaeography of Gothic Manuscript Books* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 41–42 and citations therein.

Additionally, due to the plainness of many offcut units, this study specifies a further category,

8. *null*: no decorated initials of any type, with or without space left for them to be added.

Nearly all of these levels of decorative initials make an appearance in our corpus (*table 2.07*), though the limners' skill oft proves wanting, and some levels are thin on the ground. For instance, our 140 unit corpus boasts seven units containing litteræ duplices sitting at the peak of their hierarchy of initials, plus a further seven with dentelle initials occupying that position. Given that surpassingly few medieval manuscripts contain every form of initial, this relative paucity should not surprise us, and the lacunae are not necessarily informative. Regardless, analytical results suggest, at best, a moderately decorated corpus—although the picture changes when we consider the distribution of decoration across the three main subcorpora (Law, Triv, and Quad). Subcorpus-based analyses (*table 2.08*) show a well-initialled Triv subcorpus, juxtaposed with a rather plain Quad, with Law sitting between them.[258]

Decoration in western medieval manuscripts is not limited to the elements described above, of course. While the offcut corpus tends to lack miniatures, elaborate borders, and other higher-order decorative features, it regularly includes the standard range of scribal or visual emphatics such as rubrics, coloured paraphs, heightening of majuscules,[259] coloured sublineation, line-fillers, and so on. Often added to the manuscript page in colours after the text had been copied, these aesthetico-paratextual elements simultaneously function as ornamentation and facilitate textual navigation through provision of structural clarification. Codicologists generally extend the term 'rubrication' to cover the tiny details, and yet, strictly speaking, they are not rubrics—indeed, few units in our corpus

---

[258] For instance, all litteræ duplices appear in legal units, as do nearly all gilded initials. Almost three-quarters of units boasting litteræ florissæ appear in Law and Triv, with Quad units much more modest.

[259] That is, marking each majuscule with a dot or stroke of colour, most often red or yellow.

feature rubrics *sensu stricto*—nor, despite the term's etymology, are they rendered solely in red. Nonetheless, for clarity and ease of reference, this study collectively refers to such elements as 'rubrics' or 'rubrication'.

Given that rubrication in later medieval European manuscripts typically appear in red, blue, or some combination of red and blue, frequently alternating between the two, the next analysis split the corpus into three groups: those with rubrics in multiple colours, a single colour, or no colours (i.e., omitted or in the same ink as the main text).[260] While the corpus as a whole contains roughly equal numbers of units with mono- and multicolour rubrics, with fewer containing no coloured rubrics, relative proportions between clusters deviate from this pattern (*tables 2.09–2.10*). Similar to other ornamentation metrics, the Law subcorpus sits close to the corpus mean, with Triv more ornate, and Quad more plain.[261]

2.3.4. Material Features and Offcut Use

This study's ultimate focus, however, is recruitment of offcut zone parchment as writing support. At the head of section 2.3, we saw how our subcorpora diverged in their embrace of offcut writing support, with the most striking contrast arising between Triv and Quad (*table 2.02*).[262] Do we find any correlations between reliance on offcuts and the other patterns identified above—namely, the divergences in elements of ornamentation and other features? To answer this question, I investigated

---

260 Mean number of rubrication colours, full corpus, 2+ (*n*=58): 41.4% of corpus; 1 (*n*=54): 38.6% of corpus; no coloured rubrics (*n*=28): 20.0% of corpus.

261 Mean number of rubrication colours, Triv: 1.38, Quad: 0.94, Law: 1.29, corpus: 1.22. Only three Triv units lack coloured rubrics; Triv also includes our sole example of tricolour trimming (Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 472 [A]).

262 Percentage of offcut zone bifolia, Triv: 24.4%; Quad: 37.8%; Law: 27.8%; full corpus: 29.6%.

the relationship of each of the foregoing measures to extent of offcut zone bifolia. Since the clearest associations emerge with decorative elements, this is where we shall focus our attention.

Presence of gold perhaps constitutes one of the more immediately overt comparison points. As we have seen, less than a fifth of the corpus boasts gilded decoration. The correlation between gilding and extent of offcut usage is particularly strong with gilded units incorporating roughly 40% less offcut zone parchment than their non-gilded counterparts,[263] though the latter group evinces somewhat greater variance (see *table 2.11*). The imbalance in initial types in our corpus—with some levels missing or infrequent—complicates application of statistical methods. In order to address this imbalance and ensure robust analyses, each unit in the corpus was classified based on the highest level of initial in its hierarchy, with the resultant categories merged into groups of relatively equal size. Calculating median offcut use for each group revealed an association between less ostentatious decoration and greater percentage of offcut zone bifolia (see *table 2.12*). For units wherein gilded elements[264] topped the decorative hierarchy, only one-fifth of bifolia consisted of offcut zone parchment. As initials grew plainer, the extent of offcut zone bifolia rose steadily, peaking at about 40% offcut for units lacking initials and space left for initials.[265] Experiments with reclustering—such as, for instance, ignoring use of gold, instead relying on the strict hierarchy of initials—showed persistence of this general correlation between extent of offcut zone parchment and the highest level

---

263 That is, the parchment within units boasting gold decoration is less than one-fifth (19.2%) offcut, as compared to a third (32.0%) offcut for non-gilded units.

264 Here, a synthetic category comprising all gold elements in the corpus, to wit: foliate, dentelle, and historiated initials, along with three litteræ florissæ, one littera duplex, and the corpus' lone miniature.

265 Percentage offcut by highest level in hierarchy of initials: gilded (*n*=27): 19.2%; florissæ (*n*=46): 25.1%; Lombards (*n*=37): 37.5%; no initials (*n*=33): 33.1%; of the latter, no initials and no spaces left for initials to be added (*n*=19): 39.3%.

of decorative initial in a given unit. A similar association becomes apparent upon shifting our attention to rubrication. Units with single-colour, plain ink, or missing rubrication contained nearly 50% more offcut zone bifolia than units featuring rubrics in two or more colours (*table 2.13*).[266] Thus, more modest ornamentation—and, especially, a lack of ornamentation—is associated with a greater proportion of offcut zone parchment writing support.

2.4. Conclusion

Much remains to be uncovered about the medieval offcut manuscript corpus. For instance, the extent to which the findings outlined earlier in this chapter function as a loose proxy for other factors—such as date or location of production, or changes in production contexts, economic conditions, educational or professional praxis, and so on—remains somewhat uncertain. The question will be explored in chapters three and four, with further attempts to resolve this, and other, puzzles forming part of my postdoctoral research. Nonetheless, on the basis of the evidence and factual analysis presented above, some intriguing new insights and conclusions can be advanced. First, the current offcut corpus is dominated by *Fachliteratur*, or what George R. Keiser termed "practical books for the gentleman":[267] functional, serviceable reference works. Their material and textual details suggest that a significant proportion were copied for personal consultation—whether in the home, the classroom, or the work environment (the latter two categories potentially overlapping)—although some perhaps constitute down-market, commercial copies exploiting cheaper writing support to place them within reach of a guildsman's pocket. Striking here is the corpus' peculiar lacunae: a

---

266 Percentage offcut zone bifolia in units with no coloured rubrication (*n*=28): 32.3%, single-colour rubrication (*n*=54): 35.6%, multicoloured rubrication (*n*=58): 22.6%.

267 George R. Keiser, "Practical Books for the Gentleman", in *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain, Vol. 3*, ed. J.B. Trapp and L. Hellinga (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 470.

near-complete dearth of genres usually regarded as relatively cheap, widely produced, and aimed at vernacular audiences (e.g., women and children), such as primers, devotional works, and vernacular romances. As outliers or contexts 'where offcuts aren't' (or, at least, where they scarcely appear) these texts warrant their own discussion—especially in light of Erik Kwakkel's observation that, by contrast, a significant proportion of extant Middle Dutch literary manuscripts of the fourteenth century were copied on offcut parchment.[268] Regardless, in the later medieval English context, offcuts seem strongly linked to production of practical (oft professional?) reference texts in non-commercial or para-commercial contexts. Why should this be the case?

Most likely a variety of attitudes and motivations underpinned adoption of offcut zone parchment as writing support—to wit, tensions between quality and economy, or broader concerns about costs; possible supply-chain issues; and the roles of necessity, convenience, or outright indifference (some light *might* be shed on the latter by signs of embracing offcuts versus attempts to conceal them; see chapter four). It stands to reason that spreading "script literacy"[269] is implicated here, as well, along with increasingly varied contexts of book production and use—particularly more hidden or less discussed milieux such as production external to 'the market' as conventionally understood, and for diverse types of reading. Displacement of aesthetic concerns by more pragmatic considerations, such as sheer convenience, undoubtedly constituted a major component of offcuts' appeal, particularly for codices fulfilling functions akin to modern paperbacks, note-taking apps, jotting pads, or personal notebooks. For those with the requisite degree of script-literacy, perhaps the simplest and most efficient method of mitigating production costs was to copy the book yourself, and

---

268 Personal communication; see also: Kwakkel, "Discarded Parchment", 259 n.49 and citations therein.

269 Jean-Pascal Pouzet, "Book Production Outside Commercial Contexts", in *The Production of Books in England 1350–1500*, ed. A. Gillespie and D. Wakelin (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 220.

the cost of a volume for personal use, with little concern for aesthetic niceties, could be further attenuated through selection of lower-quality writing support—such as offcuts.[270] Recruitment of down-grade supports like offcuts may speak to the status of the materials these books carry, too.

Not all scribes copied for themselves or privileged practicality over visual appeal, however, and other factors likely encouraged a scribe to choose offcuts. Then, as now, those seeking a book might 'make do': economic constraints compel us to await the paperback instead of buying the hardcover, and students (including the author of this dissertation) frequently photocopy or scan entire library copies, or otherwise pirate whole books and other assorted scholarly materials. In like fashion, selection of low-quality parchment and offcuts could be driven by financial necessity. In later medieval Europe, second-hand codices remained not only in ready supply but "central … to lettered activity",[271] with some volumes in active circulation for at least a century.[272] Such books

---

270 Freed of client-imposed deadlines, persons creating a book for themselves might also extend production into an ongoing process of expansion and updating as opportunity permitted—an approach which might help explain the irregular nature of some manuscripts in our corpus. Such an approach is discussed with reference to specific manuscripts in our corpus in chapter four.

271 Michael Johnston and Michael van Dussen, "Introduction", in *The Medieval Manuscript Book: Cultural Approaches* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), 6–9 at 7–8; C. Paul Christianson ("The Rise of London's Book-Trade", in *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain, Vol. 3*, ed. J.B. Trapp and L. Hellinga (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 132–33); Malcolm B. Parkes (*Their Hands*, 42; and idem, "The Provision of Books", in *The History of the University of Oxford, Vol. 2*, ed. J.I. Catto and R. Evans (Oxford: Clarendon, 1992), 418–19) offer additional details on medieval England's secondhand book market.

272 C. Paul Christianson, *Directory of London Stationers and Book Artisans, 1300–1500* (New York: Bibliographical Society of America, 1990), 82. Given the manifold ways to re-use manuscripts—scraping or washing leaves to support other texts; breaking for recycling into bookbindings, glue, etc.—most currently extant manuscripts' usage as books surely stretched across their entire medieval existence, reaching beyond Christianson's century.

tended to be cheaper than new copies.[273] Nonetheless, rising demand and market diversification during our period drove steady escalation in manuscript production, and helped furnish individuals seeking new books with a greater variety of options.[274] Would-be owners of new books were able to make direct, ad hoc arrangements with paid scribes by roughly 1300.[275] The end product, however—generally a plain text in loose quires—required subsequent arrangements with other book artisans, such as limners or a binder,[276] engendering further expense and delay.[277] Stationers offered another viable option. In addition to selling used codices, many stationers in Continental Europe offered 'one-stop' convenience by acting as subcontractors between artisans and those commissioning a new manuscript. The available evidence suggests that, by the later fifteenth century, some of their English counterparts fulfilled similar roles.[278]

Regardless of precise labour arrangements, however, a new manuscript did not come cheaply. Surviving itemized bills show scribal wages consuming "the lion's share" of a book's cost,[279] with

---

273 Parkes, *Their Hands*, 42.

274 Kwakkel, "Commercial Organization", 191.

275 Pouzet, "Book Production", 222. Although recent research on medieval English scribes has endeavoured to differentiate 'professional' from 'commercial' artisans, this distinction falls beyond the scope of the current study (see: Parkes, *Their Hands*, ch. 3; Linne R. Mooney, "Vernacular Literary Manuscripts and Their Scribes", in *The Production of Books in England 1350–1500*, ed. A. Gillespie and D. Wakelin (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 192–94, *et pass*.; and eadem, *Locating Scribal Activity in Late-Medieval London* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2008)).

276 On specialization in the book trade, see Christianson, *Directory*; Michael A. Michael, "English Illuminators c. 1190–1450: A Survey from Documentary Sources", in *English Manuscript Studies 1100–1700, Vol. 4*, ed. P. Beal and J. Griffiths (Oxford: Blackwell, 1993), 62–113; and Malcolm Parkes, "A List of Medieval Oxford Stationers", *The Library* 17, no. 2 (2016): 167–78.

277 Kwakkel, "Commercial Organization", 176–77.

278 Kwakkel, "Commercial Organization", 177–81, *et pass*.; Mooney, "Vernacular Literary Manuscripts".

279 Pouzet, "Book Production", 220.

fees ranging from at least twice to over five times as much as the second-highest component, namely, writing support.[280] Joanne Filippone Overty, for instance, found that labour accounted for roughly 74% and parchment 12% (20 *d*. and 6 *d*.) of total expenses for Cambridge, Peterhouse Library, MS 88, and roughly 80% and parchment 15% (16 *d*. and 3 *d.* per quire, respectively) of total expenses for Peterhouse, MSS 110, 114, 142, and 192 (all s. xv).[281] The development of faster, cheaper scripts enabled consumers to mitigate some of the expense,[282] and writing support presented producers and consumers with a further palette of cost-reducing choices. In chapter one (pp. 26–27), we saw how sporadic references in surviving records demonstrate that multiple grades of parchment remained available throughout the later Middle Ages with "[d]ifferent categories of … books mobiliz[ing] different resources".[283] Thus, along with potential supply-chain vagaries, major considerations shaping book artisans' choice of materials likely included their desired market segment, as well as

---

280 Overty, "The Cost of Doing Scribal Business", 5–6; Kwakkel, "Commercial Organization", 183.

281 Given the dimensions of these codices (338×458 mm for MS 88, 290×420 mm for the others), size may (Overty, "The Cost of Doing Scribal Business", 6), or may not (Gullick, "From Parchmenter to Scribe", 151) be implicated in the discrepancy. Either way, account records for two London Bridge antiphoners similarly show 56% of costs going to scribal labour, as compared to 20% to parchment (Overty, "The Cost of Doing Scribal Business", 6; C. Paul Christianson, "The Rise of London's Book-Trade", in *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain, Vol. 3: 1400–1557*, ed. L. Hellinga and J.B. Trapp (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 132. For further details on book prices, see: Parkes, *Their Hands*, 48–49; R. Malcolm Hogg, "Some Thirteenth-Century English Book Prices", in *Thirteenth Century England 5*, ed. P.R. Coss and S.D. Lloyd (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1995), 179–94; H.E. Bell, "The Price of Books in Medieval England", *The Library* 17, no. 3 (1936–1937): 312–32; K. Harris, "Patrons, Buyers, and Owners: The Evidence for Ownership, and the Role of Book Owners in Book Production and the Book Trade", in *Book Production and Publishing in Britain 1375–1475*, ed. J. Griffiths and D. Pearsall (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 163–99).

282 Kwakkel, "Commercial Organization", 184–85.

283 Pouzet, "Book Production", 222.

the budgets and preferences of their existing clientele—factors rooted in underlying "hierarchical attitudes to materials".[284] Use of recycled supports such as palimpsests[285] or other less-desirable options could play a significant role in limiting production costs, and savvy consumers saved a few shillings by opting for lower grade parchment, or even offcuts[286]—though the evidence hints that some might not have been pleased with the trade-off. New York, Pierpont Morgan Library, MS B.21, a pocket-sized (156×115 mm) medical miscellany written and decorated in East Anglia during the first half of the fifteenth century, opens with a calendar for Norwich featuring several leaves (e.g., ff. 2, 7, 9, 10, 12, 13) exhibiting the edge-effects characteristic of offcut zone parchment: unusual shortness relative to adjacent bifolia, edge-gaps, gelatinization, grain patterning, and striations. Yet the calendar's scribe took care to render the offending bifolia less conspicuous by concealing especially misshapen and/or gelatinized edges (e.g., ff. 10, 12, 13) within the volume's gutter—a very atypical orientation of this particular feature.[287] In this case, the extra care put into making the offcuts less obvious suggests a reluctance to incorporate them. This could suggest that reliance on offcuts in MS B.21 points either to overriding financial concerns, or to possible difficulty in tracking

---

284 Pouzet, "Book Production", 224.

285 Pouzet, "Book Production", 219.

286 Kwakkel, "Commercial Organization", 183, 185–87, 191.

287 Though not unheard of, orientation of edge-gaps and areas of intense gelatinization within the gutter of a manuscript was remarkably rare in our corpus: overwhelmingly, these traits sit towards the fore-edge and/or bottom edge of the book. The reason for this near-universal choice remains unclear. My working hypothesis is that unusually thick, stiff, or brittle regions of parchment, together with holes and shortness, likely interfered with sewing bifolia together into a gathering, and/or proved prone to cracking and breakage as a codex was repeatedly opened and closed during quotidian use. If my hypothesis is sound, deviations from the trend may suggest either a naïve book artisan or one labouring under the influence of keen aesthetic preoccupations.

down better parchment. (Further investigation of the book may shed more light.) Possible motivations underpinning use of offcuts thus might also include broader concerns about the cost of a volume, tensions between quality and economy, supply-chain issues, mere convenience, or even a measure of nonchalance. The example of MS B.21 illustrates how learning to identify specific material features (such as offcut traits), and then applying that knowledge with attention to those features (such as offcut use) can inform contextual questions, augmenting our understanding of the history and nature of an individual manuscript, as well as of the broader conditions of manuscript production and readership in later medieval England. With this in mind, it is time for us to turn to our corpus. Having just, so to speak, established some norms and rules, it seems only fitting to begin our exploration with the law.

CHAPTER 3: OFFCUTS IN LEGAL BOOKS

Let us turn our attention to our first example: London, British Library, Harley MS 6644, a small format, fourteenth-century collection of common law statutes. In this case, the overall impression is of a child, glorying in a fresh crimson crayon, having set to work on the pages—or else of a rubella outbreak. A swarm of paraphs glowers rufously. Each majuscule lurks beneath a scarlet shroud. Throughout the running headers, the marginal chapter numerals, the incipits and explicits of the statutes and associated capitula lists, every penstroke blazes darkly, blood on black, like a campfire coal. No blue, no green, no purple, no gilt, no white-space, no miniatures, no initials, no marginal doodles break the monotony; we receive only five score folia of paratextual and aesthetic erythema. (*fig. 3.01*).

This conspicuously rubescent manuscript (a unit to which we shall return later in this chapter) belongs to the largest subject matter in our corpus: legal texts. Comprising roughly half of our entire corpus, these units encompass every variety of common law statute collection, together with collections of writs, tracts and treatises on substantive and procedural law, notes on legal cases and judicial decisions, ecclesiastical and secular charters, legal glossaries and other linguistic aids, snippets of canon law treatises, and somewhat more miscellaneous conglomerations of administrative forms and other materials. That generic diversity complements a similar multiplicity in material features—though, as we shall see, one not devoid of underlying patterns. To that end, this chapter opens with a broad statistical overview of the legal half of our corpus, followed by closer analysis of the relationships between offcut zone parchment and specific generic and physical

features of these manuscripts. Finally, after exploring sociocultural associations of particular subtypes of these codices, we will finish with a pair of case studies engaging with specific items from our corpus in greater depth. Since content and design of manuscripts vary as a function of their intended use and audience, along with the associated conditions of production, turning our attention to questions of reception and use helps us interpret the material features before us. Before attempting to make statistical sense of this heterogeneous, occasionally even chaotic legal corpus, then, let us consider the context leading to production of these manuscripts by briefly examining common law's emergence and rise in importance, the training of common lawyers (the primary consumers of these manuscripts), and the main legal genres in later medieval England.

3.1. Common Law in Context

This chapter focuses on works of English common law, that is, the law representing the exercise of royal (jurisdictional) authority in England.[288] The system emerged during the later twelfth century as the norms of Chancery and the Curia Regis came to "virtually displace local custom", with the king's courts—whether at Westminster or on general eyre—increasingly superseding communal and

---

288 John Baker, *An Introduction to English Legal History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019), 33; Richard FitzNigel, *Dialogus de Scaccario*, ed. and tr. E. Amt and S.D. Church (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 90, 176, 178. Departing from the fixed, compendious codification of Roman civil or canon law, common law developed mainly "on the basis of decided cases and … the writ actions which they initiated", reflecting "prevailing custom and practice" (Anthony Musson, "Law and Text: Legal Authority and Judicial Accessibility in the Late Middle Ages", in *The Uses of Script and Print, 1300–1700*, ed. J. Crick and A. Walsham (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 96). Terms for 'common law' in the period included *jus regni* (law of the realm) and *lex terræ* (law of the land) (see Magna Carta (1215), c.39; (1225), c.29); *lex* and *jus* were not distinct in English common law as in Roman civil law (Baker, *Introduction*, 33–34 at 34 n.99).

seignorial alternatives.[289] From the reign of Henry II (1154–1189) through the first quarter of the fourteenth century, the law of the realm and associated royal judicial apparatus "expanded rapidly in scope and technical complexity",[290] and "large-scale legislative activity" in the second half of the thirteenth century yielded a flurry of statutes, regulations, ordinances, and related texts.[291] This same period saw the emergence and rapid proliferation of a professional class of common lawyers and other legal practitioners.[292] These shifts should not surprise us: later medieval England experienced a considerable degree of social unrest; as Ralph Hanna has pointed out, individuals and communities "need the law in situations where social unrest requires just dealing to be imposed by litigation".[293] As increasingly "large sections of the population … had reason to frequent the law courts in some capacity", they required some sense of the legislative landscape and procedural norms.[294] Thus the mushrooming importance and prominence of the common law, the growth of the legal profession, expansion of the courts, and heightened levels of legal activity generated an "exponential[]" rise in

---

289 Baker, *Introduction*, 16–17 and ch. 1 *pass*., quote at 17. For an overview of pre-Norman English law, and Norman reception of it, see: ibid., ch. 1–2. On common law's early development, see: Raoul C. Van Caenegem, *The Birth of the English Common Law* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988); John Hudson, *The Formation of the English Common Law* (New York: Routledge, 2018); idem, ed., *The Oxford History of the Laws of England, 2* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012).

290 Don C. Skemer, "Treatises, Tracts, and Compilations", in *The Cambridge Companion to Medieval English Law and Literature*, ed. C. Barrington and S. Sobecki (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2019), 67.

291 Paul Brand, *Kings, Barons, and Justices* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 409.

292 Jonathan Rose, "The Legal Profession in Medieval England: A History of Regulation", *Syracuse L. Rev.* 48 (1998), 112–13. Legal professions remained in flux in this era, and not everyone engaged in legal practice was what we would understand as a professional lawyer, i.e., *legis peritus* (John Baker, *The Men of Court 1440–1550* (London: Selden Society, 2012), 1:12–17).

293 Ralph Hanna, *London Literature, 1300–1380* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 53.

294 Claire Fennell, *A Middle English Statute-Book* (Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter, 2011), 1:xxvii.

legal documentary production.[295] By the end of the thirteenth century, documentary practices had permeated all levels of society. It was not uncommon for smallholders to possess and use seals,[296] and even the unlettered often demonstrated "a pragmatic knowledge of many textual forms [including] all manner of legal documents".[297] In sum, the period's boom in legal business elicited a boom in legal textual production.

The audience for legal literature in medieval England was remarkably broad,[298] encompassing members of the gentry and nobility, landowners and administrators, the mercantile classes and urban corporations, churchmen and ecclesiastical foundations, and even women—a population targeted with specially tailored legal treatises.[299] Nonetheless, law students and lawyers

---

295 Skemer, "Treatises, Tracts", 67.

296 Michael T. Clanchy, *From Memory to Written Record* (Oxford: Wiley Blackwell, 2012), 35–36.

297 Sheila Lindenbaum, "London Texts and Literate Practice", in *The Cambridge History of Medieval English Literature*, ed. D. Wallace (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 287; see also: Cynthia Neville, "Common Knowledge of the Common Law in Later Medieval England", *Canadian J. Hist*. 29, no. 3 (1994): 462–78.

298 Musson, "Law and Text", 99–100, 110; Don C. Skemer, "Reading the Law: Statute Books and the Private Transmission of Legal Knowledge in Late Medieval England", in *Learning the Law*, ed. J.A. Bush and A. Wijffels (London: Hambledon, 1999), 114–15, 128–29.

299 Musson, "Law and Text", 99, 109–110; Skemer, "Reading the Law", 114, 128; idem, "Sir William Breton's Book: Production of *Statuta Angliæ* in the Late Thirteenth Century", in *English Manuscript Studies: 1100–1600, Vol. 6*, ed. P. Beal and A.S.G. Edwards (Oxford: Blackwell, 1997), 24–51; Rosemarie Potz McGerr, "A Statute Book and Lancastrian Mirror for Princes: The Yale Law School Manuscript of the Nova Statute Angliæ", *Textual Cultures* 1, no. 2 (2006), 6–59; eadem, *A Lancastrian Mirror for Princes* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2011); Michael A. Michael, "A Manuscript Wedding Gift from Philippa of Hainault to Edward III", *The Burlington Magazine* 127, no. 990 (1985), 582+584–599; Adelaide Bennett, "Anthony Bek's Copy of Statuta Angliæ", in *England in the Fourteenth Century*, ed. W.M. Ormrod (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1986), 1–28.

likely remained the primary consumers of such volumes.[300] As such, they warrant more detailed attention—and, as we shall see, offcut zone parchment plays a central role in their manuscript culture. In order to make sense of the patterns in this half of our corpus, then, we now turn to law students and lawyers, as well as to the locus of greatest importance in our discussion of legal manuscript production: common law education. Although England's universities provided legal training from rather early on, their offerings were restricted to canon law and civil law.[301] By the second half of the thirteenth century, however, some form of school offering instruction in common law had emerged independent of the universities.[302] According to current scholarly consensus, this school was likely based at the Westminster courts,[303] where, in 1291, the bar was rearranged to

---

300 Paul Brand, "The Languages of the Law in Later Medieval England", in *Multilingualism in Later Medieval Britain*, ed. D.A. Trotter (Rochester: D.S. Brewer, 2000), 75.

301 Canon law was taught at Oxford by the 1190s, and both canon and civil law at Cambridge from the early 1200s (Nigel Ramsay, "Law", *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain, Vol. 2*, ed. N. Ramsay and R.M. Thomson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 261–62). Throughout the Middle Ages, curricula at these institutions remained restricted to these systems (Baker, *Introduction*, 170). Neither is relevant here as our corpus is devoid of their texts.

302 Paul Brand, *Observing and Recording the Medieval Bar and Bench at Work* (London: Selden Society, 1999), 15–18; John Baker, "Legal Education in London 1250–1850", in *Collected Papers on English Legal History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014), 1:273.

303 Henry III's notoriously ambiguous 1234 writ to the mayor and sheriffs of London (*CCR 1234–37*, 26) directing "that no law-teacher (*regens de legibus*) should teach school in the city" falls outside the parameters of the present discussion, but see: Baker, "Legal Education", 271–73 (quote at 271).

accommodate "apprentices to the bench".[304] Possibly as early as 1293 (21 Edw I), and certainly by Edward II's reign, apprentices spent part of their time within a specially-designated, cordoned-off area of the court from where they might watch and discuss the twists and turns of legal proceedings with occasional elucidating commentary from the Chief Justice himself.[305] In light of this, together with the absence of any known physical common law school, John Baker speculates that, at least early on, training occurred within the Court itself, possibly after it rose at midday.[306]

Yet medieval common law education consisted of more than sitting in a courtroom, struggling to stay awake whilst proceedings unfolded. Traces of pedagogical strategies survive in extant documents used in legal training exercises,[307] and this archival evidence suggests an

---

304 Brand, *Observing*, 15–18. First mentioned *temp*. Edward I, 'apprentices' likely existed under Henry III. Later denoting junior practitioners, the term "must at first have meant learners" (Baker, "Legal Education", 273; Paul Brand, "The Development of Professional Lawyers and a Legal Profession in the English Lay Courts: The Relationship between the Earliest Professional Lawyers and Their Clients", in *Patrons and Professionals in the Middle Ages*, ed. P. Binski and E.A. New (Donington: Shaun Tyas, 2012), 46). A 1287 record reports the presence of an Irishman at the Common Bench *causa addiscendi* ('for instruction') (Baker, "Legal Education", 274; Paul Brand, "Legal Education in England before the Inns of Court", in *Learning the Law*, ed. J.A. Bush and A. Wijffels (London: Hambledon, 1999), 62–74; idem, "Courtroom and Schoolroom: The Education of Lawyers in England Prior to 1400", *Historical Research* 60, no. 142 (1987), 60–61).

305 London, British Library, Stowe MS 386, ff. 125^{v}–126^{r}, a 1302 year-book report, describes how Ralph de Hengham CJ ended a case by "explaining a legal point [which it had] raised … for the benefit of the apprentices" present in the courtroom; "the same thing seems also to have been done on occasion by his successors" (Brand, "Courtroom and Schoolroom", 151; see also: Baker, "Legal Education", 274; idem, "The Pekynnes", in *Collected Papers on English Legal History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014), 1:308–314; F.W. Maitland and G.J. Turner, *Year Books of 3 and 4 Edward II* (London: Selden Society, 1907), xli).

306 Baker, "Legal Education", 274.

307 Baker, "Legal Education", 273.

instructional programme echoing the university model in providing an admixture of lectures and case-based disputations.[308] On balance, they indicate a regular, well-structured program of study with a relatively fixed and—crucially for this study—fundamentally *text-based* curriculum. As Anthony Musson observes, "[c]ommitting the law to text for the purposes of education … was a significant feature of the period".[309] Of especial note, while no single, systematic expository text developed, medieval common law apprentices devoted numerous hours to copying out their own libraries.[310]

3.2. The Books of the Common Law

Although referred to as 'unwritten' since at least the twelfth-century treatise *Glanville*,[311] the common law was certainly written down and these centuries saw a steady rise in the authority of textually encoded law.[312] By the later 1300s, English common law had transformed into "a book-learned profession at all levels".[313] Law reporting, for instance, commenced in the mid-1200s. In

---

308 Baker, *Introduction*, 159, 170.

309 Musson, "Law and Text", 109.

310 Baker, *Introduction*, 175; Musson, "Law and Text", 109; John Baker, "The Books of the Common Law", in *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain, Vol. 3*, ed. L. Hellinga and J.B. Trapp (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 414.

311 Anthony Musson, "Magna Carta and Statutory Law", in *The Cambridge Companion to Medieval English Law and Literature*, ed. C. Barrington and S. Sobecki (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2019), 54–65, 55.

312 Musson, "Law and Text", 96–97. Oral proclamation nonetheless remained a central aspect of medieval governance. By the reign of Edward III (1327–1330), and onwards into the 1400s, all new statutes were proclaimed—with Magna Carta and Statute of Winchester proclaimed quarterly—with "[i]mpromptu translation by officials" (ibid., 100–101 at 101; Clanchy, *From Memory*, 264–65).

313 Musson, "Law and Text", 109.

1299,[314] officials at the Tower of London began compiling the Great Roll of the Statutes[315] in hopes of arriving at an uncorrupted 'official version' of royal legislation; the next year, they sent authoritative reference copies of Magna Carta to all English judges. Over the ensuing decades, when counsel in Common Pleas cited legislation in court, justices increasingly insisted that they produce written copies, and, in the 1360s, justices of the peace pestered Chancery for reference copies of recent enactments.[316] Nor was the turn to textual authority confined to statutes and other official instruments: as early as 1294, John Mettingham CJ (d. 1301) "advised counsel who voiced a doubt about a particular matter to look it up in *Bracton* ('Alez a vostre Bruton' e yl vous ensegnera')"—'Go to your Bracton, and he'll teach you' (translation mine).[317] In order to learn and practice English common law, you needed access to books.

---

314 Preceding this, the first Statute Roll began in 1277/8 with the Statute of Gloucester.

315 By 1430, half a dozen rolls; two more came after a 1431–1445 gap (Percy H. Winfield, *The Chief Sources of English Legal History* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1925; repr.: Buffalo: W.S. Hein, 1983), 84–85): TNA, C74/1 (–1377), C74/2 (1311–1312), C74/3 and C74/4 (both 1377–1398), C74/5 (1399–1422), C74/6 (1422–1430), C74/7 (1446–1461), C74/8 (from 1461). Their contents are printed and translated in *SR*, vols. 1–2. After 1468/9, statutes were enrolled in the Parliament Rolls: TNA series C65.

316 Musson, "Law and Text", 106–107.

317 Brand, "Courtroom and Schoolroom", 163. The c. 1250–1256 English common law summa *De legibus et consuetudinibus Angliæ*, commonly known as *Bracton* for its author, royal justice Henry de Bracton (c. 1210–1268); see note 32, *infra*.

Those books are conspicuous for their relative dearth of major comprehensive surveys or summæ.[318] Instead, the most popular works of medieval common law—the kinds of books produced by and for students and practitioners, and populating our corpus—took the form of compilations of much shorter texts drawn together (though also circulating as independent units), such as the ***Register of Writs (Registrum brevium)***: a formulary of exemplars of writs[319] current in Chancery,[320] codex versions of which were produced from at least the early 1200s, e.g., Cambridge, University Library, MS Ii.6.13, ff. 56^{r}–62^{v} (1220s–1236); London, British Library, Cotton MS Julius D.II,

---

318 A few attempts were made. "[R]evered as the first book on English laws" (John Baker, ed., *The Oxford History of the Laws of England, IV* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), 23), *Tractatus de legibus et consuetudinibus regni Anglie* (c. 1187×89, revised c. 1265)—oft dubbed *Glanvill* for Henry II's chief justiciar (1180–1189), Ranulf Glanvill (c. 1112–1190), to whom some attribute it—chiefly engages with royal court procedure for certain types of cases (ibid., 872–73); forty-one witnesses are extant (Skemer, "Treatises, Tracts", 67). The more comprehensive *Bracton*, extant in over fifty manuscripts (Thomas J. McSweeney, "Creating a Literature for the King's Courts in the Later Thirteenth Century: *Hengham Magna*, *Fet Asaver*, and *Bracton*", *J. Legal Hist*. 37, no. 1 (2016): 41–71), also sparked briefer, "[d]erivative works"—e.g., *Fleta* (1290×1300); *Britton* (aft. 1290); the *Summa* of Gilbert de Thornton, CJ (d. 1295); Ralph de Hengham's (1235–1311) "unfinished epitome" *Hengham magna* (Skemer, op. cit., 68–69)—but fell out of favour by 1400 (Baker, *Oxford History*, 23). All "ceased to be [copied] long before they were printed" (ibid., 502; Baker, "Books of the Common Law", 412).

319 By the late thirteenth century, acquisition of an appropriate writ—formal, written instructions, usually in Latin, purchased from Chancery or the appropriate court, and consisting of a small parchment slip bearing a letter in the King's name and sealed by the edge of the great seal—had become "the normal prerequisite to litigation" in King's Bench or Common Pleas (Baker, *Introduction*, 60–64 and 71–74, at 61; Musson, "Law and Text", 96).

320 G.D.G. Hall and Elsa de Haas, *Early Registers of Writs* (London: Bernard Quaritch, 1970), xi. W.F. Maitland noted that its earliest incarnation "may not have taken the shape of a book, but [instead] consisted of a number of small slips of parchment filed together" (*The Collected Papers of Frederic William Maitland*, ed. H.A.L. Fisher (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 2:138), a notion also endorsed by Hall and de Haas (*Early Registers*, cxviii–cxxiii). Plausibly, offcuts served the purpose.

ff. 143v–147v+150r (c. 1227–1235).[321] Over the next two centuries, their size mushroomed "fifty-fold [even as they grew] more standardized and uniform"; almost two hundred medieval copies survive, either as stand-alone codices or within volumes of other materials.[322]

Yet by far the most frequently occurring textual genre in this half of our corpus, and in our corpus as a whole, is the **Statute Book (*Statuta Angliæ*)**: an unofficial compilation of common law statutes, augmented with an idiosyncratic range of formal and informal sources of law.[323] Like the law reports mentioned above, statute books emerged as a recognizable codicological category in the mid–thirteenth century; the earliest extant copy, London, Society of Antiquaries, MS 544, dates from the second quarter of the thirteenth century.[324] "[C]opied out in profusion"[325] for two hundred and fifty years for use by legal professionals, students of the law, and interested lay persons, these practical reference works were, by the early 1300s, among the most widely disseminated books in England.[326] Over a century later, the compilations remained in "in virtually ceaseless demand",[327] prompting stationers to engage in speculative production due to their high saleability.[328] Statute books' unusually heightened prevalence without[329] and within the offcut corpus—the forty-nine

---

321 Ramsay, "Law", 272–74; Skemer, "Treatises, Tracts", 73–74; Winfield, *Chief Sources*, 289.

322 Ramsay, "Law", 273–74, quote at 274.

323 Skemer, "Reading the Law", 113.

324 Ramsay, "Law", 283; see also: Skemer, "Sir William".

325 Hanna, *London Literature*, 48.

326 Skemer, "Reading the Law", 113.

327 Kathleen L. Scott, *Later Gothic Manuscripts, 1390–1490* (London: Harvey Miller, 1996), 1:66 n.26.

328 K. Harris, "Patrons, Buyers, and Owners: The Evidence for Ownership, and the Rôle of Book Owners in Book Production and the Book Trade", in *Book Production and Publishing in Britain 1375–1475*, ed. J. Griffiths and D. Pearsall (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 183.

329 For another (in-progress) project, I have compiled a database of over 400 manuscript statute books copied in England between the mid-1200s and 1500. We will revisit this set below, in passing.

copies herein comprise 35% of our corpus as a whole, and a whopping 70% of the half of our corpus discussed in this chapter—warrants more detailed discussion. As the key books in this half of our corpus, Statuta manuscripts thus constitute an important genre showing offcut use in later medieval England. Although their constituent materials were compiled into codex form by persons "directly involved in, and familiar with, the administration of the law",[330] the background and production of these volumes is complex, and we need to understand their production, parts, and physical features (e.g., mise-en-page, decoration, etc.) to consider why offcuts matter here.

3.2.1. Statuta Subtypes and Contents

The statute book's two closely-related subtypes—***Vetera statuta*** and ***Nova statuta***—diverge in temporal range, content, and organization,[331] but 'Vetera' and 'Nova' are essentially metonymic appellations.[332] Sensibly enough, Nova statuta manuscripts primarily contain Nova statuta: English common law enactments from 1327 (1 Edw III) through the fifteenth century (and later into the sixteenth century), whereas Vetera statuta manuscripts contain Vetera statuta (sometimes called 'statuta antiqua' in older literature): enactments having force of law prior to Edward III's accession.[333] The production shift from Vetera statuta to Nova statuta manuscripts began soon after the eponymous legislative change, and unfolded with remarkable speed: as Ralph Hanna points out, the majority of Vetera had been "produced by 1327 and virtually all of them before 1340".[334] Here it is worth noting

---

330 Fennell, *Middle English*, 1:xviii, citing: Bennett, "Anthony Bek's Copy", 12.

331 Musson, "Law and Text", 99; Skemer, "Reading the Law", 113.

332 Although the Vetera / Nova terminological distinction arose with Coke (*Institutes* II, IV), his usage reflected long-established judicial theory and praxis (Nicholas Pronay and John Taylor, *Parliamentary Texts of the Later Middle Ages* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1980), 18–19).

333 Musson, "Law and Text", 99.

334 Hanna, *London Literature*, 48; see also Skemer, "Sir William", 24.

that, until the mid-1400s, enactments in a given statute book generally run to the date of the book's compilation.[335] Thereafter, however, "an apparent lack of concern about the new legislation in the 1447–1477 period led stationers to use non-current exemplars".[336] Complicating this picture, many statute books were compiled and updated "in stages, sometimes over many years, as groups of new laws became available for copying".[337] When dating these codices, especially later copies, "a series of dates" often proves "more appropriate" than a single year or decade.[338]

At the heart of the Vetera collections sits a "recognizable nucleus"[339] of what are sometimes dubbed the 'Great Statutes',[340] namely:

1. Magna Carta (1215), usually a confirmation of 1225 or later;
2. Carta de Foresta (1217), again often in a later confirmation;
3. Provisiones de Merton ('Merton': 20 Hen III (1235/6), cc. 1–3), typically with subsequent expansions;
4. Statutum de Marleberge ('Marlborough': 52 Hen III (1267), cc. 1–29);
5. Statuta Westmonasterii primum ('Westminster I': 3 Edw I (1275), cc. 1–51);[341]

---

335 Fennell, *Middle English*, 1:xv.

336 Skemer, "Reading the Law", 129–30.

337 McGerr, *Lancastrian Mirror*, 24.

338 Kathleen L. Scott, *The Mirroure of the Worlde: MS Bodley 283* (Oxford: Roxburghe Club, 1980), 46 n.3.

339 Fennell, *Middle English*, 1:xxviii–xxix, xlix–l, quote at xxix.

340 Don C. Skemer, "From Archives to the Book Trade: Private Statute Rolls in England, 1285–1307", *J. Soc. Archivists* 16 (1995), 202 n.20; H.G. Richardson and George Sayles, "The Early Statutes", *Law Q. Rev*. 50 (1934), 540.

341 Chiefly drafted by Lord Chancellor and Bishop of Bath and Wells, Robert Burnell (c. 1239–1292), this unusually lengthy text offers an important codification of then-existing law in England and Wales.

6. Statutum Gloucestriæ and explanationes eorundem (‘Gloucester’ and its glosses: 6 Edw I (1278)); and
7. Statuta Westmonasterii secundum (‘Westminster II’: 13 Edw I (1285), st. 1, cc. 1–50).

While Vetera collections are far from comprehensive and vary considerably in the selection and order of their contents, we find the above sequence of important early enactments consistently accorded pride of place within intact copies. Following it, one usually encounters legislation from the reigns of Henry II (1154–1189), Edward I (1272–1307), and Edward II (1307–1327), in tandem with a hodgepodge of ordinances, writs, regulations, articles of inquest, and other “pseudo-statutory” texts or “legal apocrypha”.[342] Collectively dubbed *statuta incerti temporis*, they betray a strangely fuzzy, overly liberal notion of what constitutes a ‘statute’.[343] Textual transmission in these materials, as well as in the tracts and treatises and more adscititious contents (discussed below), can be a messy affair, with some texts “often garbled in the extreme”.[344]

In addition to the foregoing, statute collections, and particularly Vetera copies, frequently contain one or more of a plethora of shorter French or Latin ***tracts and treatises*** providing introductory and advanced treatments of a range of topics in substantive and procedural common law. Mainly originating between c. 1250 and the 1280s, these works most commonly deal with writs or pleading (e.g., *Brevia placitata*) or other practical matters, such as manorial surveying (e.g., *Extenta manerii*), or the king’s rights (e.g., *Prerogatio Regis*).[345] Especially popular were *Novæ*

---

342 Skemer, “Reading the Law”, 116–17, citing: Paul Brand, *The Origins of the English Legal Profession* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1992), 94, and Francis Palgrave, *The Rise and Progress of the English Commonwealth* (London: John Murray, 1832), 2:cxiii, cxiv n.14.

343 Hanna, *London Literature*, 51; see: Fennell, *Middle English*, 1:xxix–xxxi.

344 Fennell, *Middle English*, 1:xxxiv n.53.

345 Ramsay, “Law”, 279–80.

narrationes, and the 1260×1272 *Hengham magna* and *parva*.[346] Although long referred to as "tracts and treatises", recent scholarship demonstrates that at least some of these texts ultimately derive from educational materials, including student notes probably taken during formal lectures, and "*reportationes* of … formal classroom proceedings".[347] Perusers of statute books also encounter a wide variety of practical ***supplemental materials***,[348] ranging from charters, snippets of canon law, and gospel pericopes for administration of oaths; to legal glossaries and pronunciation guides for French; to tables of measurement units.[349] Further, statute books of all periods can incorporate ***paratextual and reference aids***[350] including lists of statutes or tables of contents, and *capitula statutorum* (a.k.a. capitularia): tables of the chapters of the Great Statutes. Both may or may not be

---

346 Ramsay, "Law", 283.

347 Quote: Hanna, *London Literature*, 49. See also: Brand, "Courtroom and Schoolroom", 160–64; idem, *The Origins*, 110–15; John H. Baker, "Learning Exercises in the Medieval Inns of Court and Chancery", in *Collected Papers on English Legal History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014), 1:13–16; John S. Beckerman, "Law-Writing and Law Teaching: Treatise Evidence of the Formal Teaching of English Law in the Late Thirteenth Century", in *Learning the Law*, ed. J.A. Bush and A. Wijffels (London: Hambledon, 1999), 33–50; Patrick F. Philbin, "The *Excepciones Contra Brevia*: A Late Thirteenth-Century Teaching Tool", in *Learning the Law*, ed. J.A. Bush and A. Wijffels (London: Hambledon, 1999), 135–56.

348 Skemer, "Reading the Law", 118; Musson, "Law and Text", 109.

349 By way of example, charters appear in: Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 476 and Toronto, Thomas Fisher Rare Book Library, MS 1053; bits of canon law in: London, British Library, Hargrave MS 433 and Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Douce 17; linguistic tools in: Oxford, Bodleian Library, MSS Douce 17, Rawlinson C.459, Rawlinson C.507. Dublin, Trinity College Library, MS 1051 contains gospel pericopes and a table of measurement aids.

350 Nova statuta often contain sophisticated navigational paratexts such as alphabetical keyword indices. Absent from our corpus, they will not be discussed; the curious can consult Skemer, "Reading the Law", 123–27.

copy-specific, and almost always sit at the front of the collection—though some manuscripts, such as London, British Library, Harley MS 6644 (with which we opened this chapter) can surprise us.

So what can we expect to see upon opening a statute book? Overwhelmingly copied in documentary hands,[351] Statuta collections prototypically adopt a single-column layout enhanced by cursory running heads and marginal capitula (Roman) numerals. Short incipits and/or explicits for each statute often appear in an enlarged display script, copied in the same ink, and often set off from surrounding text by additional empty space. In most cases, these headings are in Latin, with the statutes and other texts in French or Latin. Generally, each statute opens with a sizeable decorated initial, with or without a partial or full border, with the initial for Magna Carta typically larger and/or more elaborate in form, commonly with extensions forming a border. (At least some Nova Statuta manuscripts slightly diverge from this pattern by opening each reign's inaugural statute with a highly ornate initial—not uncommonly historiated with an image of the king[352]—employing smaller, less formal initials for statutes within the reign). Usually we find, at most, two levels in the hierarchy of initials, with Magna Carta opened by at least a littera duplex, and litteræ florissæ introducing each statute thereafter. Coloured paraphs, more often than not alternating red and blue, punctuate the text of the statutes while also gracing marginal capitula numerals, running heads, and incipits and

---

351 Exceptions include Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Rawlinson B.520 and London, British Library, Harley MS 3601, ff. 95r–139r—both in book hands—and Cambridge, Harvard Law School Library, HLS MS 12, copied in a book hand in two columns. Huntington Library, MS HM 19920 is also in two columns.

352 On representations of monarchs in statute books' historiated initials, see Anthony Musson, "Ruling Virtually? Royal Images in Medieval English Law Books", in *Every Inch a King*, ed. C. Melville and L. Mitchell (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 151–71.

explicits.[353] As with other medieval codicological genres, divergence from this general heuristic is not uncommon.

3.3. Offcut Law by the Numbers

Given this complex background, together with the sheer number of units in this study, some measure of heterogeneity is perhaps unsurprising—and the legal half of our corpus does not disappoint. For the most part, it deviates only mildly from the broader findings in this study. Across the full corpus, for example, units average about 30% offcut zone bifolia, with the legal half of our corpus sitting slightly below this percentage; similarly, the mean longest dimensions of units in the full corpus and the legal subset both sit at around 126 mm. Other measures, by contrast, show significant differences. For example, as we saw in chapter two, units in the legal half of our corpus contain significantly more quires than units in the corpus as a whole (see *table 2.05*).[354] We will discuss the significance of such discrepancies below.

Copied from the tail end of the 1200s through the 1470s (though predominantly [*n*=56] dating from the fourteenth century), the seventy units comprising this legal half of our corpus overwhelmingly consist of statute books—with Vetera, Nova, and copies combining Vetera and Nova statuta all represented—but also include Registers of Writs, tracts and treatises, and more miscellaneous materials, such as legal glossaries, administrative forms, and less mundane

---

353 While our discussion focusses on Statuta Angliæ, other types of common law manuscripts—e.g., the Registrum Brevium, major treatises—tend to follow these general aesthetic norms.

354 Mean percentage of offcut zone bifolia, legal: 27.8%, corpus: 29.6%; mean longest dimensions, legal:125.9 mm, full corpus: 125.9 mm; mean number of quires per unit, legal: 12.5, full corpus: 8.9.

materials.[355] Examination of these details reveals an interesting complication—namely, the considerable overlap we find amongst legal textual categories. For instance, Registers of Writs frequently stand alone, but sometimes survive within collections of statutes, or alongside tracts and treatises.[356] In turn, tracts and treatises very frequently travel in statute books, especially Vetera manuscripts.[357] Focussing on the *primary* content in each unit, we find only eight units of tracts and treatises, seven of 'other' or more miscellaneous items, and ten Registers of Writs. For the most part, however, the cluster remains dominated by statute books, primarily Vetera with smaller numbers of Nova.[358] This phenomenon likely reflects the nature and purposes of these books as practical compendia chiefly intended for use in contexts—e.g., pursuing litigation—which necessitated consulting a variety of reference materials, ranging from procedural tracts to models of forms to be

---

355 E.g., the *Consolacio peccatorum* or *Processus Belial* of Giacomo Palladino (*alias* Jacopo da Teramo (1349–1419)), a c.1382 tract—in Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS e Musaeo 234—recounting courtroom skirmishes between Jesus and Lucifer who has sued Christ for trespass in the wake of the Harrowing of Hell (Carlos A. Matheus López, "About the Devil, Literature, and Arbitration", *Law and Literature* 27, no. 3 (2015): 383–94; Francesco Mastroberti, "The Liber Belial: An European Work between Law and Theology. Introductory Notes for an Ongoing Research Project", *Historia et Ius. Rivista di Storia Giuridica dell'età Medievale e Moderna* 1 (2012): art. 12; Stefano Vinci, "Liber Belial: A Vade Mecum for Roman-Canonical Procedure in Europe", *Forum Historiæ Iuris* (February 2015), forhistiur.de/2015-01-vinci/abstract/).

356 London, British Library, Harley MS 961 contains only a Register, whereas Oxford, Bodleian Library, MSS Rawlinson C.459 and Rawlinson C.507 are statute collections containing Registers. Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Rawlinson C.246 contains a Register along with tracts and treatises.

357 London, British Library, Additional MS 6061, and Hargrave MS 433; and Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Rawlinson C.466 are Vetera manuscripts containing tracts and treatises.

358 Thus, statute books (*n*=45): 64.3% [Vetera (*n*=33): 47.1%, Nova (*n*=12): 17.1%], registers of writs (*n*=10): 14.3%, tracts (*n*=8): 11.4%, other (*n*=7): 10.0%. Two copies, one Vetera and one Nova, contain statutes of the abbreviata subtype.

completed and filed. Each codex thus constitutes a pragmatic, "privately tailored practitioner's collection".[359]

Textual complexity and clear identifications of textual divisions might seem to provide some basis on which to assess demand for offcut zone parchment. In fact, alas, attempts to identify clear correlations between main generic classification and extent of offcut usage in these units yield little fruit. No significant differences in mean percentage of offcut zone parchment emerge between units predominantly consisting of statuta and those mainly containing other types of texts. Breaking down the largest generic subgrouping, statute books, by type—i.e., Vetera versus Nova versus combined Vetera–Nova—proved just slightly more revealing, with Vetera only copies containing about 6% more offcut zone parchment than other types of statute books.[360]

3.3.1. Ornateness and Offcutness

Assessing offcut recruitment through a textual lens shed little light. Fortunately, the field is better illuminated by approaching these units along, not textual nor generic, but more strictly physical grounds—in particular, by focussing on the presence or absence and quality of decoration. For ease of reference, let us refer to the latter as 'ornateness'. Undertaking such analyses reveals that ornateness and 'offcutness' (extent of offcut zone bifolia) appear to be interrelated. To start, perhaps the most conspicuous and readily assessable, albeit imperfect, proxy for ornateness is the inclusion of gold leaf or shell gold in decorative elements.[361] As described in chapter two, setting aside the many

---

359 Hanna, *London Literature,* 49.

360 Units containing primarily statuta (*n*=45) averaged 28.0% offcut zone parchment, whereas units primarily containing material other than statuta (*n*=25) averaged 27.4% offcut; mean offcut use for Vetera (*n*=33): 29.6%, Nova (*n*=12): 23.5%.

361 For ease of reference, units featuring gold decoration are deemed 'gilded'.

score of manuscripts unsuccessfully reviewed for offcuts, construction of this corpus entailed careful, page-by-page assessment and reassessment of 140 production units comprising 10 819 leaves of parchment across 5 895 bifolia (some bifolia being imperfect). In total, the process uncovered gilding in only twenty-seven units, nearly all of which belong to the legal half of the corpus[362] (where they make up a bit more than one-third of the whole), over two-thirds of them being statuta (mainly Vetera) with much smaller numbers of other materials.[363] Generically, then, the set of gilded units mirrors both their non-gilded counterparts[364]—which show a similar proportion of statuta, and specifically Vetera copies—and the generic breakdown of the legal cluster as a whole. Thus we see little evidence of significant correlation between gold decorative elements and specific legal genre.

Upon investigating the relationship between gold decoration and extent of offcuts, however, the picture changes. All dimensional measures (length, ratio, and taille), writing area dimensional measures, and one structural measure (quire count) reveal disparities between legal units which boast gilding and those which lack it (*tables 3.01–3.03*). Smaller in format than their non-gilded counterparts, gilded units include 50% more quires, despite little divergence in other quire-related measures. On the basis of this measure, we might assume that the gilded law books in this study are copied in much larger script than the non-gilded law books. In reality, although the difference is

---

362 Strikingly, the corpus' only other units featuring gold decoration—Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 476, units A–B (ff. 1–40, 41–120)—belong to a codex consisting of four production units, the other two units (namely, C–D (ff. 121–160, 161–172)) being members of the current legal cluster. Thus, although not containing legal texts, the only non-legal gilded units travel with legal material.

363 Gilded legal units (*n*=25): statutes (*n*=15): 60.0% [Vetera (*n*=12): 48.0%, Nova (*n*=3): 12.0%], writs (*n*=4): 16.0%, tracts (*n*=3): 12.0%, other (*n*=3): 12.0%.

364 Non-gilded legal units (*n*=45): statutes (*n*=30): 66.7% [Vetera (*n*=21): 46.6%, Nova (*n*=9): 20.0%], writs (*n*=6): 13.3%, tracts (*n*=5): 11.1%, other (*n*=4): 8.9%.

minor, we find the opposite: gilded legal units are copied in slightly smaller hands (*table 3.04*).[365] Moreover, regardless of specific textual content, gilded units incorporate roughly one third less offcut zone parchment than their non-gilded counterparts (*table 3.05*).[366]

As laid out in *table 3.06* and discussed below, this offcutness and ornateness correlation persists when we categorize and analyze the legal subcorpus based on other decorative features, e.g., highest level in a unit's hierarchy of initials. While nearly all of our units contained some form of painted initial, some initial types were comparatively uncommon; litteræ duplices, for instance, occur in merely half a dozen of our units. Since very few medieval manuscripts contain every form of initial, a relative paucity or complete lack of certain types of painted initial among these manuscripts is only to be expected. To compensate for limited numbers, in this next stage of analysis, each unit was classified based on the highest level of initial in its hierarchy, with the resultant categories merged into one of three groups of relatively equal size. Mean percentages of offcut zone bifolia were then calculated for each group. Yet again, the analysis demonstrated a clear correlation between extent of offcut zone bifolia and a particular measure of ornateness, insofar as units boasting more elaborate initials contained lower percentages of offcut zone parchment than those featuring simpler initials or no initials at all:

1. (*n*=30) gilded (*n*=25), duplices (*n*=5): **20.2%** offcut
2. (*n*=20) florissæ (*n*=12), inhabited (*n*=1), Lombards (*n*=7): **29.0%** offcut
3. (*n*=20) no decorated initials: **37.6%** offcut.

---

365 Mean line height (in mm), gilded legal units (*n*=25): 3.3 (range 2.7–5.0), non-gilded legal units (*n*=45): 3.6 (range 2.1–4.9).

366 Mean offcut bifolia: 19.9% versus 32.2%.

Subtly altering the grouping of the different initial types yielded similar results; for example,

1. (*n*=25) gilded: **19.9%** offcut
2. (*n*=18) inhabited (*n*=1), duplices (*n*=5), florissæ (*n*=12): **24.4%** offcut
3. (*n*=27) Lombards (*n*=7), no decorated initials (*n*=20): **37.3%** offcut

or, in like fashion,

1. (*n*=25) gilded: **19.9%** offcut
2. (*n*=25) inhabited (*n*=1), duplices (*n*=5), florissæ (*n*=12), Lombards (*n*=7): **27.8%** offcut
3. (*n*=20) no decorated initials: **37.6%** offcut.

Of course, as explained above, *gilded initial* is a synthetic classification adopted to facilitate analysis. Encompassing decorative elements incorporating gold leaf or shell gold, it here comprises historiated, foliate, and dentelle initials which feature gold leaf or shell gold, together with a handful of units boasting lower-order initials rendered in gold leaf, namely, several litteræ florissæ augmented with gold, and a single littera duplex in blue and gold.[367] Since the latter units contain initials which boast gold, yet are slightly less elaborate in form, subsuming them into the gilded category might be expected to skew our results. Nonetheless, re-analysis ignoring the use of gold (i.e., classifying units based solely on the *form* of the initials with no regard for inclusion or exclusion of gold) elicited the same trend—to wit, a correlation between offcutness and ornateness such that units boasting higher-order initials recruit less offcut zone parchment:

1. (*n*=23) historiated (*n*=8), inhabited (*n*=2), dentelle (*n*=7), duplices (*n*=6): **21.3%** offcut
2. (*n*=26) litteræ florissæ (*n*=19) + Lombards (*n*=7): **26.6%** offcut
3. (*n*=20) no decorated initials: **37.6%** offcut.

---

[367] Namely, Cambridge, MA, Harvard Law School Library, HLS MS 57; London, British Library, Harley MS 5326 and MS 1261 (all florissæ); and Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS e Musaeo 234 (duplex).

As a further exploration of the relationship between decorative elements and use of offcut zone writing support, legal units were divided into groups based on the number of colours used in their rubrication: two, one, or none (i.e., lacking coloured rubrication). In light of the size discrepancy between these groups, a further analysis merged the single colour and no colour populations. As previously, even this comparatively simple analysis pointed to our same correlation: the greater number of colours used in rubricating a manuscript, the lower percentage of offcut zone bifolia found within that manuscript (*table. 3.07*):

1. two colour rubrication (*n*=38): **23.3%** offcut
2. one colour rubrication (*n*=14): **32.4%** offcut
3. no colour rubrication (*n*=18): **33.7%** offcut
4. one or no colour rubrication (*n*=32): **33.1%** offcut.

In summary, gilded and ungilded legal units diverge on a number of decorative measures, and, regardless of the precise feature under consideration—use of gold leaf or shell gold, highest level in hierarchy of initials, or even number of colours employed during rubrication—statistical analysis reveals non-trivial correlations between extent and level of decoration ('ornateness') and the uptake of offcut zone parchment as writing support ('offcutness'). Given this correlation, which has emerged from a bird's-eye view of our corpus, and one prioritizing gilding and painted initials, it is worth taking a closer look at the less 'ornate' manuscripts—after all, the majority of the legal units lack high-end adornment. Let us do so with attention to a specific case—Harley 6644—considering the relationship between offcuts and ornateness therein, as well as what this little book might tell us about the audience and usage of this type of offcut legal manuscript.

3.3.2. Unadorned Manuscripts

Despite their more workaday quality and sometimes unconventional traits, all forty-five non-gilded legal units more or less follow the same basic content and design norms for English common law manuscripts outlined earlier in this chapter. Even most of the entirely unadorned, unfinished units (a subcluster to which we will return) adhere to this basic framework, suggesting producer intent to conform to expectation. Nonetheless, non-gilded copies tend to adopt a slightly larger, broader format than their gilded peers, with fewer quires, and a markedly larger mean percentage of offcut zone parchment—60% more, in fact (*table 3.05*).[368] More revealingly, copies lacking gilding also show greater evidence of use: twenty-six of the forty-five (57.8%) exhibit marginalia, corrections, and other annotations. By contrast, only three (12%) gilded units include similar additions and interventions, and only one of those three (4%) offers substantial marginalia. These findings could be interpreted to suggest that owners of the non-gilded units were less reluctant to alter or supplement the physical book than the owners of the gilded units. Why this should be so remains unclear, but we know that gilding was not all that expensive relative to other costs arising in book production; far more substantial were scribal labour and writing support. Even the finest decoration encountered in our corpus constituted only a minor fraction of a book's price.[369] Thus, while cost may enter into the decision—particularly with student copyists—the discrepancy seems more likely to be an indication of other factors (i.e., concerns, motivations, attitudes) at play. Thus the finding likely points to different usage contexts or conditions (e.g., gilded units could also fulfil 'display' or social signalling functions subject to potential diminishment by additions or alterations).

---

368 Non-gilded copies: 32.2% offcut, gilded copies: 19.9% offcut.

369 See: Joanne Filippone Overty, "The Cost of Doing Scribal Business: Prices of Manuscript Books in England, 1300–1483", *Book History* 11 (2008), 1–32.

Harley MS 6644—the tiny (ff. 1*+118; c. 105×75 (c. 85×55) mm), fourteenth-century Vetera statuta so passionately enhanced by an overzealous rubricator, as described at the top of this chapter—belongs to this unpretentious, non-gilded subcluster. Exhibiting the general features (see description in volume two, pp. 50–51) representative of its peers, it diverges from expectation in two principal ways: first, in the highly unconventional placement of its capitula tables (immediately preceding each applicable statute versus clustering at the start of the codex); second, in its strangely extensive reliance on red and only red for rubrication. Rather than wholly unusual, Harley 6644's marked ruddiness is a characteristic shared in kind, if not in degree, with nearly one-in-four of those legal units lacking gold. Proportionally, single-colour rubrics appear in half as many gilded as non-gilded units. Intriguingly, all three gilded examples employ blue as the sole rubrication colour, whereas their non-gilded counterparts consistently opt for red. Non-gilded units with single-colour rubrics tend to be among the plainest in the legal cluster, with most featuring only rough Lombards, space left for initials, or some combination of the two.[370] For instance, the first units in Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Rawlinson C.507 and MS Rawlinson C.466 (both bearing only red rubrics) each open with a single, middling-quality painted initial, followed by spaces left for initials, many of which have been completed with unsophisticated, less skillful additions by either contemporary or slightly later hands.

Austerity prevails amongst the non-gilded units, generally, with nearly half devoid of painted initials of any kind. Litteræ florissæ crop up in a dozen units, and Lombards in half that amount, with the fanciest initials in ungilded copies—litteræ duplices—populating a similar proportion of copies.

---

370 Of legal units with single colour rubrication, three contain gold decoration, and eleven lack it. Among the latter group, one boasts litteræ florissæ as a highest-level initial, whereas four feature Lombards; the remaining five lack decorated initials (two of the five have space left for addition of initials).

Typically of middling-to-decent quality, the latter consistently travel with two-tone rubrication, with most featuring litteræ florissæ as a secondary level in their hierarchy of initials.[371] Unsurprisingly, even within the ungilded subcluster, the plainer the unit, the higher the percentage of offcut zone parchment: copies boasting only Lombards or lacking initials entirely use nearly 50% more offcut writing support as compared to copies decorated with litteræ duplices or florissæ.[372]

In light of their relative plainness, greater uptake of offcut zone parchment, and more extensive signs of use, it seems plausible that a significant proportion of the units devoid of gilding might have been created for law students or practitioners on a limited budget, or even *by* those students and practitioners—that is, they could constitute the books copied by user–scribes. If so, the greater uptake of poor-quality parchment in these copies likely reflects economic necessity or other pragmatic concerns such as availability of materials. Consistent with this theory are the lower-quality, incomplete, or absent decorative schemata in most ungilded units. Given that limning entailed a separate set of skills, often involving a distinct group of professionals, even moderate script literacy would not automatically confer the ability to adorn a newly-copied book. Moreover, many user–scribes probably saw no need to beautify their handiwork. Others, desiring at least some adornment but unable to afford professional intervention, may have called upon a more talented associate or simply given it the old college try—with mixed results. The user–scribe hypothesis also helps account for the idiosyncratic features found in some copies, such as Harley 6644's strange embedded capitula tables.

---

371 No painted initials (*n*=19): 42.4%, Lombards (*n*=7): 15.6%, litteræ florissæ (*n*=12): 26.7%, litteræ duplices (*n*=6): 13.3%. Litteræ florissæ units with litteræ duplices as secondary initials (*n*=4): 66.7%.

372 Lombards (*n*=7): 36.7%, no initials (*n*=20): 37.6%, duplices (*n*=5): 21.8%, florissæ (*n*=12): 24.6%.

3.4. Gilded Law Books

From the outset, aside from law students and practitioners, English common law texts held relevance for landowners, prelates, and divers administrators. Book artisans soon responded with creation of deluxe copies—e.g., Princeton, University Library, Scheide MS 30, owned by Bishop of Durham Anthony Bek (d. 1311)—perhaps modelled after high-end canon and civil law manuscripts which, enhanced with illumination from at least 1241, saw importation into England from the late 1200s, if not earlier.[373] Intended for both practical reference and display, downright swanky law books thus appear on the scene from the outset of the statuta production period, sometimes betraying their owners' status as non-legal-specialists. Cambridge, MA, Harvard Law School Library, HLS MS 12 (c. 1307), for instance, atypically includes good quality marginal drawings in colours and gold which reflect the foci of adjacent statutes—a species of artistic finding system[374] rarely encountered in these collections.[375]

Production of luxurious common law collections continued to the end of the 1400s, culminating in the late fifteenth-century standard model Nova Statuta: a cluster of ostentatious, large-format manuscripts following a standardized layout and decorative schema, and likely produced on a speculative basis by a set of scribes and illuminators working under a single artisan.[376] One might assume especially sumptuous law books belonged either to important ecclesiastical institutions or to members of the aristocracy, but some were held by individuals of slightly less illustrious standing. Consider London, British Library, Cotton MS Nero C.I; Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Hatton 10;

---

373 Ramsay, "Law", 265–66.

374 Ramsay, "Law", 284.

375 But see also the similar Norwich Castle Museum, MS 158-926/4d, produced in the 1330s.

376 McGerr, *Lancastrian Mirror*, 16, 21–26 *ff*.; Scott, *Mirroure of the Worlde*, 46, 49–50. These Statuta have received considerable scholarly attention.

and London, Lincoln's Inn, MS Hale 71. All standardized Nova Statuta, they bore arms, respectively, of Middle Templar William Calow J (CP) (d. July 1487);[377] Sergeant-at-law Thomas Pygot (d. 1520);[378] and Sir Gregory Adore (d. 1504)[379] who, despite humble origins, became an Inner Templar and Sergeant-at-Law.[380] Inspired by the common law's escalating status and power, these grander codices represent commercial productions for legally literate audiences, some of whom may not have been legal professionals, but who used written law to signify a particular type of status and authority.

While the current corpus boasts no such conspicuously ostentatious manuscripts, nearly half of the twenty-five unit gilded group consists of slightly upmarket production units, mainly statute

---

377 Baker, "Books of the Common Law", 416, 422; E.W. Ives, *The Common Lawyers of Pre-Reformation England: Thomas Kebell: A Case Study* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), 456; David J. Seipp, "Introduction", in Nicholas Statham, *Statham's Abridgement of the Law*, tr. M.C. Klingelsmith (Clark, NJ: Lawbook Exchange, 2007), xv.

378 Baker, "Books of the Common Law", 422 n.86.

379 Baker, "Books of the Common Law", 422.

380 Ives, *Common Lawyers of Pre-Reformation England*, 105, 379, 452. Other examples which might bear fruit include, but are not limited to, a c. 1445 Nova statuta sold by Christie's in 2005 (Christie's, "Valuable Printed Books and Manuscripts including Maps and Atlases", Sale 7088, Lot 19. London, King St, 16 November 2005, www.christies.com/lot/lot-nova-statuta-statutes-of-the-realm-from-4601733/), with ownership inscriptions of William Coote of Coningsby, Lincs.; London, British Library, Additional MS 18600 (s. xiv; fourteenth-century inscription of Ricardus Arneston); Norwich Castle Museum, MS 158.926/4d (c. 1350; fourteenth-century inscription of Willelmus Sunman), and MS 158.926/4g.1 (c. 1450; fifteenth-century inscription of Johanni Fyncham).

books with a single Register of Writs, and a copy of Novæ narrationes.[381] Showing lower proportions of offcut zone parchment,[382] they also offer finer and more complete decorative schemata than our non-gilded units, with considerable aesthetic diversity. Conceivably produced by commercial book artisans, their occasional reliance on poor-quality writing support may betoken customer penny-pinching or parchment supply-chain weaknesses. Of course, ostentation is a matter of degree, with decisions regarding its extent guided by the eye, and the pocket-book, of the would-be book-owner. Within the gilded subcluster we also find a small group of Statuta vetera units dating from the later fourteenth or very early fifteenth century, and approximating one another in decoration and layout: London, British Library, Additional MS 6061; Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 482; Toronto, Thomas Fisher Rare Book Library, MS 1053 [C]; Cambridge, MA, Harvard Law School Library, HLS MS 174; and, more tangentially, Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Rawlinson C.456 [C]. All feature enlarged incipits and explicits; alternating red and blue paraphs within (with a few exceptions) constituent texts, incipits and explicits, running heads, and marginal capitula numerals; and competent, if not spectacular, dentelle initials. Two of the above units (Fisher and HLS) include a secondary hierarchy of red and blue litteræ florissæ.[383] Members of the group incorporate slightly more offcut zone parchment than the fancy commercial versions described above, though the average remains moderate: 23.4% (range 5–38). Conforming to the broad layout and decoration norms for

---

381 Statuta: Oxford, Bodleian Library, MSS Rawlinson C.454 [units C–D] and Tanner 450 [B–C, E]; Cambridge, MA, Harvard Law School Library, HLS MS 173 [B]; and Dublin, Trinity College Library, MS 1051 [A, C–D]. Register of Writs: Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Rawlinson C.246. Novæ narrationes: London, British Library, Additional MS 25029.

382 They average 13.6% offcut zone bifolia (range 8–26), with only one exceeding 15% (Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Rawlinson C.454 [C]: 26%).

383 London, British Library, Harley MS 5326 [A, B] and Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 476 [D] (both s. xiv 1/4) share the dentelle and flourished initials, but lack nearly all other features.

statute books; gilded, yet not too fancy; and copied on tolerable support; they may represent a pragmatic, middle-of-the-road commercial option. That is, units of this kind could point to savvy book artisans catering for as broad a market as possible.

Yet use of gold leaf need not always signify a purchased volume. Equally, those with adequate script-literacy could copy their own law (as many did), then pay a professional limner to jazz up the final version. Cambridge, MA, Harvard Law School, HLS MS 58, copied capably, but perhaps slightly carelessly or under pressure—note the irregular size and spacing (e.g., ff. 25^{v}, 51^{r}, 134^{r}, 135^{r}, 142^{v})—may offer an example of the practice. Working on passable parchment (slightly over a quarter offcut zone), the copyist left spaces for initials, demarcating the gaps with fine lines. The slightly slapdash litteræ florissæ and incomplete rubrication, however, often trespass over adjacent text (e.g., ff. 18^{r}, 119^{v}, 129^{v}). At f. 5^{r}, a historiated initial, in gold and colours, follows an uncommon design for statute books (especially ones of this format and quality), and has been squeezed-in, spilling into the gutter: the scribe left insufficient space to accommodate it. Together with MS 58's other features, signs of weak coordination between scribe and limner suggest decoration added unusually long after copying. Perhaps the owner eschewed decoration at the outset, only to have it added once they could afford it.

Unsurprisingly, then, we do identify some correlations between aesthetic richness (or at least extent of embellishment), degree of standardization, and take-up of offcut zone writing support in a given codex. Assuming a range of approaches to book production helps us account for the heterogeneity of the gilded subcluster which encompasses probable output from professional scribes and limners, the respectably prosaic copies described above, and indifferently-written texts with marked peculiarities of layout or decoration. Even with this range, however, statute books generally

—and particularly the gilded versions—tend to conform to the broad norms of layout and decoration we saw above.

Then we have the exceptions.

3.5. Ornate Outliers

As we have seen, in extant high-end statute books, particular decorative 'types' existed, such as the standardized Nova Statuta, and our own broad groupings within the offcut corpus. Nonetheless, not all copies conform to these types. Although some measure of variation is to be expected in bespoke, manually-produced items like handwritten books, a small number of copies in our corpus stand out as more conspicuous aberrations. Certainty as to the outliers' ultimate causes remain elusive. Some more idiosyncratic copies may come from the hands of non-legal scribes, and producer location could also be implicated. As a general rule, the main production centre of statute collections is assumed to be London–Westminster,[384] in close proximity to the central law courts and Inns of Court. Yet evidence suggests at least a few non-metropolitan copies. For instance, Claire Fennell argues for an early fourteenth-century, Chipping Norton, Oxfordshire, origin of Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Rawlinson B.520;[385] Oxford, Christ Church College Library, MS 103 (c.1297), may have been produced in Cobham, Surrey;[386] and Princeton, University Library, MS Garrett 146 (1297×1299) in Lincoln.[387] Could the nature and/or location of book producers account for some of

---

384 Scott, *Later Gothic Manuscripts*, 2:319, 329, 345; Skemer, "Reading the Law", 115–16, 122, 130; idem, "Sir William", 25.

385 Fennell, *Middle English*, 1:xvi–xviii.

386 Hanna, *London Literature*, 52–53.

387 Skemer, "Sir William". Other examples include New York, Columbia University, Rare Books and Manuscript Library, MS Plimpton 273 (York?; s. xv 1/4) and Oslo, Schøyen Collection, MS 710 (Yorkshire?; s. xiv 1/4). These cases warrant further work.

our corpus' misfits? I contend that it can, and propose that one particular unit offers some clues: London, British Library, Harley MS 1261. A c.1383 Nova Statuta collection covering enactments from 1 Edw III (ff. 13–217) through 7 Ric II (ff. 217–271), the well-copied Harley MS 1261 follows the typical statuta format. Somewhat unusually, paraphs in red or blue, embellished with penwork in the other colour, punctuate its running heads, marginal capitula numerals, and the text of its statutes. While this style of paraph is not especially common in statute books, the manuscript boasts another, significantly more surprising feature: two 7-line, and multiple 2–3 line, golden initials flourished in purple with foliate motifs.

But Harley MS 1261 is not purely *sui generis*. London, British Library, Lansdowne MS 475 and Oxford, Bodleian Library, Ashmole MS 1152, although far from identical, are also statute books copied out carefully and skilfully—no student scrawling here!—on middling-to-poor parchment, also during the waning decades of the fourteenth century: c.1382/3 and c.1399, respectively. All three of these manuscripts include remarkably similar, purple-flourished gold initials (*figs. 3.02a–f*).

What an unusual detail. As disclosed above (p. 101 n.329), preparatory to another project, I have compiled a list of medieval English manuscript statute books currently running to over 400 codices produced from the thirteenth through fifteenth century. Querying this corpus yields eighty-seven copies produced between c.1375 and c.1425. Of these four-and-a-half score, only five feature pen-flourished gold initials. In three of those five—the trio discussed here—that flourishing is purple. (Several more copies boast purple flourishing, but not on gold initials). Certainly, English-produced manuscripts with purple-flourished gold initials are not unheard of. Non-legal examples include,

- London, British Library, Harley MS 5977, ff. 35$^{r–v}$, a s. xiv$^{4/4}$ or s. xv$^{1/4}$ Missal fragment;

- London, British Library, Royal MS 16 E II (see ff. 24v, 25r), an Anglo-Norman and Latin devotional collection of s. xv1/4;
- London, British Library, Harley MS 3049 (see ff. 30v, 56v, 113r, 158v, 193r), theological works copied s. xv3/4 at the Benedictine cathedral priory of St Cuthbert, Durham;[388]
- London, British Library, Harley MS 2409 (see f. 2r), a s. xv copy of vernacular religious texts gifted, in the late 1400s, by Dame Joan Hyltoft of Nun Coton, Lincs., to Mald or Maud Wade, prioress of the Cistercian Priory at Swine, East Yorkshire;[389]
- London, British Library, Harley MS 1037, ff. 111r–134v, (see f. 119v), a Middle English summary of the Old Testament in a s. xiv4/4 or s. xv1/4 composite manuscript.

Despite the presence of these non-legal examples, however, and while statute books were produced for approximately two and a half centuries and many are lavishly decorated, including with gold, our tiny troika appears to comprise some of the only known, extant common law statute books with initials of this type—gold flourished purple—of any date, in the entire two-and-a-half century, approximately 400 manuscript run. All three are smaller format volumes copied at least partially on poor quality, or even offcut zone, parchment at the tail end of the fourteenth century.

As John Block Friedman has shown, during the later 1300s, this type of decoration was uncommon in most of England. Manuscript codices copied and decorated in England in the later Middle Ages evince "a relatively uniform palette containing chiefly red, rose, blue, white lead, orange, brown, and black. Two colours in the Ricardian period, however, are rather less typical of the

---

388 *Medieval Libraries of Great Britain*, dir. R. Sharpe and J. Willoughby (Oxford: Bodleian Libraries, University of Oxford, 2015), mlgb3.bodleian.ox.ac.uk, no. 2400.

389 John Block Friedman, *Northern English Books, Owners, and Makers in the Late Middle Ages* (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1995), 374 n.19; *Medieval Libraries of Great Britain*, nos. 5331, 4177.

south than of the north": green and purple.[390] Like green, purple elements in decorative borders and initials were "widespread among northern codices that do not share other features in common".[391] In many cases, purple features as an accent within mainly red and blue decoration, but purple penwork around the body of initials is an especially common attribute of northeastern manuscripts, particularly those from Durham.[392]

Statute books, we learned above, tend to adhere fairly closely to an aesthetic 'type'—one from which our trio diverges. Equally, as mentioned earlier (p. 121), despite the importance of London–Westminster as a primary locus of statute book production, copies were created elsewhere. Perhaps this tiny group of purple-flourished statute books deviates from expectation because its members were not produced in London, but in a different context entirely, namely, the north or northeast. Certainly these regions were sites of manuscript production and dissemination in the later Middle Ages.[393] Does any other information support such a hypothesis? I think it does. While Harley MS 1261 offers us only a badly blotted-out inscription, both of the other codices boasting purple-flourished gilt initials, MS Ashmole 1152 and Lansdowne MS 475, feature legible additions evoking

---

390 Friedman, *Northern English Books*, 74.

391 Friedman, *Northern English Books*, 86.

392 Friedman, *Northern English Books,* 212.

393 See: Friedman, *Northern English Books*; Thorlac Turville-Petre, "Some Medieval English Manuscripts in the North-East Midlands", in *Manuscripts and Readers in Fifteenth-Century England*, ed. D.A. Pearsall (Woodbridge: D.S. Brewer, 1983), 125–41; Stacey Gee, "'At the Sygne of the Cardynalles Hat': The Book Trade and the Market for Books in Yorkshire, c.1450–1550" (D.Phil. diss., York University, 1999); Joel Fredell, "The Pearl-Poet Manuscript in York", *Studies in the Age of Chaucer* 36 (2014), 1–39; idem, "The Thornton Manuscripts and Book Production in York", in *Robert Thornton and His Books*, ed. S. Fein and M.R. Johnston (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2014), 109–30; A.S.G. Edwards, "Northern Magnates and their Books", *Textual Cultures* 7, no. 1 (2012), 176–86, and citations therein—but note the latter's very sound cautions, discussed below.

regionalized connections—specifically, multi-generational ownership of these manuscripts by legal families with close, long-term ties to the region. Briefly, then, I contend that the combination of material and documentary evidence within and without these books points towards Yorkshire production. This matters because a non-London–Westminster production context helps account for the presence of outlier features and reliance on offcut writing support. Moreover, the families associated with these codices paint a profile of the professional class behind the creation and use of English common law manuscripts—including those incorporating offcut zone parchment. With this in mind, let turn our focus to cases where we can say something about owners, thereby highlighting the use of these books, as well as the relationships between material features of this specific book genre and the people who used them. While this kind of analysis temporarily leads us away from offcut parchment *per se*, it stands to provide valuable insight into the reception of books made of this material.

The first of these manuscripts, Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Ashmole 1152, boasts extensive inscriptions and annotations. At various points, the book seems to have been in the possession of two Yorkshire men, namely, William Swillington: "[e]ste lib*er* constat Willi*m*us Swillyngton in com*itatum* Ebor*acum*" (f. 2^{r}); and George Swillington: "Georgius / Swillyngton / Swillyngton in com*itatum* Ebo*rac*", "Georgius mp de liddingto[n]" (f. 1^{r}). The book's longer annotations clarify their relationship:

> fillij Willi*mus* Swillyngton / Georgius Swillyngton / Rauff Swillyngton / Robert Swillyngton / Peter Swillyngton clericus / Johannes Swillyngton (f. 1^{v})

> Willi*m*us Swillyngtou*n* / Georgius Swillyngtou*n* / Peterus Swillyngtou*n* / Robertus Swillyngtou*n* / Radulful Swillyngtou*n* / Johannes Swillyngtou*n* (f. 4[r]).[394]

A stub (f. 32[r]) offers a slightly expanded version, adding a Thomas Swillington, plus three untricked and unhatched sketches of coats of arms, the first, *A Chevron*; the second and third, *Quarterly, 1 & 4: Three Roundels, 2 & 3: A Chevron*.[395] These helpful annotations point us to the Swillingtons of Driffield, Yorkshire.[396] William and John of f. 2[r], and Thomas of f. 32[r], remain somewhat mysterious (though I will advance hypotheses shortly), but we know that they belonged to a cadet branch of an old Yorkshire family (*fig. 3.04*).[397]

This family's most prominent member was Ralph ('Rauff') Swillington. A royal clerk (*clericus*) by 1493,[398] Ralph was admitted to the Inner Temple before 1502, received commissions to deliver the gaol at Leicester in 1506 and 1507, and acted as Reader at the Inner Temple on 12 May 1514 and as Treasurer in 1524. Appointed to the Leicester bench in 1509—and, much later, to those of Middlesex and Warwickshire (1524)—he became Recorder of Leicester (1510–) and of Coventry (1515–), MP (Coventry) in 1523, and finally, in 1524, Attorney General to Henry VIII, a post he

---

394 A bracket, labelled "com*ium* Ebor*ac*", frames lines 2–6.

395 I have followed the conventions of England's College of Arms, according to which blazons are unpunctuated, with tinctures and charges capitalized (Thomas Woodcock and John Martin Robinson, *The Oxford Guide to Heraldry* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988), 74).

396 Regarding the first arms, and quarters 2 and 3 of the second, see Thomas Woodcock, et al., eds., *Dictionary of British Arms* (London: Society of Antiquaries of London, 1996), 2:263+277–79, 4:233.

397 S.M. Thorpe, "Swillington, Ralph (by 1485–1525), of the Inner Temple, London and Stivichall, nr. Coventry, Warws.", in *History of Parliament Online*, dir. P. Seaward (London: Institute of Historical Research, 2020).

398 A.E.W., "Swillington of Swillington", *The Herald and Genealogist. Vol. 4*, ed. J.G. Nichols (London: J.G. Nichols and R.C. Nichols, 1867), 232–33.

occupied until his demise the following year.[399] He married Elizabeth, daughter of William Babthorp and widow of Thomas Essex.[400] Although buried in Temple Church, London, Ralph directed that a memorial be established at Driffield "where I was borne, with the ymage of my father and *his iiij childern*, after the forme of Baron Roclyff hath in the Temple".[401] Ralph died without issue, bequeathing his nephew, George Swillington, land in Driffield, 100 marks, and another £40 "for the purches of Harpers londes", plus various chattels.[402]

Ralph's will names as executor his brother, the "Peter Swillyngton clericus" of f. 1ᵛ in Ashmole 1152. Presented to Belton, diocese of Norwich, on 16 May 1498,[403] Peter was a resident canon of the collegiate Church of the Annunciation of Our Lady of the Newarke 1518–1528; after resigning with an annual pension of £5,[404] he became parson of Belgrave, Leicestershire. His will stipulates bequests to his college, mother church, and various chapels, leaving most of the residue to his nephew, George Swillington.[405] Peter also acted as executor for the third brother, Robert. Born in Driffield, but later a Citizen of London, Robert gained his freedom as a draper in 1512.[406] Although

---

399 John Baker, *The Men of Court 1440–1550* (London: Seldon Society, 2012), 2:1492; *CPR 1485–94*, 507, 561; F.A. Inderwick, ed., *A Calendar of the Inner Temple Records. Vol. 1* (London: Henry Sotheran & co., 1896), 30, 81; Thorpe, "Swillington, Ralph".

400 TNA, C 1/251/21, C 1/355/46.

401 [John William Clay], ed., *North Country Wills* (Durham: J. Whitehead & Son, 1908), 119–20; emphasis added.

402 TNA, PROB 11/22/63 (11 July 1525; prov. 14 February 1526).

403 *CPR 1485–94*, 174.

404 A.K. McHardy, "Patronage in Late Medieval Colleges", in *The Late Medieval English College and Its Context*, ed. C. Burgess and M. Heale (Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 2008), 107.

405 TNA, PROB 11/28/505 (21 January 1540; prov. 27 May 1541).

406 *Records of London's Livery Companies Online: Apprentices and Freemen 1400–1900* (Centre for Metropolitan History, 2008–, www.londonroll.org), *s.v.* "Swillington".

wed, he died without issue, naming as executors his wife Margaret[407] and brother Peter, and as heir his nephew, George Swillington.[408]

Of the fourth brother, we find mainly silence. "[U]nnamed in any of the wills, [he] presumably died earlier".[409] MS Ashmole 1152, ff. 1^{v}, 4^{r}, 32^{r}, however, suggest that his name might have been John. Passing references to John Swillingtons, sometimes specified as 'of Yorkshire', pop up in records from 1454 to 1486.[410] The most significant for our purposes attests to the involvement of one John Swillington, gent., in William Essex's 1465 commitments regarding the wardship and marriage of Elizabeth (d. 1547), a then-minor daughter and heir of the late William Babthorp, esq.[411] Ultimately, in 1487, Elizabeth wed William Essex's son, Thomas, but after his c. 1500 death she

---

407 Margaret wed thrice: (1) Robert Bewyke, tailor, of London; (2) Robert Swillington; (3) William Owen (TNA, C 1/410/35; also C 1/302/80), lawyer, Middle Templar, and copyist of Fitzherbert's *La Graunde Abridgement* (Dillwyn Miles, "Owen, William (c. 1488–1574), Lawyer", in *ODNB* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 06 January 2011), doi: 10.1093/ref:odnb/21036).

408 Clay, *North Country Wills*, 276; TNA, PROB 11/19/400; 01 May 1520, prov. 10 May 1520; Baker, *Men of Court*, 2:1493.

409 S.M. Thorpe, "Swillington, George (by 1508–58/60), of Sutton Bonnington, Notts. and Liddington, Rutland", in *History of Parliament Online*, dir. P. Seaward (London: Institute of Historical Research, 2020).

410 We find the name in records for 1486 (Mary D. Lobel, ed., *A History of the County of Oxford: Volume 6* (London: Victoria County History, 1959), 286–87), 1482 (*CFR 1471–85*, 251–52), 1474 (Leicester, Record Office for Leicestershire, Leicester, and Rutland, 26D53/924), 1473/4 (H.C. Maxwell Lyte, ed., *A Descriptive Catalogue of Ancient Deeds: Vol. 4* (London: HMSO, 1902), 4:332, no. A. 8598), 1471 (TNA, CP 25/1/179/96, no. 26), 1461 (*CFR 1461–71*, 24, 28), 1454 (*A Collection of Ordinances and Regulations for the Government of the Royal Household, Made in Divers Reigns* (London: Society of Antiquaries of London, 1790), *19), and 1451 (*CFR 1445–52*, 201). See also: Baker, *Men of Court*, 2:1491–92.

411 *CFR 1461–71*, 160.

remarried—to Ralph Swillington.[412] The John Swillington involved in Elizabeth's marriage arrangements may be the man of that name who acted as Attorney of the Exchequer for the escheator of Yorkshire from 1450,[413] Attorney of the Exchequer of Pleas from c. 1455 through 1485, and who held a position secondary to the King's Remembrancer of the Exchequer from c. 1455 through 1479.[414] If so, the dates suggest that this John Swillington was not Ralph's brother, but one of his uncles—a hypothesis we will revisit shortly.

The fourth brother's son, George, was perhaps the second most prominent member of the family. Of Liddington, Rutland, and Sutton Bonnington, Notts.,[415] he acted as Justice of the Peace for Leicester (1547) and for Rutland (1547–), as MP (Leics.) in the 1547 and 1553 Parliaments, and managed to pursue a successful legal and political career in a time of considerable upheaval.[416] Despite the turbulence, George also found time to fulfill duties as Marshall for every Christmas celebration in the Middle Temple from 1551 through 1558.[417] That somewhat lighter role "must have come late in his career": our earliest reference to him dates from 1529 when he represented the 1st Earl of Rutland "with a number of other Leicestershire lawyers in a property transaction".[418]

---

412 John Hamilton Baker, "Essex, Sir William (c.1470–1548), of Lainbourn, Berks.", in *History of Parliament Online*, dir. P. Seaward (London: Institute of Historical Research, 2020); Thorpe, "Swillington, Ralph". Elizabeth did not remarry after Ralph's death; her will was proved 25 January 1547 (TNA, PROB 11/31/386).

413 TNA, E 159/227.

414 Baker, *Men of Court*, 2:1491–492.

415 Baker, *Men of Court*, 2:1491; see also TNA, C 1/1071/61, C 1/1476/64–66, C 1/981/79–80.

416 *CPR 1547–48* 85, 88; Thorpe, "Swillington, George".

417 Charles Henry Hopwood, ed., *Middle Temple Records* (London: Butterworth & co., 1904), 1:82, 88, 94, 98, 103, 107, 113, 118.

418 Thorpe, "Swillington, George".

While his will has not survived, it seems he died around 1558: the Middle Temple recorded him as "mortuus" in that year.[419] Complicating our view, in the early 1500s (1518×1529), a George Swillington of Furnival's Inn sued in Chancery for deeds pertaining to messuages and land in Great and Little Driffield, Yorks.; records identify him as "George, grandson and heir of William Swillyngton, esquire",[420] suggesting he could be the unnamed fourth brother's son—a hypothesis echoed by John Baker, who observes that he inscribed his name, "Geo. Swyllyngton", in another legal manuscript: London, British Library, Additional MS 5923. Yet this same George Swillington had been involved in legal action in 1523, 1519, and 1498.[421]

To untangle this snarl, let us cast our focus back a generation to the family patriarch, William, and to the mysterious Thomas on f. 32ʳ. William Swillington of Driffield entered the historical record in May 1435 as a creditor in an action for debt and, in summer 1446, as querent in a plea of covenant in Spaldington, Yorks.[422] At midcentury (March 1458), William Swillington of Driffield *the younger* collected a tax levied in Yorkshire.[423] Young William is likely the William Swillington who, June–Michaelmas 1471, collected customs and subsidies in Kingston upon Hull, in the East Riding of Yorkshire[424]—for, by January 1461/2, one of the Williams was dead. In that month, Alice, widow of "William Swelyngton, esq.", took the veil at Durham.[425] Also around midcentury, in 1449–1450,

---

419 Thorpe, "Swillington, George"; Baker, *Men of Court*, 2:1491.

420 TNA, C 1/568/54.

421 Baker, *Men of Court*, 2:1491.

422 TNA, C 131/229/37B, C 241/227/17; TNA, CP 25/1/280/159, no. 30.

423 *CCR 1454–61*, 310.

424 *CFR 1471–85*, 6–7, 10; John Lister, ed., *The Early Yorkshire Woollen Trade* (Leeds: Yorkshire Archaeological Society, 1924), 33–34; TNA, E 122/62/17, E 122/62/14.

425 James Raine, and John William Clay, eds., *Testamenta Eboracensia: A Selection of Wills from the Registry at York. Vol. 4* (Durham: Andrews & co., 1869), 340.

Lincoln's Inn admitted one Thomas Swillington as a Fellow *ad communes clericales* (at clerks' commons) for three years on the condition that his father, William, "be exonerated from all pensions which he owed to the Society for the time when he was a Fellow up to" Thomas' admission. Two years later, the Inn amerced Thomas for his absence the previous autumn, but the fine was reduced (to 6 *s*. 8 *d*.) due to the severity of his father's illness.[426] We have, then, an elder William Swillington of Driffield (bef. 1435?–by 1461?), and a younger William Swillington of Driffield (*fl*. 1458–1471), with a Thomas (*fl*. 1449–1452) son of William Swillington between them. Given the dates of our other Driffield Swillingtons, I infer that William the younger was the William of MS Ashmole 1152; Thomas (f. 32^{r}) seems to have been his brother (see *fig. 3.04*).

Ralph "received increasing recognition of his ability as a lawyer" in his twilight years,[427] and his career recommends him as a logical choice for owner of Ashmole 1152. Yet the codex proclaims itself property of William Swillington and of George Swillington, both of Yorkshire (ff. 2^{r}, 1^{r}). No paradox emerges here, however. It makes sense that a man like "Willi*m*us Swillyngton in com*itatum* Ebor*acum*" (f. 2^{r}), a Yorkshireman from a legal family, would own Ashmole 1152, a book of statutes with distinctive northeastern or northern style of decoration. From here, George's possession of the book also needs no explanation. Although he married a Leicestershire girl, divested himself of his northeastern properties, and decamped to the south,[428] the curious little law-book likely came to

---

426 William Pailey Baildon and James Douglas Walker, eds. and trs., *The Records of the Honourable Society of Lincoln's Inn. The Black Books. Vol. 1* (London: H.S. Cartwright, 1897), 19–20, 21. On 7 May 1452, a Thomas Swillington and his wife, Joan, were deforciants in a Yorkshire plea of covenant, losing lands in Thwong—probably Tong, West Yorkshire (Anthony David Mills, *A Dictionary of British Place-Names*, 1st rev. edn. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), *s.v.*)—but gaining 40 marks of silver (TNA, CP 25/1/281/160, no. 91).

427 Thorpe, "Swillington, Ralph".

428 Thorpe, "Swillington, George".

George by descent from its earlier master: his grandfather, William—perhaps even via Uncle Ralph. A practicing lawyer and Middle Templar with a successful political career, "Georgius Swillyngton … mp de liddingto[n]" (f. 1r) would have had both sentimental and practical reasons to mark it as his own. Heir to his three uncles due to their lack of issue, George himself died leaving only three daughters—though his wife, Anne, daughter of William Turvile of Flamville, Leics., had a son from her first marriage.[429] Whether the book fell to the lad after his stepfather's death, I cannot say.

In turn, our third purple-flourished statute book, London, British Library, Lansdowne MS 475, contains several inscriptions, with two of particular interest to us. The first, dashed off vertically on f. 211v and dated 15 December 1500 ("quintedecimo die decembris anno d*omi*no mill*esim*o cccc lxxxxx^{mo}"), appears to be the start of the last will and testament of a Jehan Celyn (or Celys?) de Madingely. Maddeningly, attempts to identify the testator bore scant fruit. Madingley, however, is a village sitting on the western outskirts of Cambridge; it is attested as early as the Domesday Book.[430] This short addition to the manuscript thus links one of its early users to the East Midlands. Further, Lansdowne MS 475 bears the sixteenth-century inscription of one "h dygby" (f. 256v) (*fig. 3.03*). The most plausible candidate here seems to be Henry or Harry Digby, esq.: the

---

429 Thorpe, "Swillington, George"; TNA, PROB 11/49/180, prov. 05 June 1567.

430 Mills, *Dictionary of British Place-Names*, *s.v.*

son of a London mercer named Benjamin, and his wife Katharine.[431] Seventh son of Everard Digby (d. 1509) of Tilton, Leicestershire and Stoke Dry, Rutland, and Everard's wife, Jacquetta (Ellis) (d. 1483), Benjamin became progenitor of the Digbys of London and of Garendon, Leicester, a cadet branch of the famous Digbys of Tilton.[432] In 1494, the Company of Mercers made him a Freeman; in 1527 he took on his own apprentice.[433] The decades in between saw him actively litigating[434] and

---

431 TNA, PROB 11/24/289 (prov. 17 December 1532). Benjamin names as executors "Kateryn … my trusty and welbiloued wyfe and henry Dygby my sonne", and mentions a John Aleyn, kt., probably John Allen of Stamford, Lincs. (d. 1554), MP in 1542, 1547, 1553–1554. Allen's will, in turn, names as supervisor Henry Digby, gent., of Tickencote, Rutland—a mere three miles from Stamford—and references William Campanett "who was a friend of Digby" (A.D.K. Hawkyard, "Allen, John (by 1510–54), of Stamford, Lincs.", in *History of Parliament Online*, dir. P. Seaward (London: Institute of Historical Research, 2020), and witnessed the will of Sir John Digby in 1529. Henry assigned his lease of Tickencote to William after William's brother, attorney (CP) and MP (Peterborough) John Campanett (by 1519–1557), wed Henry's ward, Margaret (Lynne) (S.M. Thorpe, "Campanett, John (by 1519–57), of London and Tickencote, Rutland", in *History of Parliament Online*, dir. P. Seaward (London: Institute of Historical Research, 2020); *CPR, 1550–53* 60).

432 John Nichols, *History and Antiquities of the County of Leicester* (London: John Nichols, 1800), 3.1:473–75; G.H. Dashwood, ed., *Visitation of Norfolk in the Year 1563* (Norfolk: Miller & Leavins, 1878), 1:408; George William Marshall, ed., *Visitations of the County of Nottingham in the Years 1569 and 1614* (London: Taylor & co., 1871), 168; TNA, PROB 11/16/284, 11/18/466, 11/28/396, 11/31/152.

433 *Records of London's Livery Companies Online*, *s.v.* "Digby".

434 Indexes to CP 40 can be consulted via: Robert C. Palmer, ed., *Anglo-American Legal Tradition* (O'Quinn Law Library, University of Houston Law Center, 2006–), aalt.law.uh.edu/Indices/CP40Indices/CP40_Indices.html); search 'Digby' or 'Dygby' under the years 1510, 1512, 1521, 1524, 1525, 1529, 1530, and 1531.

repeatedly popping up in feet of fines.[435] On 31 December 1524, London alderman and merchant of the staple, Sir John Skeffington (or Skevington),[436] appointed Benjamin an executor of his will. Witnesses included Benjamin's son—"Hen. Digbe, gent."[437]—to whom the alderman bequeathed £3 6*s*. 8*d*., plus a black gown.[438]

Henry Digby's name peppers legal records from Yorkshire and Leicestershire in the second quarter of the 1500s, initially as attorney to the Skeffingtons of Skeffington, Leicestershire,[439] but subsequently in connection to the household of the Earls of Rutland, particularly Thomas Manners

---

435 P.H. Reaney, and Marc Fitch, eds., *Feet of Fines for Essex* (Colchester: Essex Archaeological Society, 1964), 4:110, 111, 119, 126, 173. In English common law, a foot of fine (*pes finis*) is a copy of the final concord or fine (from the opening word *Finis*, or *Finalis concordia*) between parties in a(n often fictitious) land dispute or conveyance. Under the Justiciarship of Hubert Walter, the established chirographic practice—duplicate copies, one for each litigant, on a single sheet—was modified to copying in triplicate; located at the bottom of the sheet, the third copy at the 'foot of [the] fine' went to the Exchequer (Clanchy, *From Memory to Written Record*, 68–73).

436 For his grandson, see: Ben Coates, "Skeffington, Sir John (c.1584–1651), of Skeffington, Leics.; later of Fisherwick, Staffs.", in *History of Parliament Online*, dir. P. Seaward (London: Institute of Historical Research, 2020). The alderman's brother, William (d. 1535), married first Benjamin's sister, Margaret, and secondly Anne, daughter of Benjamin's brother, John (S.M. Thorpe "Skeffington, Sir William (by 1467–1535), of Skeffington and Groby, Leics.", in *History of Parliament Online*, dir. P. Seaward (London: Institute of Historical Research, 2020); Nichols, *History and Antiquities of the County of Leicester*, 3:432, *et seq.*).

437 *Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, Henry VIII, 4, 1524–1530*, ed. by J.S. Brewer (London: HMSO, 1875), 411–13 at 412.

438 S.H. Skillington, and G.F. Farnham, "The Skeffingtons of Skeffington", *Trans. Leicestershire Archaeological Soc.* 15 (1927–1928), 99–100.

439 Skillington and Farnham, "The Skeffingtons of Skeffington", 123; Charles Travis Clay, ed., *Yorkshire Deeds: Vol. 4* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 6, no. 20.

(c. 1492–20 September 1543), 1st Earl of Rutland and 12th Baron de Ros,[440] as well as his son and grandson: Henry (1526–1563), 2nd Earl and 13th Baron, and Edward (1549–1587), 3rd Earl and 14th Baron.[441] Holding extensive ancestral properties in Northumberland and Yorkshire, the Earls sat on the council of the north and occupied multiple northern offices, including as wardens of the east and middle marches on the Scottish border; Lord Lieutenants of Nottinghamshire, and either Rutland or Lincolnshire; and constables of Nottingham Castle. As their attorney and administrator, Digby created at least two manuscript records now in the archives of Belvoir Castle, Leicestershire. The first he labelled as,

> A book made by me, Harry Dygby, off expences of my Lord's howshold at Belvoire from the xxij day of August, anno regni Henrici VIII xxxiiij to [= 1543], to the v day of November then next enswynge, my Lorde beyng in the northe.[442]

The second, of a near-identical nature, spans 1 March 1552 through 14 June 1553.[443] From the 1530s until the death of the 5th Earl in 1612, multiple members of the Digby family served or associated

---

440 Recall that our earliest reference to George Swillington of Ashmole 1152 finds him acting as an attorney to the 1st Earl of Rutland in a 1529 property transaction (p. 129).

441 On the 2nd (Henry, 1526–63), 3rd (Edward, 1549–87), 4th (John, d. 1588), and 5th (Roger, 1576–1612) Earls, see: M.M. Norris, "Manners, Henry, Second Earl of Rutland (1526–1563)", in *ODNB* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 03 January 2008), doi: 10.1093/ref:odnb/17955; Sybil M. Jack, "Manners, Edward, Third Earl of Rutland (1549–1587), Magnate", in *ODNB* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 17 September 2015), doi: 10.1093/ref:odnb/17952; Paul E.J. Hammer, "Manners, Roger, Fifth Earl of Rutland (1576–1612), Nobleman", in *ODNB* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 03 January 2008), doi: 10.1093/ref:odnb/17962.

442 *The Manuscripts of His Grace the Duke of Rutland, K.G. Preserved at Belvoir Castle*, ed. H.C. Maxwell-Lyte, et al., 4 vols. (London: HMSO, 1888–1905), 4:337.

443 *Manuscripts of His Grace*, 4:370–371.

with the Earls of Rutland.[444] Harry, however, seems to have been an especially valued retainer, representing and administering for the household longer than any other: 1542–1582.[445] The 1st Earl's will appoints him executor.[446] Although associated with London's Middle Temple—where he secured the admission of a kinsman, John Digby, in 1551[447]—Harry maintained his residence close to the Rutland family seat. On 6 July 1552, he acted as commissioner in a verdict at Stamford, Lincolnshire,[448] and March 1557 saw him involved in a transaction concerning some properties he had purchased from the late Earl; the relevant records identify him as "Henry Digby, of the town of Leicester, gent.".[449] As late as September 1578, Henry wrote to the Earl of Shrewsbury (regarding records of the Earl's court, as well as Digby's own allowance) from Ravenstone, Derbyshire.[450] Four years later, he contacted the 5th Earl of Rutland from the same locale.[451]

All is not entirely straightforward, however, for these records introduce a minor source of confusion. Both Ravenstone missives identify the writer as "Harry Dygby, the elder". Likewise, Digby's March 1557 land conveyance names both himself and "[h]is son Henry Digby … attorney".

---

444 *Manuscripts of His Grace*, vols. 1, 4, *passim*.

445 *Manuscripts of His Grace*, 1:90 (*bis*), 100, 102, 116, 117, 118, 119, 137; and 4:337–38, 344, 370–71.

446 Prov. 19 May 1545; Nicholas Harris Nicolas, ed., *Testamenta Vetusta* (London: Nichols & Son, 1826), 2:719–21; Clay, *North Country Wills*, 184–90. Digby shared the position with "the Countes, Sir Richard Maners, [Sir John Chaworthe … Augustyne Porter, Henry Digby, and Robert Thurston]"; collectively they were allotted "the some of fourtye poundes", i.e., £6 6 *s*. 8 *d*. each (Clay, *North Country Wills*, 189).

447 Hopwood, ed., *Middle Temple Records*, 1:81–82.

448 Lincoln, Lincolnshire Archives, Spalding Sewers/473/2.

449 Lincoln, Lincolnshire Archives, CRAGG/4/10.

450 London, Lambeth Palace Library, MS 697, f. 92.

451 *Manuscripts of His Grace*, 1:137.

This other Henry—one of several sons[452] of Henry senior and his wife, Margaret (Trice) of London —is Henry Digby of Garendon (Leics.) and London.[453] Exactly which "h dygby" inscribed Lansdowne MS 475 remains uncertain, and perhaps father and son represented and administered for the Earls in turn. Both men were active in the law. Extant records, however, suggest that the elder Digby had the longest period of relevant activity and significantly greater (professional) connections with the north. Perhaps he accompanied the Earls on one or more of their many excursions to their extensive northern holdings.

Perhaps. The precise origins of these statute collections, of course, cannot be confirmed. As Anthony Edwards wisely cautions us, "[t]aste, like books, is portable" and ownership information may not reliably link a given manuscript to a particular location;[454] moreover, the connection with Northern England in the case of Lansdowne MS 475 seems weaker than those uncovered during investigation of MS Ashmole 1152. Nonetheless, the patterns remain suggestive. While only MS Ashmole 1152 seems clearly to have originated in Yorkshire, the distinctive and, for statute books, highly atypical decoration of all three manuscripts gestures towards production outside of London, with the purple flourishing indicating a northern or northeastern origin. Further, inscriptions within two of the three indicate connections with the northeast for at least part of their earlier history. My hypothesis is that these codices belong to a small cluster of Statuta copied in the latter region,

---

452 The others included Thomas, of Bale, Norfolk; John, of Ravenstone and of London, and Jasper (TNA, PROB 11/18/466, PROB 11/31/152; William Camden, *Visitation of the County of Leicester in the Year 1619*, ed. by J. Fetherston (London: Taylor & co., 1870), 2:87; Nichols, *History and Antiquities of the County of Leicester*, 3.1:475; Thorpe, "Campanett"; *CSP 1547–80* 1:29).

453 Camden, *Visitation of the County of Leicester*, 2:87; Nichols, *History and Antiquities*, 3.1:475.

454 Edwards, "Northern Magnates and their Books", 178–80, quote at 178.

perhaps for local gentry and administrators. This is significant as statute books are overwhelmingly assumed to be products of London–Westminster.

More usefully here, however, the presence of unusual golden initials on lesser-quality parchment may shed light on the varied reasons some book producers resorted to second-rate material. Offcut zone parchment most commonly crops up in down-market codices or those produced for personal use; books incorporating the material rarely boast such careful work or fine decoration. Thus, use of substandard parchment, however sparingly, in all three books, with offcut zone parchment in at least one, sits at odds with the elegant, albeit atypical, initials. Although we need further investigation before drawing firm conclusions, perhaps the producers of these volumes opted for poorer-quality writing support out of necessity due to parchment supply-chain issues in provincial centres. Contrariwise, the juxtaposition may point to differing attitudes towards parchment quality among varied audiences or in disparate regions. These possibilities await us among the others explored in the next chapter.

3.6. Conclusion

Before we turn to the non-legal half of our corpus, though, it remains to draw together what we have learned about our legal units, which, taken in aggregate, evince significantly greater internal coherence than the subcorpus we will discuss in chapter four. In this chapter, we learned that common law books dominate later medieval England's offcut corpus, and we encountered a large number of these manuscripts, whether in passing or in detail. We found that, on the whole, this subcorpus consists of very small, yet often very thick, statute books, generally with low levels of ornamentation. Showing widespread consistency in contents and organization, plus adherence to aesthetic and paratextual 'types', most of these manuscripts were likely produced in a narrow set of

cultural and geographical contexts for an identifiable group of users. Some traceable members of our corpus provide opportunities for getting to know those original owners, and obtaining a sense of how these books might have been used on the ground. We also identified an association between the extent of ornamentation in these manuscripts and uptake of offcut zone parchment as writing support, such that greater ornamentation negatively correlates with degree of 'offcutness' (extent of offcut zone bifolia). The plainer the law book, the rougher the parchment.

Primarily these books were instruments for the learning and practice of common law, yet they generate interest from a design perspective as they share key features beyond strict textual content—e.g., organization of the contents, layout and paratextual devices, and ornamentation norms—transforming them a material codicological group or design category. The combination of a shared design category and reliance on offcut zone parchment as writing support jumps out at us due to the sheer number of these manuscripts, their intended audience, and the known practice of copying legal manuscripts as a component of later medieval common law education (p. 98). The coincidence of close structural and design similarities together with recruitment of our material in such a large number of manuscripts signals a relationship between offcut parchment and a particular production context. Linking these two aspects of the corpus has proven of interest and revealing of a likely pattern: common law manuscripts (and especially statute books)—as a textual and codicological genre frequently (not always) produced by and/or for the personal, practical use of individuals with relatively little money—were often such that choosing offcuts instead of better quality parchment simply made sense. Overall, our insights point to a mixture of pragmatic use and economizing impulses. Even our corpus' more ornate copies with relatively 'high-brow' provenance draw attention to the widespread nature of this pattern. Not only do the relatively lower numbers of such copies underscore the general trend, but—as we saw in section 3.5, during our investigation of a

small subcorpus of statute books boasting purple-flourished gold initials—the exceptions sometimes suggest other possible reasons a book-maker might rely on offcut parchment, for instance, supply-chain issues arising in regional production contexts, involvement of different types of users and producers, or varying attitudes towards this material. Consideration of such differences will form part of our investigation in chapter four, to which we now turn.

Chapter 4: Offcuts in Non-Legal Books

This chapter engages with our second subcorpus—that is, the remaining seventy units of our corpus—consisting of units not (primarily) containing legal materials. Given their numbers, these units cannot be ignored—and, sooner or later, whether you work on materiality or not, you will likely encounter similar manuscripts. Determining what to make of them, however, proves no simple task. First, taken together, these units do not fit the patterns identified among their legal counterparts (and discussed in the previous chapter). Secondly, albeit more crucially, this non-legal half of our corpus offers little in the way of conspicuous new patterns. Certainly the manuscripts populating these seventy units do provide a wealth of information—as we shall see, on the whole, these volumes evince a marked tendency to 'show their work'—yet they present no single coherent narrative, and thus generate non-trivial methodological and theoretical challenges. Such hurdles may or may not be a function of the relatively small corpus size in this proof-of-concept study, of data collection issues, or of some other factor or factors currently eluding detection; time, plus further data gathering and analysis, will tell. However frustrating, this state of affairs is not wholly devoid of utility: our non-legal subcorpus not only serves as a counterpoint to its legal counterpart, offering a sobering contrast to our set of law books' relative tidiness and internal coherence, but also functions as a 'case in point' of the problems inherent in restricting our focus to individual manuscripts or small groups of manuscripts. Researchers extrapolate from narrow samples at their peril.

4.1. Comparing the Legal and Non-Legal Subcorpora

To begin, before moving on to the broad statistical findings, let us obtain a general sense of the varied contents and somewhat chaotic nature of this subcorpus. In a departure from what we have seen thus far, the non-legal units are characterized by marked heterogeneity. Along with the endlessly prolific 'Anonymous', the subcorpus includes works by, or attributed to, Walter de Avinon, Johannes de Sacrobosco, Augustine, Heinrich von Langenstein, John Bromyard, Mā Shā' Allāh ibn Atharī, Johannes Somer, William of Conches, Lanfranc, Giraldus Cambrensis / Gerald of Wales, William Peraldus, Isidore of Seville, John Lydgate, William of Montoriel, Jacques de Vitry, Trotula, Geoffrey of Monmouth, Seneca, and scores of others.[455] Contents range from astronomical tables and calendrical treatises, through medical receipts and phlebotomy tracts, to satirical verses and songs of praise, snippets of bestiaries and of legal proceedings, homilies and preaching aids, works on geometry and on the natural world, annals and histories, scholastic texts, magical incantations and rituals, exempla, herbals, musical notation, and guides to rhetoric and logic. Amidst the turmoil we even find notes for a will, instructions for making metal polish, an account of a haunting, and a list of

---

[455] For Walter de Avinon and Trotula, see: London, British Library, Sloane MS 783B; William of Conches: Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Digby 1; Lanfranc: London, British Library, Egerton MS 2340; Monmouth: Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 476; Johannes Somer: Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Digby 5. Works by Sacrobosco, von Langenstein, ibn Atharī, and Lydgate can be found in London, British Library, Harley MS 941. Isidore of Seville appears in Sloane MS 783B and Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 472; Augustine in London, British Library, Arundel MS 310 and Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Douce 34; Montoriel in Oxford, Bodleian Library, MSS 24 (touched on earlier in this chapter) and Digby 2. London, British Library, Harley MS 912 (discussed in depth in § 4.3, *infra*) includes texts by Bromyard, Cambrensis, Peraldus, de Vitry, and Seneca.

the prices of drugs sold at Boston in 1315.[456] Materially, we find the ground no smoother: as we shall see, the non-legal units evince rather different variability on most of our measures including longest dimension, writing area, script size, range of quire types, number of rubrication colours, and percentage of offcut zone bifolia. This subcorpus includes the most complex collations in the entire corpus—including one which continues to elude concise description[457]—and even incorporate generous helpings of paper. But what do the numbers say? Can descriptive statistics help us traverse this jungle, and locate a firm peak from which to survey the landscape and pick out a path?

At first glance, we might assume little meaningful difference between the two parts of our corpus. Their near-identical median percentages of offcut zone bifolia (24% and 25%) lull us into a sense of security: *Nothing to see here*, they mutter, *move along*. Closer inspection tells another story. The medians may match, but the means and ranges certainly do not (see *table 2.02*): non-legal units are slightly more offcut, but vary more in their offcutness.[458] Contrast gradually starts to emerge as we turn our attention to other metrics. Direct comparison of the dimensions of the law and non-law subcorpora again present a monotonous picture, but other approaches to assessing manuscripts' external dimensions (ratio and taille) hint at something else going on (*table 2.03*): despite their near-identical heights, compared to their legal counterparts, non-law units tend to be noticeably larger.[459]

---

456 Notes for a will (including the initials H de B, R de B, and V de C) appear at Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Digby 2, f. 79^{v}; metal polish instructions can be found on f. 47^{v} of London, Wellcome Library, MS 559; and London, British Library, Sloane MS 783B, f. 146^{r} lists prices for drugs sold at fairs in Boston and in Toledo in 1315. For the haunting, see London, British Library, Harley MS 912, ff. 333^{v}.23–334^{r}.28, which relates how Fr. John Coby, OP abjured the spirit of the deceased Lord William de Corvo which had persisted in vexing the late Lord's widow.

457 Namely, London, British Library, Sloane MS 783B.

458 Mean offcut bifolia, legal units: 27.8% (*R*: 5%–86%), non-legal units: 31.3% (*R*: 3%–100%).

459 Ratio, legal units: μ 0.667, non-legal units: μ 0.730. Taille, legal units: μ 209.9, non-legal units: μ 217.8.

As a group, these units also contain far fewer quires than the legal half of the corpus, and vary less in the number of different quire types they hold—that is, units in the non-law subcorpus contain fewer quires, often (but not always) boasting simpler and more consistent structure than our common law books (*table 2.05*). Despite this, however—and despite sharing the same median quire size as the legal subcorpus—non-law units as a group evince heightened structural variance insofar as their gatherings show a significantly larger range in type.[460] Between their boards we find varying degrees of lack of congruence in several features including writing area (slightly larger mean, and more varied in non-law units) (*table 2.04*), line height (significantly larger and more variable in non-law units) (*table 2.06*), and number of rubrication colours (lower on average in non-law units) (*table 2.09*).[461]

Our non-legal subcorpus sends mixed messages. Some of the features of this half of the corpus—larger format, more consistent structure (on *some* measures of structure), roomier writing area, and greater line-height—typically point to increased formality and/or expense, with, we might infer, associated distinctions in production context and intended audience. Other features—slightly elevated offcutness with wider range of offcut zone percentage, as well as the highest offcut percentages in the corpus; fewer quires; less consistent structure (again, on *some* measures of structure); and augmented variability in writing area dimensions, line height, and average number of

---

460 Quire count, legal: μ 12.53 (*R*: 1–33), non-legal: μ 5.10 (*R*: 1–32); number of quire types, legal: μ 2.24 (*R*: 1–6), non-legal: μ 1.85 (*R*: 1–5); quire type, legal: μ 8.89 (*R*: 2–16), non-legal: μ 9.33 (*R*: 2–24)—but note the discrepancy in range on this last metric: gatherings in legal units range from two to sixteen bifolia in length (i.e., *R*: 14), whereas those in non-legal units range from two to twenty-four folia in length (*R*: 22).

461 Writing area, longest dimension, legal: μ 89.3 mm (*R*: 65–118), non-legal: μ 91.1 mm (*R*: 57–125); line height, legal: μ 3.52 mm (*R*: 2.12–4.95), non-legal: μ 3.83 mm (*R*: 2.04–6.44). Number of rubrication colours, legal: μ 1.29 (*R*: 0–2), non-legal: μ 1.16 (*R*: 0–3).

colours used in rubrics (despite a lower average number of colours)—point elsewhere, away from formality and expense. This confusion should not surprise us. After all, we already know that, in a marked contrast to the relative coherence of the legal units, irregularity appears to be the name of the game in the complex ecosystem of the non-legal half of our corpus. And so, great caution is warranted when juxtaposing our legal and non-legal subcorpora. Even relatively simple comparisons, such as those presented above, yield more complex results than anticipated once we dig down a bit. Moreover, as we are about to see, those preliminary findings are significantly disrupted when we break the non-legal subcorpus into constituent groups—a step to which we now turn.

4.2. The Garden of Forking Paths

As observed above, the non-legal subcorpus is characterized by unusual complexity and uncertainty. If we set aside its material diversity to focus on content, these seventy units can be slipped into a handful of broad generic or topical groups, overwhelmingly in Latin with some Middle English:[462]

- medicine (*n*=18): tracts and treatises, charms and receipts, and herbals;
- theology and devotion (*n*=17): a theological dictionary, earlier Wycliffite texts, patristic extracts, and a preacher's compilation;
- astro-calendrical texts (*n*=12): calendars, works on time, and astronomical, astrological, and calendrical tables and treatises;
- letters (*n*=12): history, canonical literature, rhetoric, grammar, and the like;
- logic (*n*=4): tracts on logic and philosophy;
- science (*n*=2): William of Conches' *Dragmaticon*, and a quadrant-building treatise;

---

462 For more information on these manuscripts, see the "Manuscript Corpus" appendix in volume two.

- miscellanea (*n*=5): a set of subject indexes, works of *Fachliteratur*, and units which eluded easy classification (often due to no one subject consuming more than half the leaves).

As we learned in chapter two, when pursuing statistical methods we strive to work with corpora of sufficient size to ensure robust results. Alone, each of the foregoing groups is far too small for viable analysis; when pursuing comparative work, juxtaposing data sets of approximately equivalent size increases the likelihood of obtaining reliable results. Over and above this issue, establishing subgroupings within the mass of non-legal units can ease navigating the complexity and uncertainty characterizing the non-legal subcorpus. Accordingly, in order to facilitate analysis, I merged more or less complementary generic categories into larger sets, generating two roughly balanced groups:[463]

- **Triv** (*n*=34)—an expanded trivium-based group comprised of the letters (*n*=12), logic (*n*=4), and theological and devotional (*n*=17) units, along with one of the miscellaneous units: Harley 912 [B] (subject indexes to a compilation of preaching aids);
- **Quad** (*n*=36)—an expanded quadrivium-based group comprised of medical (*n*=18), calendrical and astronomical (*n*=12), and scientific (*n*=2) units, plus four miscellaneous units: Digby 2 [A] (added to Quad as over half of its pages bear eclipse forecasts); Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Rawlinson C.212 (receipts from Mappæ clavicula and other sources, along with an herbal); and Harley MS 941, units [A] and [C] (miscellaneous collections, which, after extensive deliberation, were allocated to the Quad subcorpus by flipping a coin).

---

[463] These designations, Quad and Triv, are flawed 'hacks' deployed to make the best of a non-ideal situation —namely, somewhat messy, generically lopsided subcorpora. I remain dissatisfied with the intervention. For instance, professional and practical texts (especially medicine) should be distinct from Quad and Triv, and the decision to subsume calendrical texts within Quad is questionable. Unfortunately the constrained corpus size compelled discomfiting compromises. (During expansion of the project, k-means cluster analysis, or other techniques, may lead to discovery of better approaches to grouping.)

Having bisected the topsy-turvy second half of our corpus, clearer patterns begin to emerge. Reanalysis brings at least partial resolution of the enigma: subcorpus two does, indeed, embody at least two distinct subgroups which diverge not merely in broad content type, but in material features. When analyzed together (as a 'non-law' subcorpus), however, trends associated with one set of units partially obscure the other. Statistical results most closely tracked the Triv units along two measures (number of quires per unit, mean quire type).[464] On other measures, however, results pulled away to varying degrees due to influence of the Quad units (percentage of offcut zone parchment, longest dimension, writing area longest dimension, number of quire types per unit, line height, number of rubrication colours),[465] to offer a strange agglomeration of echoes from both sets—whence our incongruous initial findings. As far as general trends go, analysis reveals that units within the Quad grouping offer by far the broadest range in percentage of offcut zone bifolia, including our corpus' sole examples of 100% offcut zone parchment units (though the parchment in those units is often mixed with other types of writing support). Routinely the least ornate units in the corpus, Quad units include a markedly broad range of sizes (though they trend slightly shorter than other non-legal units), consist of relatively few quires, and show considerable mutability in quire type. This same subset of units also provides several especially anarchic collations. That is, as a group, Quad units tend to be among the roughest and most turbulent in our entire corpus. Triv units, by contrast, tend

---

464 Mean *number of quires per unit*, non-legal subcorpus: 5.1 (*R*: 32), Triv: 6.7 (*R*: 32), Quad: 3.5 (*R*: 12); *quire type*, non-legal subcorpus: 9.3 (*R*: 22), Triv: 9.2 (*R*: 18), Quad: 9.5 (*R*: 22).

465 Mean *percentage offcut*, non-legal subcorpus: 31.3 (*R*: 97), Triv: 24.4 (*R*: 70), Quad: 37.9 (*R*: 97); *longest dimension*, non-legal subcorpus: 126.0 mm (*R*: 70), Triv: 129.6 mm (*R*: 45), Quad: 122.6 mm (*R*: 65); *writing area longest dimension*, non-legal subcorpus: 91.1 mm (*R*: 68), Triv: 94.3 mm (*R*: 52), Quad: 87.7 mm (*R*: 53); *quire types per unit*, non-legal subcorpus: 1.85 (*R*: 4), Triv: 1.89 (*R*: 4), Quad: 1.82 (*R*: 4); *line height*, non-legal subcorpus: 3.83 mm (*R*: 4.40), Triv: 3.78 mm (*R*: 3.78), Quad: 3.90 mm (*R*: 4.40); *rubrication colours*, non-legal subcorpus: 1.16 (*R*: 3), Triv: 1.38 (*R*: 3), Quad: 0.94 (*R*: 2).

towards the more orderly and ornate end of the scale, bearing some similarities to the corpus' legal half. These units offer the tightest range of percentage offcut zone parchment in the entire corpus, and include the 'least offcut' units in our study (i.e., those containing the lowest percentage of offcut zone parchment). Generally the largest units, with the roomiest writing area, they also show somewhat limited range on both those measures as compared to Quad and Law units. Their number of quires per unit varies impressively, but the structure of manuscripts in the Triv group remains conservative, offering the lowest number of quire types per unit.[466] Although Triv shows a low number of rubrication colours, this measure fluctuates wildly (likely due to further subgroupings—a feature reflected, as well, in the bimodality of the previous measure), and includes the only example of trichromatic rubrication in the entire corpus.

Of course, not all manuscripts in this half of our corpus are conspicuously unusual or irregular. Consider Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Digby 2, a small format (c. 110×75 mm, 152 ff.) scholarly miscellany, mainly of logical and philosophical works, with some liturgical material, eclipse forecasts for 1281–1300 (ff. 1^{r}–4^{r}), and an Easter table starting in 1282 (f. 14^{r}). The manuscript's decoration and mise-en-page shift for almost every item therein.[467] Its nine, sometimes imperfect, production units consist of quires running to four, or six, or eight, or ten, or twelve, or (*why not?*) fourteen folia of generally indifferent writing support, with the overarching units usually containing just under one-fifth offcut zone parchment, though the amount varies from 0% (unit H: ff. 126–140) to 38% (unit E: ff. 46–95). Likely produced "in Oxford for a Franciscan involved with

---

466 A more granular analysis, not explored here, showed that quire type per unit evinces intriguing bimodality. The finding warrants further exploration in future studies.

467 For detailed description of Digby 2 and its continuation, Digby 24, see volume two, pp. 55–59.

the university",[468] Digby 2 includes a calendar (ff. 8r–13v) of standard post-1260 Franciscan use, augmented with feasts of St Patrick and of St Laurence of Dublin. Since the latter had no cult in England, we might "wonder whether the scribe was perhaps an Irish friar".[469] Regardless of its owner's identity, the manuscript's contents and material features (i.e., small format; low-quality parchment; considerable aesthetic and structural—and, to a lesser extent, generic—heterogeneity) gesture towards an open, episodic production process by an individual slowly customizing a volume of practical works for personal reference.

Nonetheless, in many ways Digby 2 remains in keeping with the legal manuscripts discussed in chapter three: produced in close association with institutional norms and contexts, and not overly surprising in its form and contents. The current chapter, however, traipses about the untamed edges of our corpus, exploring the outliers, the odd and irregular, the books and statistical findings which defy easy classification and analysis—instead sprouting a healthy crop of problems. While the limited time and space allocated to us renders discussion of all minutiae and permutations impossible, some of these problems will be presented herein so as to provide a sense of the kind of work that remains to be done as we set about making better sense of offcut zone parchment use in practice. To this end, we shall wander through two manuscripts—one from each of the largest subclusters in each of Quad and Triv: (*i*) medical, and (*ii*) theological / devotional works—shockingly different from one another, and yet similar in ways not immediately obvious. Let us set out, away from the structured confines of court rooms and university lecture halls, out beyond the

---

468 Nigel J. Morgan, "The Liturgical Manuscripts of the English Franciscans c. 1250–c. 1350", in *The English Province of the Franciscans (1224–c. 1350)*, ed. M.J.P. Robson (Leiden: Brill, 2017), 235.

469 Richard W. Pfaff, *The Liturgy in Medieval England: A History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 325–26, quote at 326.

city walls and thence into the wilderness. Don't be alarmed: for the first part of our journey, a chatty familiar shall guide us.

4.3. Liber Graculi: Harley 912

If a jackdaw copied a manuscript, the result might resemble London, British Library, Harley MS 912, a (currently) two volume manuscript of complex collation[470] running to 404 leaves (foliated 1–400*, with one original but unfoliated leaf after f. 333, and two more after f. 127) distributed across a dozen extended production units, with inconsistent layout and decoration (*fig. 4.01*).[471] This manuscript's three longest items—selections of the *summæ* by English Dominican John Bromyard (d. c. 1352) and the (probably) Welsh Franciscan John Waleys (d. c. 1285),[472] plus a set of elaborate

---

470 Namely: $I^{4\,(-2,4)}$ (1–2), II^{16} (3–18), III^{12} (19–30), IV^{16} (31–46), $V^{12\,(-1)}$ (47–57), VI–X^{12} (58–117), 6 singletons (118–123), $XI^{8\,(-1)}$ (124–127, 127*, 127**, 128), $XII^{14\,(-1)}$ (129–141), $XIII^{10\,(-1,9)}$ (142–149), $XIV^{16\,(-2,12)}$ (150–163), $XV^{12\,(-1)}$ (164–174), $XVI^{12\,(-1,2)}$ (175–184), XVII–XIX^{12} (185–220); XX^{6} (221–226), 6 singletons (227–232), XXI^{12} (233–244), $XXII^{10}$ (245–254), $XXIII^{12}$ (255–266), $XXIV^{8\,(-4)}$ (267–273), XXV^{8} (274–281), $XXVI^{6}$ (282–287), XXVII–$XXIX^{8}$ (288–311), 1 tipped-in recycled leaf (312), XXX^{12} (313–324), $XXXI^{12}$ (325–333, 333*–335), $XXXII^{22\,(-1)}$ (336–356), $XXXIII^{10}$ (357–366), $XXXIV^{12}$ (367–378), $XXXV^{4}$ (379–382), $XXXVI^{8}$ (383–390), $XXXVII^{2}$ (391–392), $XXXVIII^{10\,(-10)}$ (393–400*).

471 For details, see description in volume two, pp. 44–49.

472 Jenny Swanson, "Wales, John of [John Wallensis] (d. 1285), Franciscan Friar and Theologian", in *ODNB* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 23 September 2004), doi: 10.1093/ref:odnb/28552. In her study of Waleys, Swanson records 144 extant copies of his *Communiloquium sive Summa collationum* (eadem, *John of Wales: A Study of the Works and Ideas of a Thirteenth-Century Friar* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 229–89); Richard Sharpe adds a further three copies to the tally (*A Handlist of the Latin Writers of Great Britain and Ireland before 1540* (Turnhout: Brepols, 1997), 337–40 at 338). To the foregoing, this dissertation adds Harley MS 912, ff. 263^{r}–311^{r}, bringing the total to 148.

indexes which we shall consider in due time[473]—together comprise only about one-fifth (19%) of the total content, yet point to the book's likely intended purpose: a collection of preaching aids assembled for personal use. As a whole, the manuscript offers a hodgepodge of over 200 distinct items—ranging in length from single-line epigrams, to stretches spanning more than 100 pages of continuous (at least, more or less continuous) prose—nearly all in Latin with a smattering of brief interpolations in Middle English or French.[474] Excepting only occasional interventions by other hands—e.g., probably most of quires XXXIV [ff. 367–378] and XXXVI [ff. 391–392], and all of XXXVIII [ff. 393–400*][475]—this great mass of material was overwhelmingly copied by a single individual.[476]

Picking up his quill in the second half of the fourteenth century (probably earlier in the third quarter), this scribe–compiler left us a strongly vertical, often quite choppy, Gothic cursive,[477] with tall, straight ascenders sprouting Chancery-style loops to the right, sometimes with added spurs, or, more rarely, with bifurcation (*figs. 4.02–4.06*).[478] He relied on characteristic Anglicana features: tall,

---

473 The indexes occupy ff. 3^{r}–57^{v}; excerpts of John Bromyard's *Summa predicantium*, ff. 71^{v}–122^{v}; and John Waleys, *Summa collationum* or *Communiloquium*, ff. 263^{r}–311^{r}. I discuss Bromyard and the indexes in depth later in this chapter. For the Waleys, compare the 1481 Ulm incunabular edition (Johannes [Guallensis], *Summa collationum, sive communiloquium* (Ulm: Johann Zainer, 1[4]81)), available open-access via Universitäts- und Stadtbibliothek Köln: www.ub.uni-koeln.de/cdm/compoundobject/collection/inkunabeln/id/99575/rec/1.

474 In addition to the medical receipt on f. 366^{r}, Middle English appears at (folium.line[s]): ff. 188^{r}.14–16, 204^{v}.27–28 + 205^{r}.01, 212^{r}.08–09, 368^{r}.08–09, and bas de page on ff. 144^{v} and 177^{v}; for French, see: ff. 69^{r}.24, 82^{r}.26–27, and 368^{r}.09–11.

475 Tellingly, as discussed below, these quires appear to be almost entirely devoid of offcut zone parchment.

476 Several other locations remain unclear, and further research may point to the presence of other hands.

477 For a full description of this hand, see volume two, pp. 46–47.

478 E.g., **spurs**: 145^{v}.03 ('De h*oc* scr*i*ptu*m*'), 08 ('illa'); **bifurcation**: 145^{v}.06 ('Judith'), header ('historia').

dual-compartment /a/; the dotted English /y/; /w/ with crazily cumbersome ductus.[479] Two of the more striking letterforms include a reverse /d/ with its counterclockwise loop swooping all the way down to the very bottom of the letter (sometimes continuing slightly beyond it!), and figure-eight /g/ with lower compartment held strangely high, like a tiny child sitting on a bridge over a creek, tucking short limbs up tight to avoid wet feet from the waters below.[480] Despite variation in mise-en-page, nib width and shape, letter shape, the apparent haste with which the hand was executed, and (as we are about to see) mode, these two letterforms—swooping /d/ and timid-bottomed /g/—remain stable, offering a compass in the wilderness. This hand's highly variable duct reflects several modes of execution. Like much of the index, f. 47^{v} shows this on a single page, e.g., column one's final two lines do not match the rest of that column, but do match the tighter aspect of f. 28^{r}.07–11 or much of f. 4^{r}. Such variability might sometimes prompt us to assume multiple copyists at work throughout the manuscript, if not for the eerily consistent /d/ and /g/, along with our scribe's propensity for shifting mode mid-sentence, as we see in line six on f. 352^{r} (*fig. 4.05*; note the consistency in ink colour). Attention to these features show modifications made over an extended period of time—a pattern foregrounded in the index, certainly, but also elsewhere. Consider f. 213^{r}, which offers evidence of post-foliation additions such as the upper marginal annotation's avoidance of the foliated numeral '89' at right, suggesting addition after binding and foliation (*fig. 4.06*). Given his apparent dedication to collecting textual odds and ends, let us call this messy scribe–compiler Fr. Jackdaw.

With Harley 912 we are dealing with a largely Latinate miscellany, specifically a preacher's technical reference collection, and one often characterized by a striking degree of organizational

---

479 E.g., **/a/**: 4^{r}.02 ('edificare'), 07 ('accip*er*e'); **/y/**: 4^{r}.30 ('dyadema'); **/w/**: 4^{r}.05 ('ewang*i*lic*us*').

480 Loop of **/d/** just passes through the letter's base at, e.g., 47^{v}, col.2, 13 ('Addicu*m*'), 14 ('p*re*dicatores'). For the timid-bottomed **/g/**, see, e.g., 4^{r}.09 ('religione'), 11 ('leges'); 50^{v}.02 ('f*ra*gile*m*').

turmoil. By this stage, for mendicants, we expect more material in English—consider, for instance, the work of Augustinian John Mirk (*fl*. c. 1382–c. 1414)—particularly when arrangement of the content points towards flux. While we do encounter Latin collections for preachers, they tend to be rather better organized than this example, and, I will show, organization offers us important clues here. A highly codicologically and textually complex extended production unit, Harley 912 sends clear signals of not merely usage, but aggressive wrangling for specific purposes. We might think of it as an 'active' or 'open' or 'living book', one seemingly created by a working professional as a β-version personal tool. It is an emerging structure: a personal archive or workbook in the process of becoming.[481] Unsurprisingly, the manuscript's materiality proves rather revealing. Its blue woollen bookmarks (at ff. 50, 53, 56, 198, 221, 231, 355) suggest personal, domestic production and/or use.[482] While almost half of its production units lack offcut zone parchment, the remainder (namely, units B–H) vary in their embrace of the material (but hover around 20%), though the parchment quality trends towards 'poor' in many sections. Reliance on humble, lower-quality materials, including offcut zone parchment, is revealingly symptomatic—part and parcel of Harley 912's 'open production' signal. Given the close interrelationship of the book's physical features, and its textual and structural complexity, the manuscript is best understood if we first analyze it from a

---

481 That we lack an obvious term for this state of affairs (besides, perhaps, those suggested above) shows the extent to which we think of a codex as fixed thing, a container technology defined by its telos rather than its process.

482 See: Alexandra Gillespie, "Bookbinding", in *The Production of Books in England 1350–1500*, ed. A. Gillespie and D. Wakelin (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 167–68; Daniel Sawyer, "Navigation by Tab and Thread: Place-Markers and Readers' Movement in Books", in *Spaces for Reading in Later Medieval England*, ed. M.C. Flannery and C. Griffin (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016), 104–05, 109–10.

codicological point of view before turning our attention in earnest to how it incorporates offcut zone parchment.

In addition to the three lengthier items mentioned above, Harley 912 contains a number of other texts of more middling extent—namely, an extract from Seneca on ff. 325^{r}–331^{v} + 129^{r}–141^{v}; excerpts from Gerald of Wales' *Itinerarium Kambriæ* (3rd recension) and *Descriptio Kambriæ* (2nd recension) at ff. 209^{r}–218^{r} and 218^{r}–221^{r}, respectively;[483] selections from William Peraldus' *Summa de vitiis* (ff. 255^{r}–262^{r}),[484] as well as from Jacques de Vitry's *Historia occidentalis* (ff. 221^{v}–228^{v}); and, as a later addition occupying ff. 368^{v}–377^{v}, "De miraculis Hieronymi", a letter purportedly from Bishop Cyril of Jerusalem to Augustine, describing the miracles of Jerome.[485] Fully half (55%) of the manuscript, however, consists not of these longish-to-middling length works, but of our Jackdaw's stockpile of significantly shorter clips. And so, interspersed throughout the codex, we find selections spanning a folium or two, such as a chunk of Albertus Magnus' *Liber in mineralium* (ff. 205^{v}–207^{r}); a selection from Maximus of Turin's *Homiliæ hiemales* (ff. 145^{v}–146^{r}); Henry of Sawtry's abridged version of *Purgatorium S. Patricii* (ff. 161^{v}–162^{v}); segments of Vincent of Beauvais' *Speculum morale* (f. 160^{r}), and of Peter Comestor's *Historia scholastica* (f. 195^{v}); an entry from Riccobaldo of Ferrera's *Pomerium* (f. 143^{v}); part of "De miseria condicionis humane" by Lotario de'Conti di Segni (better-known as Pope Innocent III) (f. 123^{r}); a list of English kings with durations of their reigns

---

483 James F. Dimock, ed., *Itinerarium Kambriæ et Descriptio Kambriæ* (London: Longmans, Green, Reader, & Dyer, 1868), 6:xxxiii–xlii.

484 De luxuria, 1.1, 1.2, 2.3, 2.6, 2.7, 2.9, 5.1; de avaritia, 2.1, 2.2, 2.13; De peccato linguæ, 2.6. See: Guilielmi Peraldi, *Summæ Virtutum ac Vitiorum. Tomus Secundus* (Coloniæ Agrippinæ: Sumptibus Antonii Boëtzeri, 1629).

485 Jacques Paul Migne, ed., *Patrologiae Cursus Completus. Series Latina* (Paris, 1845), 22:289–326.

(ff. 366v–367r); and a brief explication of the Pater noster (f. 145r);[486] together with extensive short florilegia and a wide range of exempla and fables about diverse subjects such as the unicorn, Alexander and the girl, a Jew with a demon trapped in a ring,[487] and so on. The trove also features smatterings of verse: vv. 2975–3057 of Guillaume de Berneville's *La vie de saint Gilles* (ff. 183v–184r), Hugh Primas' six-line satire against Pope Lucius III (f. 337v), a version of "de tribus Herodibus" (f. 357r), the seven-line "Septem dicta recordacionis" (f. 147r), "Versus de plagis Ægyptii" (f. 145r) attributed to Hildebert de Lavardin, and lines 2716–724 of *Urbanus magnus* (f. 148v).[488]

---

[486] For these texts, see: Albertus Magnus, "Tractatus II: De lapidibus pretiosis et eorum virtutibus", in *Liber Primus: Mineralium, B. Alberti Magni*, ed. A. Borgnet (Paris: Ludovicum Vives, 1890), 5:40; Maximus of Turin, "Homilia Prima de Ieiunio Quadragesimæ", in *Salviani, Episcopi Massiliensis. De Vero Judicio et Providentia Dei, Libri VIII* (Rome: Paulum Manutium, Aldi F., 1564), 108–10; C.H. Talbot, "A List of Cistercian Manuscripts in Great Britain", *Traditio* 8 (1952), 402–18; Riccobaldo of Ferrara, "Historia episcoporum Urbis successorum Patri Apostoli vicarii Christi", in *Pomerium Ravennatis Ecclesie*, ed. G. Zanella, lib 6.2, no. 159 [anno MIII] (Cremona, 2001, www.gabrielezanella.it/Pubblicati/Pomerium.html).

[487] Papers on some of these smaller items, including the tale of the Jew with a demon-haunted ring (this latter co-authored Dr Adrienne Williams Boyarin and myself) are in progress.

[488] On these texts, see: Jocelyn Wogan-Browne, "The Apple's Message: Some Post-Conquest Hagiographic Accounts of Textual Transmission", in *Late-Medieval Religious Texts and Their Transmission*, ed. A.J. Minnis (Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 1994), 46 n.21, citing: Louis Brandin, « Un fragment de la Vie de Saint Gilles, un vers français », *Romania* 33, no. 129 (1904), 94–98; Berthe M. Marti, "Hugh Primas and Arnulf of Orléans", *Speculum* 30, no. 2 (1955), 233–38; Domenico Pezzini, "Le 'Ore della Croce' nelle Liriche Inglesi Tardo-Medievali", *Ævum* 83, no. 3 (2009), 698; Lucie Doležalová, "Latin Mnemonic Verses Combining the Ten Commandments with the Ten Plagues of Egypt Transmitted in Late Medieval Bohemia", in *The Ten Commandments in Medieval and Early Modern Culture*, ed. Y. Desplenter, J. Pieters, and W.S. Melion (Leiden: Brill, 2017), 152–72; Fiona Whelan, *The Making of Manners and Morals in Twelfth-Century England* (New York: Taylor & Francis, 2017), 147 n.106.

Amidst all this, Fr. Jackdaw squirrelled away a gleaming hoard of bright and shiny snippets: a single line Greek alphabet list (f. 155^{v}) attributed to Arn of Salzburg;[489] a pair of lines from dist. 5 of Paucapalea's *Summa* on the *Decretum Gratiani* (f. 203^{v}),[490] two lines on the 1308 coronation of Edward II (f. 148^{v}), another brace of lines from *Viridarium consolationis* (1.1.24, at f. 195^{r}),[491] a heap of synchronisms[492] from two to eight lines in length (ff. 195^{v}–196^{r}), a couplet from Carmina

---

489 Alan Griffiths, "A Family of Names: Rune-Names and Ogam-Names and Their Relation to Alphabet Letter-Names", (PhD diss., Universiteit Leiden, 2013), table 16 [2:34, 6].

490 Johann Friedrich von Schulte, ed., *Die Summa des Paucapalea über das Decretum Gratiani* (Giessen: Roth, 1891), 11.

491 Chris L. Nighman, ed., "Viridarium consolationis. Pars 1: De peccatis, caput 1: De superbia (24)", *Digital Viridarium consolationis Project* (Waterloo, ON: Wilfrid Laurier University, 2021), web.wlu.ca/history/cnighman/VC/Fontes/1.1.24.pdf.

492 For instance, "N*otandum* q*uod* b*eat*a I*oannes* ewang*eles* fuit xxxj^{a} [triginta unum] annor*um* q*uando Christus* mortuus e*st* / vixit an*no* p*ost* passione*m* dom*inum* lxviij [sexaginta octo] annis *et* mortuus e*st*·" (f. 195^{v}.26–27). I am indebted to Dr Elizabeth Boyle (Maynooth) for assistance in identifying the nature of these items.

Burana (CB207, at f. 144v),[493] verses such as those opening f. 197v,[494] and countless Latin tags—e.g., "lignum Crux· *et* auis· en femina q*uae* t*ibi* manis· / Pestis vtraq*ue* grauis s*ed* femina prior vtrauis" (f. 146v), and "Hostis no*n* ledit n*isi* cu*m* temptat*us* obedit / Est leo si cedit · Si no*n* q*uasi* m*us*ca recedit" (f. 207r). Many of these items are previously attested— Primas' Satire, for instance, can be found in Copenhagen, Arnamagnæan Institute, AM 732 b 4to, f. 4v; "de tribus Herodibus" pops up in Berne, Burgerbibliothek, Bongarsiana Cod. 434, f. 51r,[495] among others; f. 145r's explication of the Pater noster appears in Paris, Bibliothéque de Mazarine, MS 774; Wien, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, MS 795, f. 19r includes the Greek alphabet list; and London, British Library, Arundel MS 8365, f. 12v has another copy of "Septem dicta recordacionis". Some can be found quite widely. For instance, "Versus de plagis Ægyptii" (also found in London, British Library, Cotton MS Vitellius A XII; Paris, Bibliothéque de l'Arsenal, MS 937; Lille, Bibliothéque municipale,

---

493 J.A. Schmeller, ed., *Carmina Burana: Lateinische und Deutsche eiser Handschrift des XIII Jahrhunderts aus Benedictbeuern auf der K. Bibliothek zu München* (Breslau: Verlag von Wilhelm Koebner, 1883), 245.

494 Namely, "<…> p*ro* pietate*m* mites t*erra*m po*s*sideam*us* / <…> nimis amissis doleas no*n* o*mn*e q*uod* audie / Crede; n*ec* affectes id h*abe*re neq*uis*· / Larga di*e* pietas venia*m* no*n* dimidiabit / Aut nil aut totu*m* te lac*ri*ma*n*te dabit / Sit t*ibi* pot*us* aq*uam* cibus arid*us* aspe*r*a vestis / Dorso u*ir*ga· breuis sompn*us* <dur*umque*> cubile / Flecte genu tu*n*de pect*us* nudu*m* capu*d* ora". A version of lines 2–3 ("Nec amissa nimis luge, nec omne quod audis crede, nec affectes id quod habere nequis") appears as a note in Lincoln, Cathedral Chapter, MS 132 (C.5.8) (Rodney M. Thomson, *Catalogue of the Manuscripts of Lincoln Cathedral Chapter Library* (Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 1989), 101); f. 5r.a of Arnamagnæan, AM 732 b 4to gives a version of lines 4–5 ("*Omnipotens* dominus ·ueniam non dimidiabit / Aut nil aut totum te lacrimante dabit"); and lines 6–8 open an eleven-line poem on f. 26v of Harley 956 (Greti Dinkova-Bruun, "Notes on Poetic Composition in the Theological Schools ca.1200 and the Latin Poetic Anthology from Ms. Harley 956: A Critical Edition", *Sacris Erudiri* 43 (2004), 344–45).

495 Hermannus Hagen, ed., *Catalogus codicum bernensium (Bibliotheca Bongarsiana)* (Bern: B.F. Haller, 1875), 381.

MS 447; Genève, Bibliothèque publique et universitaire, MS lat. 140; etc.), and the widespread "Hostis non ledit", sometimes misattributed to the *Fasciculus morum*, though it did not originate there.[496]

4.3.1. An 'Open' Book …

Despite the immense value of these riches for any preacher, it appears our Jackdaw found his cache unwieldy. Harley 912 offers multiple hints of its compiler's frustration, such as numerous cross references to other folia, and, perhaps most conspicuously, a series of twenty-four repeatedly expanded (and occasionally cancelled) indexes. For a mid-fourteenth-century English manuscript, created almost contemporary with the most active period of Bromyard—who was somewhat of a referencing pioneer[497]—Harley 912 shows itself eerily precocious in this feature, and exploring the

---

496 S. Wenzel, "The English Verses in the *Fasciculus Morum*", in *Chaucer and Middle English Studies: In Honour of Rossell Hope Robbins*, ed. B. Rowland (New York: Routledge, 1974), 232; Anthony Fitzherbert, *The Book of Husbandry, by Master Fitzherbert, Reprinted from the Edition of 1534*, ed. W.W. Skeat (London: Trübner & co., 1882), 117 [= f. 84]; G. Holmstedt, ed., *Speculum Christiani: A Middle English Treatise of the Fourteenth Century* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1930), 240.

497 Bromyard's works include indexes and "efficient system[s] of cross-reference, at a time when it was still a relative novelty for an author to index his own works" (Peter Binkley, "Bromyard [Bromyarde], John (d. c. 1352), Dominican Friar and Preacher", in *ODNB* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 23 September 2004), doi: 10.1093/ref:odnb/3521). On medieval indexing more generally, see: Caroline Diepeveen, "Continental European Indexing: Then and Now", *The Indexer* 25, no. 2 (2006), 74–78; Bella Hass Weinberg, "Book Indexes in France: Medieval Specimens and Modern Practices", *The Indexer* 22, no. 1 (2000), 2–13; eadem, "Predecessors of Scientific Indexing Structures in the Domain of Religion", in *The History and Heritage of Scientific and Technological Information Systems: Proceedings of the 2002 Conference*, ed. W.B. Rayward and M.E. Bowden (Medford, NJ: Information Today, 2004), 126–34; Mary A. Rouse and Richard A. Rouse, « Concordances et index », en *Mise en page et mise en texte du livre manuscrit*, éd. H.-J. Martin and J. Vezin (Paris: Editions du Cercle, 1990), 218–28.

manuscript's elaborate indexing and cross-referencing proves especially fruitful. This opening set of navigational tools, the third of Harley 912's longest texts, is, in fact, the longest single item in the manuscript. Fifty-eight folia in length (*fig. 4.07*), it betrays signs of intense, contemporary reworking and modification for particular ends. As we shall discover, we can see Fr. Jackdaw preparing to tackle this tool, starting the task, abandoning it out of frustration or tedium, but returning again and again. Overlapping each other in various ways, and evidently compiled in multiple stages, Harley 912's indexes offer glimpses of what our preacher sought from his collection, and how he went about extracting it.

Diverse in extent and foci, the two dozen constituent indexes include a dedicated table for the Seneca excerpts (f. 2$^{r–v}$), plus several false starts: indexes commenced, only to be abandoned and crossed-out (ff. 2^{v}, 47^{r}). The remainder tackles manifold subjects: the doings of emperors and kings (ff. 4^{v}, 52^{v}), as well as of the Welsh (f. 54^{r}); curses and the lifting thereof (f. 47^{v}); exempla and stories "no*ta*biles *et* mirabiles" (f. 49^{v}), "ad religiosos" (f. 52^{v}), "*contra* diu*er*sa p*e*ccat*a*" (ff. 50^{r}–51^{v}); ecclesiastical history (f. 49^{v}); little analogies and "fabul*is*" of the sheep, the wolf, etc. (f. 52^{v}); metaphors on diverse topics such as the ring of Moses, or Alexander and the girl (ff. 54^{v}–55^{r}); accounts of the Holy Land and other parts of the East (f. 53$^{r–v}$); and so on. A small number—such as those titled "De fabul*is*" and "An*a*themati" (ff. 52^{r}, 47^{v})—offer only a few entries, yet the section culminates in an eighty-two page alphabetic thematic index (ff. 6^{r}–46^{r}) guiding readers to material on myriad topics: Ely and Rome, usury and cupidity, obedience, the Magdalen, and the Mass, along with trees and eyes and partridges, books and dice, soldiers and paupers, silence and beauty.

When not compiled long after a codex's initial production, medieval indexes all too often consist of generic tables (sometimes purchased separately) listing subsections of major texts, akin to

those associated with Statuta Angliæ (see chapter three, pp. 105–06) or with the Decretals.[498] Neither is the case here. Rather, Harley 912's idiosyncratic, codex-specific indexes offer brief descriptions of target items (a short summary, title, or first line)—with some indexes going a step further, arranging individual entries beneath underlined subject headings—plus location indicators keyed to specific folia, for instance, "planete· vij· planete; 7· artib*us com*per*ant*ur· 93·b·" (f. 36r), "Rex· De vitus *et* u*ir*tutib*us* i*n* rege· C50·" (f. 37v), "Stella· De Stella q*ue* c*ir*cu*m*dat*ur* corona· 51·f·" (f. 42r), "De p*ur*gatorio pat*ri*cii· ·39·" (f. 50r). Specific to this manuscript, they reference nearly the full span of its collected contents, including both major and minor texts.

If we attend to these location indicators, a further dimension of Harley 912's complexity emerges. In addition to the modern foliation mentioned in passing above, roughly 75% of Harley 912's leaves bear fourteenth-century foliation in Hindu–Arabic (e.g., '214') or combined Hindu–Arabic and Roman (e.g., 'CC·14') numerals—in not one, but two sequences. The first of these sets of medieval foliation (for clarity, designated 'ff_{m1}.') irregularly populates the initial post-index section of Harley 912: ff. 58–128 (production units C–D). After popping up at f. 60 (corresponding to f_{m1}. 3), this foliation continues until f. 107 (= f_{m1}. 50), then disappears. The second sequence ('ff_{m2}.') begins with numeral 3 (i.e., f_{m2}. 3) on f. 129r, and runs until f. 378r (= f_{m2}. 267) (*fig. 4.01*). Our indexes cite this *second sequence* of medieval foliation, omitting the ff_{m1}. leaves, as well as the four irregular quires—which lack medieval foliation—at the very end of the manuscript: Fr. Jackdaw's carefully-honed reference tool applies only to ff. 129–368. (How odd! After all, the ff_{m1}. quires, the ff_{m2}. quires, and some of the final unfoliated quires appear to be of the same

---

498 For instance, Oxford, Merton College, MS 266, ff. 143r–192v (also found in Bruges, Stadsbibliotek, 373, ff. 1–92) and 196r–236v (also: Basel, Universitätsbibliothek, C.V.37, ff. 1–52; Bruges, Stadsbibliotek, 373, ff. i–lxxx), or Iohannes de Deo's widely attested *Decretum abbreuiatum* (e.g., Oxford, Merton College, MS D.3.7).

approximate date. For now, just tuck away this peculiarity: we shall return to it.) This portion of the manuscript, bearing the second set of medieval foliation and Jackdaw's collection of sources, consists of five production units copied on variable quality support. Offering comparatively low proportions of offcut zone parchment—ranging from 16% through 31%—it nonetheless contains Harley 912's most conspicuously shoddy bifolia (see § 4.3.2).

To further complicate matters, most of the entries encode target locations alphanumerically,[499] with the numeric component singling out a particular leaf, whereas its alphabetic counterpart specifies a location on that leaf, marked by Jackdaw with marginal minuscules (*fig. 4.09*). Within the second set of medieval foliation, these letters appear in the margins of most folia (81% of leaves in $ff_{m2.}$),[500] and seem to be unique to these witnesses of these texts, suggesting that Jackdaw imposed them upon his collection, likely for faster referencing. The technique helped our clever scribe–compiler expedite navigation of his large and messy book, locating a specific passage as swift as a hare in a glade.

A more immediately conspicuous aspect of the indexes is their 'well-ventilated quality', with constituent sections set off from one another by generous whitespace. Such distinctive mise-en-page signals that the indexes' current state was far from the last word: Fr. Jackdaw planned further growth and cultivation. In support of this hypothesis, consider the index of "versus· de diu*er*sis mat*er*iis" (ff. 48^{v}, 49^{r}). Split across two folia and interrupted by another index, its arrangement suggests that Jackdaw expected a relatively succinct list, but dredged up too many examples for the allotted space,

---

499 Alphanumeric location markers populate all index folia except 50^{r}–51^{r}, 52^{v}, 53^{v}, 54^{v}–55^{r}; they occur only once on ff. 51^{v}, 53^{r}, and 54^{r}.

500 Indexed folia bearing marginal minuscules: ff. 129–131, 133–134, 136–141, 143–156, 158, 160, 163–173, 175–177, 179–208, 210, 214–218, 221–223, 227–267, 269–311, 313, 315–317, 321–322, 324, 330–332, 335–336, 339, 341, 345, 351–365, and 368.

forcing the inventory to spill over onto the next page. In truth, the outcome was probably inevitable. Although Jackdaw did index items corresponding to verse in our modern sense (e.g., Guillaume de Berneville's *La vie de saint Gilles* (c. 1150) at ff. 183^{v}–184^{r}), he deployed the term "v*er*sus" in capacious fashion, often applying the designation to myriad brief items—encompassing short rhyming mnemonics, epigrams, and so on—tucked in around other texts. For the most part, "versus· de diu*er*sis mat*er*iis" labels its entries with a summary of their content or main theme (e.g., "De te*m*ptac*i*one di*abol*a· 83" (f. 48^{v})), though some items supply a portion of the opening line, as at f. 48^{v}, where "Lignu*m* c*ru*x *et* auis· 20" indexes f. 146^{v}'s couplet "lignum Crux· *et* auis· en femina q*uae* t*ibi* manis· / Pestis vtraq*ue* grauis s*ed* femina prior vtrauis". Yet see, for instance, ff. 166^{r}, 169^{v}, 186, 270^{v}, 278, and 306^{v}, where the verses are embedded in prose (in such cases a marginally scrawled "vs" or "v*er*sus" sometimes pinpoints the target, as on f. 306^{v}). With the exception of ff. 166^{r} and 169^{v}, little on those leaves suggests "verse" at initial glance, and what glimmered enough to catch a Jackdaw's eye remains unclear.

Notable for our purposes, however, are traces of the indexes' developmental history. The opening entries in "versus· de diu*er*sis mat*er*iis" list location anchors in approximate folium order: 18, 19, 20, 19, 21, 21, 21, 22, 22, 49, 60, 62, 49. Beneath that last entry, a decisive separation line conveys finality: *enough with this index!* Nonetheless, immediately thereafter, the litany of verses resumes with the fineness of the pen nib and/or colour of the ink shifting every few items, and the folium order growing more random: 199, 83, 72, 209, 246, 226, ~~227~~, 227, 227, [f. 49^{r}:] 227, 40, 43, 44, 69, 73, 73, 73, 73, 81, 83, 246, 246, 37, 8, 9, 147, 183. These details show that the inventory was not compiled via strict methodical progression, working through the collection from the first to the last folium—at least, not for very long. Instead, Jackdaw created a perfunctory list, only to repeatedly revisit it as he amended and used his book. (Did he just *now*, and *now*, and *now* suddenly

realize that a previously copied item did—or, on second thought, did not [note the cancelled entry on f. 48v]—constitute verse? It seems so.) Similar features (irregularities in mise-en-page, abrupt changes in the writing quill and/or ink colour, stochastic order of folia numbers, and so on) occur in the rest of the indexes, as well. By way of example, see f. 34r where Jackdaw again ran out of space, coaxing us overleaf with a signe-de-renvoi; or the additions to the indexes, repeatedly crammed into gaps and margins (e.g., ff. 16r, 22v, 50r, 50v, 52r);[501] or the cancellations at ff. 9r, 48r, and 48v. With offcut zone parchment comprising over one-fifth of the indexes' bifolia (22%), the section's writing support further bolsters this sense of a 'work in progress'. Together, these properties of the indexes—their granularity, the alphanumeric location anchors, copious space left for future emendations, signs of repeated alteration and augmentation, all on indifferent writing support—paint a picture of a practical professional tool, actively relied upon, and undergoing intermittent growth and development.

Fr. Jackdaw puts these folia numerals, and occasionally the alphanumeric location anchors, to work beyond his indexes. Peppering Harley 912's post-index leaves (for the most part[502]) are just under four dozen marginal cross-references of three general types: external cross-references, and two types of internal cross-reference (*fig. 4.08*).[503] The number of volumes referenced in the external examples is unclear; they include, among others, a white (or perhaps tawed) book (f. 240r: "ad Id*e*m

---

501 Additions in different ink appear at: ff. 6v, 10v, 16r–v, 18v, 20r–v, 21v, 22v, 24r–v, 25v, 26v, 27r, 28r–v, 29v, 30r, 34r, 35v, 37v, 38r–v, 43r, 44r, 45v, 47v, 48v, 49r–v, 50r–v, 51v, 52r–v, 53r, 54r, 55r, 57v.

502 A few appear in the indexes. One, at f. 34r, directs the seeker to items overleaf via a signe-de-renvoi. Another, at f. 50v, indexes with a cross-reference formula ("ad id*e*m no*ta* … 11·C·21").

503 External cross-references appear on: ff. 29v (*bis*), 165r, 234v, 238r, 240r, 317r (*bis*), 317v, 318v, 364v, 382r, 387v, and 389r; for internal cross-references, see: ff. 50v, 65r, 67r, 71v, 123r, 124r, 130r, 131v, 145r, 145v, 146v, 148v, 155v, 182v, 183r, 184v, 204r, 207v, 216r, 226v, 232r, 232v, 236r, 243r, 254v, 322v, 343r, 351v (*bis*), 355v, 358r, 359r, 360v, 365v, and 389r.

i*n* albo li*bro* … 70·a"), a visually similar book*let* (f. 165^{r}: "ad Id*e*m i*n* libella alba C·95"), a large book (f. 238^{r}: "ad Id*e*m i*n* magno li*bro* ·71·"), at least one volume of Rabanus (f. 234^{v}: "ad id*em* i*n* p*rimo* rabano a 22· 11"; f. 389^{r}: "spisso albo Rabano 400· 10·c p*er* to*tum*"; see also the two added cross-references on f. 29^{v}), and so on. Several of these cross-references could share a single target. For instance, the white book of f. 240^{r} could be the white Rabanus mentioned on f. 389^{r} which could certainly be f. 238^{r}'s large book. Contrariwise, the references might designate a series of discrete codices: a white book (f. 240^{r}), a large book (f. 165^{r}), a white Rabanus (f. 389^{r}), et cetera. Complicating the situation, the codices in question could belong to Jackdaw's library or (perhaps more likely, for a preacher) to an institutional library which granted him access.

One day the puzzle of Jackdaw's library may be solved, but today is not that day. Instead, we turn to his *internal* cross-references. As noted, these take two forms. Those of the first type, simple in structure and comprising over half of all cross-references in Harley 912, refer the reader to relevant passages skulking elsewhere in the manuscript. Typically quite terse—e.g., "CC·13", "n*ota* ad Id*em* i*n* / mat*er*iis 14", "No*ta* ad id*e*m C·19·b", "ad Id*e*m 20", "no*ta* 254·e" (ff. 131^{v}, 145^{r}, 232^{r}, 359^{r}, 360^{v})—they crop up as more elaborate instructions, as well, for instance, "No*ta* p*ro* prelatis s*iue* visitatorib*us* sec*u*lariu*m et* religiosor*um* C·39·b" (f. 389^{r}). The second type of internal cross-reference facilitates navigation of the especially disjointed witnesses in Harley 912—and on multiple occasions they are sorely needed, indeed.

Fr. Jackdaw, you see, exhibited a habit of copying lengthy, multi-section works with their constituent sections arranged in incorrect order; randomly abridged; and interspersed with other, significantly shorter texts. While frequent abridgements are not unheard of for this type of manuscript, his other practices often render unclear the question of whether he had finished copying a particular item. More than once a text appears to end, only for more of it to crop up a few leaves

ahead—or several quires back. By way of example, on f. 325r we encounter part of an extract from Seneca (*Declamationes* I, Controversiæ). The passage ends imperfectly at mid-page on f. 331v, only to pick up again at f. 129r, after which it continues until ending at f. 141r. A more extended state of disorder prevails in one of the manuscript's longest texts: an abortive copy of the *Summa prædicantium* (ff. 71v–122v) of John Bromyard (a.k.a. Joannes Bromyerde; d. c. 1352).[504] Written in the second quarter of the 1300s,[505] and described by Peter Binkley as "surely the largest English collection of preaching aids to flow from a single pen in the fourteenth century", this "encyclopaedia for preachers" consists of 198 chapters, alphabetically arranged, each engaging with a potential sermon topic.[506] Its contents split evenly between Bromyard's own polemical argumentation and carefully-cited excerpts from authorities, allowing users to build their own sermons by piecing together selections of Bromyard's models, or taking his source materials as a starting point for their own ideas. Subjects covered include specific sins and virtues (e.g., avarice, faith), concepts of theological interest (e.g., excommunication, angels), and issues "suitable for moral discussion" (e.g., labour, warfare).[507] Running to almost a million words, this immense work may have been compiled

---

504 Sharpe, *A Handlist of the Latin Writers*, 220–21. Sharpe (221) lists five witnesses—Avignon, Bibliothèque municipale, MSS 305, 306 (volumes two and three of an originally three-volume set); Cambridge, Peterhouse, MSS 24, 25 (a two-volume set); Cardiff, Public Library, MS 3.174, ff. 5r–236v (an abbreviated copy of A–L); London, British Library, Royal MS 7 E IV; and Oxford, Oriel College, MS 10, ff. 1r–(271)—plus two attested copies, the whereabouts of which remain unknown—Canterbury, St Augustine's (BA1.752); Norwich, 1352 bequest of Simon Bozon (B58.25). To these witnesses, this dissertation adds Harley MS 912, ff. 71v–122r (a copy of most of A).

505 Leonard E. Boyle, "The Date of the *Summa Praedicantium*", *Speculum* 48 (1973), 533–37.

506 Peter Binkley, "John Bromyard and the Hereford Dominicans", in *Centres of Learning: Learning and Location in Pre-Modern Europe and the Near East*, ed. J.W. Drijvers and A.A. MacDonald (Leiden: Brill, 1995), 255–56.

507 Binkley, "John Bromyard", 256.

collaboratively, with Bromyard himself acting as a chief editor overseeing a team of friars at Hereford Priory.[508] Harley 912 contains versions of the majority of the *Summa*'s 'A' chapters which should total twenty-seven in number, running from Abiectio to Auaricia.[509] Alas, our witness' coverage proves rather spotty. Of the twenty-seven, only eighteen appear in Harley 912—in the order, A.13: Aduentus, A.8: Accidia, A.10: Accipere, A.11: Accusatio, A.12: Acquisitie, A.7: Absolutis, A.3: Ab infantia, A.4: Abstinentia, A.5: Absconsie, A.1: Abiectio, A.2: Abiicere, A.9: Accedere, A.17: Adulterium, A.15: Adulatio, A.18: Aduersitas, A.19: Ambulare, A.16: Adoratio, and finally A.20: Amor—all subjected to heavy abridgement. For instance, Harley 912's chapter A.3, "Ab infantia" (ff. 97^{v}.08–99^{r}.30), contains less than half as much text as the same chapter in Anton Koberger's 1485 Nürnberg edition of the *Summa* (Bromyard ff. 26^{v}–27^{r}), with some of that chapter's articles omitted entirely—e.g., art. 4, 12, 15–16, 22—and others truncated to less than half their length—e.g., art. 6, 9, 14, 17–18, 20–21. At the time of writing, the location of Harley 912's Bromyard chapters A.14, A.21–A.27 remains a mystery (given our scribe's approach to copying, if originally included and not lost, they may consist of fragments tucked away on random leaves elsewhere in the manuscript).

---

508 Binkley, "John Bromyard", 259, 263.

509 Namely: Abiectio (ff. 102^{r}–103^{v}), Abiicere (ff. 103^{v}–104^{v}), Ab infantia (ff. 97^{v}–99^{r}), Abstinentia (ff. 99^{v}–100^{v}), Absconsio (ff. 101^{r}–102^{r}), Abusio, Absolutio (ff. 93^{r}–97^{v}), Accidia (ff. 72^{r}–74^{v}), Accedere (ff. 104^{v}–105^{v}), Accip*ere* (ff. 75^{r}–76^{v}), Accusatio (ff. 77^{r}–79^{v}), Acquisitio (ff. 79^{v}–93^{r}), Aduentus (ff. 71^{v}–72^{r}), Aduocatio, Adulatio (ff. 108^{r}–111^{v}), Adoratio (ff. 115^{r}–116^{v}), Adulteriu*m* (ff. 105^{v}–108^{r}), Aduersitas (ff. 111^{v}–113^{r}), Ambulare (ff. 113^{r}–115^{r}), Amor (ff. 116^{v}–122^{v}), Amicicia, Angeli, Anima, Arma, Ascendere, Audire, and Auaricia. List source: Johannes de Bromyard, *Summam predicantium*: *op*[*us*] *vtiq*[*ue*] *co*[*m*]*me*[*n*]*datissimu*[*m*] (Nurenbergk: Anthoniu[m] koberger, [1485], ISTC no. ij00261000); chapters appearing in Harley 912 sublineated with locations given in parentheses.

A still greater challenge emerges during Fr. Jackdaw's selections from *Remediarium conversorum*, Peter of Waltham's synthesis of excerpts, focusing exclusively on moral life, from Gregory the Great's lengthy *Moralia in Iob*.[510] In his 1984 edition of the text, Joseph Gildea, OSA reported seventeen known extant witnesses.[511] The *Mirabile* website lists a further three witnesses, two of which do appear to contain witnesses of the *Remediarium* (if the corresponding catalogue

---

510 The prologue of the *Remediarium* takes the form of a letter to Bishop Richard FitzNeal, under whom Peter (a.k.a. Petrus Londinensis; d. aft. 1194) was Archdeacon of London (Sharpe, *A Handlist of the Latin Writers*, 435; Morton W. Bloomfield, *Incipits of Latin Works on the Virtues and Vices, 1100–1500 A.D.* (Cambridge, MA: Mediaeval Academy of America, 1979), 2819, 6476). On Peter himself, see: René Wasselynck, « Les compilations des ‹ Remediarium Conversorum › du VII^{e} au XII^{e} siècle », *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale* 29 (1962), 28–31.

511 Joseph Gildea (*Remediarium Conversorum: A Synthesis in Latin of Moralia in Job by Gregory the Great* (Villanova: Villanova University Press, 1984), 2–3) reports: Arras, Bibliothèque municipale, MS 331, ff. 2ra–130^{rb}; Cambridge, University Library, MS Ff.IV.37, ff. 119ra–195va; Cambridge, Trinity College Library, MS B.2.1, ff. 1ra–98^{vb}; Cortona, Biblioteca del Comune di Cortona e dell'Accademia Etrusca, MS 62, ff. 3ra–180^{vb}; Graz, Universitätsbibliothek, MS 1025, ff. 2ra–140^{vb}; Hereford, Hereford Cathedral Chapter Library, MS P.III.12, ff. 1ra–67^{rb}; Klagenfurt, Studienbibliothek, MS 154, ff. 173ra–200^{vb}; London, British Library, Royal MS 7 A VII, ff. 1ra–130ra; London, St Paul's Cathedral Library, MS 4, ff. 1ra–188^{vb}; Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Bodley 809, ff. 1ra–85^{vb}; Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Hamilton 53, ff. 1^{r}–193^{v}; Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Laud misc. 6, ff. 1ra–180va; Oxford, Merton College Library, Coxe MS 48, ff. 17ra–123^{rb}; Paris, Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal, MS 408A, ff. 7^{r}–169^{v}; Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS lat. 3227, ff. 1^{v}–157^{v}; Paris, Bibliothèque Mazarine, MS 686, ff. 1ra–149^{vb}; and Tours, Bibliothèque municipale, MS 327, ff. 101ra–266^{vb}. Klagenfurt self-consciously consists of extracts; the Arras, both Cambridge, Graz, Hereford, Royal, Hamilton, and Tours witnesses are imperfect. On Arras, all three Paris witnesses, Bodley 809, and Hamilton 53, see: René Wasselynck, « Extraits du ‹ Remediarium Conversorum › de Pierre de Londres », *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale* 32 (1965), 121–32.

entries are sound).[512] To the latter inventory, this dissertation adds Harley 912, bringing the total number of witnesses to twenty. Fr. Jackdaw embarks upon his copy of the text on f. 229r, starting with portions of Waltham's prologue (f. 229r.01–19).[513] Transitioning to the *Remediarium* proper at f. 229v, he selectively picks his way through part 1, book 1, and on into book 2, thence to the prologue and first chapter of book 3, ending a few leaves later amidst a litany of vices: "De t*ri*stici / a· malitia· rancor· pusillanimitas· desp*er*at*i*o· torpor· / circa p*ræ*cepta ¶ vagatio me*n*tis· erga illicita· De auaritia" (f. 232v.30–32). Overleaf, on f. 233r, the unexpected lies in wait: a strange, abrupt shift. The nature of the text at ff. 233r.01–235v.17 remains unclear. Despite incorporation of an excerpt from part 2, book 1, c. 3 at f. 233r.21–28, and the presence of cross-references linking ff. 243v and 232r, these few folia do not seem to belong to the *Remediarium*. Maybe Jackdaw worked from a corrupt exemplar? In any event, shortly thereafter, another disruption occurs: the opening line of f. 236r picks up from the previous break (i.e., from f. 232v.32): "De auaritia p*ro*dit*i*o· fraus· fallacia·

---

512 The two witnesses are: Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek, VLQ 67, ff. 1r–126v (Karel Adriaan de Meyïer, *Codices Vossiani Latini, Pars II: Codices in Quarto* (Leiden: Universitaire Pers Leiden, 1975), 2:155–56) and Praha, Archiv Prazského Hradu, Knihovna Metropolitní Kapituly, N. VI, ff. 132r–193r (Antonin Podlaha, *Soupis rukopisu knihovny Metropolitní Kapitoly prazské. F–P* (Prague: Ceské Akademie Ved a Umení, 1922), 2:367–70 [no. 1530]); *Mirabile* also lists Hereford, Hereford Cathedral Chapter Library, MS P.III.11 ("Petrus Londoniensis Archdiaconus m. post 1194: Remediarium Conversorum", *Mirabile*, dir. L. Pinelli (S.l.: Società Internazionale per lo Studio del Medioevo Latino and Fondazione Ezio Franceschini, 2016)), but its inclusion appears to be an error: the codex in question contains Peter Lombard's *Sententiarum libri IV* (R.A.B. Mynors and R.M. Thomson, eds., *Catalogue of the Manuscripts of Hereford Cathedral Library* (Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 1993), 88).

513 As with other lengthy texts, Fr. Jackdaw freely abridges Waltham. Hence the start of his witness to the prologue on f. 229v.01–19 corresponds to Gildea's edition as follows: lines 01–12 = Gildea 27.15–28.27, 12–17 = ibid. 28.30–28.34, 17–19 = ibid. 28.38–28.40. Due to space limitations, I decided against providing line to line correspondences in this discussion. I am working on a paper providing a more granular description and analysis.

p*er*iuria· Inq*uui*etudo· viol*e*ntia *et contra* mi*seri*am cordis obdurat*i*ones", carrying on with 1.3.1 (f. 236^{r}.01–236^{v}.25). From here, Fr. Jackdaw continues his selective copying from various books in part 1, and on into part 2, until the end of the next gathering (f. 254^{v}) where he suddenly grinds to a halt amidst part 2, book 4, c. 1: "ut sic debita minist*er*ia a s*u*bditis exigat· q*ua*tin*us* ip*s*e". To complete the passage, one must flip back several quires to f. 207^{v}: "ip*s*e *etiam* q*uid* semp*er* admonit*i*onis debeat sollicitus atte*n*dat·" (2.4.1). The excerpt finally ends at f. 208^{v} in c. 19 of part 2, book 4. Thus, Harley 912's imperfect witness of Waltham's *Remediarium* runs as follows:

- ff. 229^{r}–232^{v}: part 1, from prologue of book 1, through book 3, c. 1;
- ff. 236^{r}–254^{v}: part 1, book 3, c. 1 (continued) through books 4–6; followed by part 2, books 1, and 3–4, ending at 2.4.1;
- ff. 207^{v}–208^{v}: part 2, book 4, continuation of c. 1 on through c. 19.

Fortunately, our messy Jackdaw strew breadcrumbs to guide us through this tricky part of the forest. The first lurks bas de page on f. 232^{v}, where we find the annotation, "Req*ui*re in p*ri*ncipio q*ua*rti folii", preceded by a signe-de-renvoi. Leaping ahead the stipulated quartet of folia brings us to f. 236^{r}, where the upper margin offers both the corresponding *signe* and a further note confirming our arrival at the correct waypoint: "No*ta* i*n* p*redicta*m *quarto* folio". A similar annotation at f. 254^{v} ("Req*ui*re … 83° folio i*n* [*secunda*] p*ar*te ad … signu*m*") links to f. 207^{v}—which, again, bears a matching *signe* plus a note helpfully signposting back whence we came ("N*ota* <p*ri*ncipiu*m* istius

mat*er*ie> ·C31·").[514] The challenge met, now our path is clear again—on ahead, straight as the crow flies. We only thought we were lost.

4.3.2. … Or Open Book*s*?

So why the jumping about? Is Harley 912 simply assembled out of order? From a textual standpoint, the codex resembles a squirrel's nest in places, with some sections more chaotic than others. Nonetheless, the evidence does not support such a hypothesis. For instance, across both the comparatively neat grove of Bromyard chapters and the branching thicket of Waltham excerpts all bifolia nest correctly: no lacunae intrude, even where the text spans a quire break. Moreover, upon completing a chapter, Jackdaw typically commenced a new chapter on the very next line—often, to all appearances, in a single stint of copying (see, e.g., *fig. 4.10*). Similar patterns hold throughout the manuscript. Quires are largely sound, with few hints of reorganization. Excluding only that on f. 69^{v}, Harley 912's eighteen catchwords[515] all match the first word of the following quire. Most seem to have been added during copying except those on ff. 208^{v}, 232^{v}, and 244^{v} (and possibly 287^{v}), where the ink and pen nib of the catchword appear to match those of the leaf's marginal annotations, rather

---

514 The annotation on f. 254^{v} directs us to "83" (= f. 207^{v}), where instructions point back to "C·31"—that is, not f. 254^{v}, but f. 255^{r}, at the start of selections from Dominican friar Willelmus Peraldus' (d. c. 1271) *Summa de vitiis* (ff. 255^{r}–262^{r}). The anchor should specify "C·30". In fairness, since the versos lack foliation, "C·31" *is* the only foliation visible from the target: f. 254^{v}. Thus, while "C·31" may be a simple error (evidence of a note scrawled in haste?), it could also constitute a deliberate choice intended to enhance efficiency: one flips to page "C·31" and sees the (prominent) *signe* on the facing page, rather than flipping to page "C·30", only to scan the text in bewilderment until turning over the leaf.

515 Catchwords appear at: ff. 69^{v}, 81^{v}, 93^{v}, 105^{v}, 117^{v}, 196^{v}, 208^{v}, 220^{v}, 226^{v}, 232^{v}, 244^{v}, 254^{v}, 266^{v}, 273^{v}, 281^{v}, 287^{v}, 295^{v}, and 303^{v}. Ff. 123^{v}, 128^{v}, 141^{v}, 149^{v}, 163^{v}, 174^{v}, 184^{v}, 311^{v}, 324^{v}, 335^{v}, 356^{v}, 366^{v}, 378^{v}, 382^{v}, 390^{v}, 392^{v}, and 400*^{v} lack catchwords.

than of main text. Content and catchwords indicate that the manuscript's reordering and discontinuities do not signal lost leaves, nor incorrect assembly and/or reassembly of the manuscript.

Medieval foliation paints a slightly different picture. Despite numerous imperfect quires, the collection's original foliation is rarely disrupted. It last occurs, you will recall (p. 159), on f. 378 (= f_{m2}. 267). Subsequent quires (XXXV^{4}, XXXVI^{8}, XXXVII^{2}, XXXVIII$^{10\,(-10)}$), lack premodern foliation; were it present, the manuscript's final leaf (f. 400*) would bear the label [f_{m2}.] '290'. Not only do we find no such numerals, Harley 912's indexes reference no internal foliation higher than f_{m2}. 257 (= f. 378). Even so, this aspect of the manuscript preserves traces of past structures. Note the transition between quires XXIX and XXX, where the medieval foliation runs: [ff$_{m2}$.] 186 (f. 309), 187 (f. 310), 188 (f. 311), [unfoliated (f. 312)],[516] 201 (f. 313), 202 (f. 314), 203 (f. 315), thereafter continuing to the terminal instance of medieval foliation (f_{m2}. 267). Folium numerals between f_{m2}. 188 (the last leaf of XXIX^{12}) and f_{m2}. 201 (the first leaf of XXX^{12}) do appear in the index.[517] It

---

516 F. 312, which lacks medieval foliation, is a leaf recycled from another manuscript, rotated 90° clockwise, then tipped-into Harley 912. It bears an adapted version of the *Chronica Aedidii li Muisis* of Gilles li Muisis (or Le Muiset; c. 1272–1352) which opens with verbatim content from the *Chronica*, then branches out to mention Johannes de Muris (a.k.a. Jean des Murs; c. 1290–c. 1355) and John Ashenden (d. in/bef. 1368?), two authors of astronomy treatises with particular reference to the 1345 conjunction of Saturn, Jupiter, and Mars (see Jean-Charles Houzeau and A. Lancaster, *Bibliographie générale de l'astronomie, Tome I, Partie I* (Bruxelles: F. Hayez, 1887), 734; Keith Snedegar, "Ashenden, John (d. in or before 1368?), Astrologer", in *ODNB* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 23 September 2004), doi: 10.1093/ref:odnb/39190; Jean-Patrice Boudet, "Jean de Murs, Astrologer", *Erudition and the Republic of Letters* 4, no. 1 (2019), 123–45).

517 F_{m2}. 189 is indexed on ff. 12^{v}, 20^{r}, 24^{r}, 26^{v} (bis), 35^{r}; f_{m2}. 190 on f. 29^{v}; f_{m2}. 194 on f. 53^{r}; f_{m2}. 195 on f. 53^{r} (bis); f_{m2}. 196 on ff. 25^{r}, 31^{r}, 53^{r}; f_{m2}. 197 on f. 53^{r} (bis); f_{m2}. 198 on f. 53^{r}; f_{m2}. 199 on f. 26^{v} (bis); and f_{m2}. 200 on f. 2^{v}.

seems sound to assume that, once upon a time, another quire of twelve nestled between quires XXIX^{12} and XXX^{12}. Its ghost still haunts the manuscript's indexes.

The above discussion focusses upon ff$_{m2}$.: Jackdaw's indexes target leaves within the latter sequence of medieval foliation, starting with quire XII. Between the indexes and the ff$_{m2}$. quires, however, sits another, *un*indexed division of the manuscript (ff. 58–128: VI–X^{12}, 6 singletons, XI$^{8\ (-1)}$)—though it certainly could be indexed. Recall, these quires hold the first sequence of (slightly spotty) medieval foliation: ff$_{m1}$. 3–50 (= ff. 60–107). Their primary content, Bromyard's *Summa*, occupies f. 71^{v} through f. 122^{v}. For the most part, the Bromyard was copied in quires of twelve, though these sesternions come to an end at f. 117^{v} (the final leaf of quire X). The next quire (XI$^{8\ (-1)}$: ff. 124^{r}–128^{v}) holds snippets of text, including bits of a quodlibetal (ff. 126^{v}–127^{v}), and several blank folia (ff. 127*^{r}–127**^{v}). Between the two quires we find six singletons (ff. 118–23) bearing the tail end of Bromyard (ff. 118^{r}–122^{v}), a short excerpt of Innocent III's *De miseria condicionis humane* (f. 123^{r}), and another cancelled index (f. 123^{v}).[518] Intriguingly, these sections of the codex represent two material extremes. Production unit C (comprising ff. 58^{r}–123^{v}) was copied on comparatively good writing support, with offcut zone parchment comprising only 7% of the unit, whereas production unit D (ff. 124^{r}–128^{v}) contains the highest proportion of offcut zone parchment in the manuscript: 75%.[519] The significance of this discrepancy will be discussed below.

Why did Jackdaw decline to index this section of Harley 912? Whence f. 123^{v}'s cancelled index, detached from the main indexes (which furnish plenty of space for expansion), and the cancelled index on f. 2^{v}? Why does Fr. Jackdaw's book feature two sets of medieval foliation, only

---

518 The first appears at f. 2^{v}.

519 A caveat is in order. While unit D contains the highest *proportion* of offcut zone parchment in the codex, it does not contain the worst *quality* parchment in the codex. Materiality, alas, is complicated.

one of which, the second—i.e., *not* the foliation of the section carrying f. 123ᵛ's cancelled index—features in the set of indexes? Why do the leaves holding the indexes lack medieval foliation? A possible clue may lurk on f. 365ᵛ where, appended to a paragraph opening with a signe-de-renvoi, a cross-reference asserts, "P*ri*ncipiu*m* p*redic*tis narr*a*tus req*ui*re i*n* isto libello 249·b" ('Find the start of the above tale in this booklet 249 b'). Sure enough, f_{m2}. 249 (= f. 360) delivers the rest of the story in question, along with both a matching signe-de-renvoi and a parallel comment linking back to f. 365ᵛ. Still, what peculiar phrasing: "i*n* isto libello", 'in *this* booklet' (i.e., that in which Jackdaw writes). None of Fr. Jackdaw's other cross-reference specifies in this fashion. As we have seen, Jackdaw regularly specifies external volumes, but merely implies internal cross-referencing by declining to specify a target codex. Is "isto libello" simply a random turn of phrase, or does the framing imply the existence of other volumes in Jackdaw's possession?

Harley 912's haphazard collation, inconsistent layout and decoration, and irregular textual organization speak to a fitful, episodic creation process stretching over an extended period of time, and not proceeding according to a preordained scheme. Instead of planning the present codicological form as a unit at the outset, Jackdaw altered his approach on multiple occasions, resulting in a dozen units, A–M (see *fig. 4.01*), most of which contain more than one of what Erik Kwakkel has termed "design units".[520] Rather than roughly equivalent components representing a series of steps along a single path, these units can be subsumed within superordinate structures, each encompassing one or several production units and corresponding to a broader phase or stage of copying, some of which

---

[520] Erik Kwakkel, in a forthcoming paper, uses this term for a manuscript "result[ing] from one design process" and thus "adher[ing] to the same design principles (measurements of written space, size and treatment of margins)", etc. throughout ("The Pro-Active Scribe: Preparing the Margins of Annotated Manuscripts", *Glossatur*, special edition, ed. by K. Menendez and M. Stock [forthcoming], 3–4).

likely developed simultaneously but discretely. Those overarching ‘use phases’ or components break down roughly as follows:

α. indexes and notes; no medieval foliation (units A–B; ff. 1^{r}–57^{v});

β. medieval foliation set 1; unindexed (unit C; ff. 58^{r}–117^{v});

γ. six singletons (unit C; ff. 118^{r}–123^{v});

δ. imperfect quire of random snippets (unit D; ff. 124^{r}–128^{v});

ε. medieval foliation set 2; indexed (units E–K; ff. 129^{r}–378^{v});

ζ. unindexed quires; no medieval foliation (units K–M; ff. 379^{r}–400*^{v}).

Picture Fr. Jackdaw producing his copy of Bromyard (β)—a handy text for such a fellow, to be sure. Towards the end of that labour he switched to singletons (γ), perhaps uncertain of where he would finish, perhaps lacking access to full quires—who can say? (Significant here is the cancelled index at f. 123; for now, set it aside.) At this stage, β and γ together constituted a set, a unit. When it occurred to Jackdaw, he foliated the set, maybe for easier reference. Subsequently, or perhaps simultaneously, he began to keep another volume:[521] materials for use in writing sermons. Did Bromyard inspire him? The *Summa prædicantium*, remember (p. 165), intersperses its author’s fiery arguments with useful selections from authorities. (*hmm… A private florilegium: what a nifty thing to have on hand.*) Regardless, now he possessed two books in different states of completion: his Bromyard {β + γ} and his incipient hoard of gleaming rhetorical baubles {ε}—a promising state of affairs for any preacher.

But alack! Too soon our Jackdaw’s unwearying quests through the volumes of Rabanus, the markedly large codex, the book with the tawed cover, and however many others, saw his cache of authorities proliferate into a dense, brambly tangle with new items squeezed into any available space, sometimes spilling over beyond the bounds of their original page or into another quire. For all that,

---

[521] Or, contrariwise, perhaps he copied his book of sources first, and his Bromyard later.

the conglomeration remained functional for him. Then, one dim afternoon, desk-bound and drafting a sermon between flickering rushlights, he recalled an exemplum which should illustrate his point perfectly—or would it? *I should refresh my memory*, he mused. But where is it? Fr. Jackdaw *knew* he recorded it: he remembered sitting in the cathedral library, under the pinched gaze of the librarian, copying from the fat, white codex with its gambolling initials, cornflower blue and green as new shoots. He could almost smell the stone walls. A frantic search eventually uncovered the tale, tucked away deep in a long quire, but his frustration had peaked. So much time wasted in rifling through his own notes! *I need to be better organized*… We can imagine Jackdaw (for most scholars have shared the experience at one point or another) snatching up the nearest available writing support—the blank backside of that other scrappy booklet on his desk (to wit, his Bromyard {β+γ})—to make sense of the mess by scribbling out a rough series of internal references. For the moment, the stopgap helped. Still, he realized it could not suffice for long: this forest had grown too vast to be traversed efficiently via a single sheet. Soon he cancelled that preliminary concordance (now occupying f. 123^{v}), and his capacious indexes, {α}, were borne. These indexes constituted a further structural unit, one developed to help him grapple with his unwieldy mass of source materials. And so, for a time, our Jackdaw used three books: his Bromyard {β+γ}, his collection of sources {ε}, and his indexes to his collection {α}. Why not index Bromyard, as well? Probably he felt no need: that smaller, less unruly booklet contained only the single text, and he likely used it in a fashion very different from the randomly-assembled and -consulted reference collection. It remained manageable.

Finally, at some juncture Fr. Jackdaw, or possibly another person, drew these three structural units ({β+γ}, {ε}, and {α}) together into a single codex along with a handful of additional scattered bits: {δ} and {ζ}. The latter pair cannot be post-Jackdaw for, though unfoliated and unindexed, they contain some material in his hand. When the early, imperfect quire {δ} entered the picture is unclear:

it offers few clues, and may not belong at its current location in the manuscript. The final unindexed and unfoliated quires {ζ} probably joined the rest of the manuscript fairly late in the process, though they, too, keep their own counsel for the moment. Harley 912 is not merely a manuscript, but one individual's carefully cultivated library, jammed between boards. Although most of its leaf-specific references reveal an annotator working with a single, consolidated volume, attention to the whole suite of available details helps reveal something of that volume's evolution and use.

Other aspects of materiality similarly reflect aspects of a book's development, along with its intended functions and audience. Consider again Harley 912's writing support. Marred by some staining—typically running down fore-edges and likely arising from water damage (see, e.g., ff. 16–22)—its 200 bifolia and fifteen stray singletons[522] of poor-to-middling quality parchment offer some scattered holes and medieval repairs,[523] but relatively little overt evidence of offcut zone origin. Not quite two dozen bifolia boast edge-gaps, with a further ten fall unusually short or narrow compared to their neighbours. Obvious gelatinized edges appear sporadically within and without those groups, with some bifolia (e.g., ff. 184, 206, 255, 303, among others) flagrantly proclaiming their origins by dint of a generous suite of offcut zone traits: sizeable edge-gaps with stiff, thick gelatinized edges, certainly, but also flay marks, lingering follicles, especially rough or pronounced grain patterning, and dark discolouration. Isolated examples of the less reliably diagnostic features (e.g., hair follicles,

---

[522] This count excludes the recycled f. 312.

[523] Holes mark ff. 159, 174, 183, 206, 246, 255, 329, 354, and 355; for repairs, see: ff. 23, 60, 85, 162, 167, 199, 266, 301, 364, and 372.

discolouration, grain patterning) prove especially widespread, and frequently travel together (see *figs. 4.11–4.14b*).[524]

Still, despite inconsistent use of offcut zone parchment, this dimension of the codex remains informative, especially when we consider the material's internal distribution. More than a few of Harley 912's quires contain no offcut zone parchment at all. The very first and last four production units[525] appear entirely devoid of the material whereas the remaining production units vary enormously in the percentage they contain. Offcut zone parchment comprises only 7% of the writing

---

[524] As we saw in chapter two, the most reliably diagnostic traits are edge-gaps, conspicuously small size relative to adjacent folia, and gelatinization. Edge-gapped or conspicuously short or narrow bifolia in Harley 912 (*n*=35): ff. 9[_12], [10_]11, 36[_41], [49_]54, [63_]64, [124_]127**, [125_]127*, 133_136, [164_]174, [bef. 175_]183, [bef. 175_]184, 175_182, 176_181, [188_]193, [190_]191, [199_]206, [200_]205, [209_]220, [233_]244, 249[_250], 255[_266], 256[_265], [267_]273, [296_]303, 298[_301], 299_300, [306_]309, [313_]324, [314_]323, [315_]322, [316_]321, [317_]320, 318[_319], [325_]355, and 329[_332]. For gelatinized edges (*n*=16), see: ff. 9[_12], [10_]11, 36[_41], 47[_57], [110_]113, [126_]127, [175_]183, 190_191, [200_]205, 249[_250], 255[_266], [267_]273, [299_]300, [296_]303, 316_321, [313_]324.

A note on notation conventions: The fundamental structural unit of the codex is the bifolium, i.e., a single sheet of parchment folded to yield conjoint folia; assessing for offcuts entails examining material traits of, not folia, but *bifolia*. Folium ranges being conventionally indicated via en-dash, I indicate conjoint folia via underscore, so as to clearly distinguish reference to a bifolium from reference to a range of folia. That is, whereas 'ff. 120–123' denotes a full range of folia from 120 through 123, inclusive (i.e., ff. 120, 121, 122, and 123), 'ff. 120_123' denotes a single bifolium comprised of the conjoint folia 120 and 123 (i.e., ff. 120 and 123 which constitute *a single folded sheet of parchment*). For further specificity, I employ brackets to clarify which half of a bifolium exhibits a particular trait. Thus, 'trait X: ff. [120_]123' denotes that trait X appears on the f. 123 half of the bifolium comprised of ff. 120 and 123, but *not* on the f. 120 half; by contrast, 'trait X: ff. 120_123' denotes that trait X manifests on both halves of the bifolium comprised of ff. 120 and 123 (i.e., on f. 120 and f. 123).

[525] Namely, units A (two singletons: ff. 1–2), J ($XXXIII^{10}$: ff. 357–356), K ($XXXIV^{12}$, $XXXV^{4}$, $XXXVI^{8}$: ff. 367–370), L ($XXXVII^{2}$: ff. 371–392), and M ($XXXVIII^{10\,(-10)}$: ff. 393–400*).

support in unit C (ff. 58r–123v), the unindexed section of the manuscript bearing the first sequence of medieval foliation, along with Jackdaw's copy of Bromyard and a cancelled index. (Perhaps the unit began as an attempt at a reasonably 'good' witness of the text.) As one might expect, the highest percentage (75%) of offcut zone writing support in Harley 912 occurs in unit D (ff. 124r–128v), the unindexed, irregular quire populated with textual scraps such as parts of a quodlibetal (ff. 126v–127v) and several blank folia (ff. 127*r–127**v). The slightly wrinkled bifolium ff. 126_127, falling quite short relative to adjacent folia and sporting a subtle gelatinized edge; the curved, slightly gelatinized edge-gap of f. 127* (conjoint with f. 125); plus the swooping edge-gap of f. 127** with its striations, under-scraped patches, and the stiffened, gelatinized extension point at the lower fore-edge of its conjoint leaf (f. 124) together reveal a quire composed almost entirely of lower-quality support. Although it includes none of the manuscript's most brazen examples of offcut zone parchment, reliance on such poor material for nearly the full gathering underscores the sense of this unit as a span of scrap parchment or 'loose-leaf' intended for note-taking or early stage drafting, and perhaps not originally planned for incorporation into Harley 912. Between the two extremes of unit C and unit D fall Fr. Jackdaw's indexes (unit B [ff. 3r–57v]: 22%) as well as his corresponding trove of sources (units E [ff. 129r–196v]: 16%, F [ff. 197r–311v]: 31%, G [ff. 313r–324v]: 17%, H [ff. 325r–356v]: 19%) which bears the second sequence of medieval foliation (referenced in the indexes). Their fluctuating, albeit habitually substandard, parchment quality—and recall that Harley 912's particularly dramatic examples (ff. 184, 206, 255, 303, discussed above) lurk herein—reflects their status as drafts under continual development: practical tools designated for long-term use, yes, but intended for only the maker's eyes.

So far, the manuscripts we have explored, both in this chapter and in earlier chapters, show considerable diversity of content, aesthetics, intended audience, and so on. Nonetheless, they also

share several attributes. All primarily focus on texts of a pragmatic nature and all betray close links to professional or paraprofessional contexts such as common law institutions, the university, and the Church. In addition, these manuscripts 'look like manuscripts', following the basic format commonly associated with conventional western European handwritten codices: a series of quires arranged in orderly progression, all roughly orthogonal (usually taller than wide). To fit cleanly within such books, offcut zone bifolia underwent trimming to square, their irregular contours pared away to match the tidy, unswerving outlines of their non-offcut neighbours. Most units in our corpus, whether discussed in the body of this dissertation or not, share these connections and features. Offcuts and offcut zone parchment, however, were not the exclusive dominion of professionals and their affiliated institutions. As we saw back at the outset of our journey, in chapter one, offcut use spread far beyond the narrow confines of courtroom, classroom, and cloister, eagerly received by persons from all strata of society. Among their number, if we look long enough, we occasionally encounter individuals embracing slightly less orthodox approaches to book-production. We now turn to the output of one such producer.

4.4. The Cunningman's Book: Ashmole 1378

In the Bodleian Library, snug in a slate-grey phase box, rests a jumble of parchment scraps—some stiff and thick and level as postcards, some hooked and warped like trail-trees, some so translucently fragile one fears their deliquescence in the vulgar light. Ensconced within a simple covering of cracked and discoloured limp vellum, these forty-three slips of carefully-processed, carelessly-trimmed skin yield a bundle scarcely as large as a smart-phone. The whole resembles nothing so much as a scrappy stack of documentary ephemera—receipts and tickets and notes and invoices—all folded double and crammed into a worn billfold. The latest manuscript in our corpus, this small, thin

bundle—Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Ashmole 1378—dates from c.1500, with additions through the sixteenth century. Now held together with sparse modern stitching, the manuscript's leaves feature pagination apparently added at an early stage,[526] along with numerous holes betraying multiple re-sewings. Its eccentric collation[527] points to a fitful production process, likely comprising several expansions (*figs. 4.15–4.16*). The little booklet probably entered the world as quires II and III, the order of which (as revealed by the original pagination) should be reversed. The foregoing set of quires not-quite-nests within a quintet of folia (ff. 29–33 [pp. 54–63]) likely representing an initial expansion. Short parchment stubs (≤ 15 mm wide) extending from those five singletons protrude between f. 2 [pp. 2–3] and f. 3 [pp. 50–51] (i.e., between quires I and II), suggesting they constitute either (*i*) a now-imperfect quire of ten which originally wrapped entirely around quires II–III, but lost its first half; or (*ii*) a stack of stray leaves tucked in after quires II–III, with their ragged-left edges slightly wrapped around those quires to facilitate stitching together the bundle.[528] A second expansion saw quire IV appended to the booklet. Finally, in a third expansion, quire I was wrapped around quires II–IV. Traces of fine red pen-flourishing extending down from the upper edges of ff. 2^{v}, 41^{r}, and 43^{r} [pp. 3, 78, and 82] reveal that this final, enveloping quire uniquely consists of parchment recycled from another codex, probably the lower margin of a large liturgical manuscript.

Otherwise the producer of Ashmole 1378 relied upon parchment of highly variable quality, including some offcuts. As in many other cases, shape and size provide clues of offcut origin with the

---

526 Hindu–Arabic numerals, 1 (f. 1^{v}) to 83 (f. 43^{v}), with inconsistencies; see description in volume two (pp. 51–54) and *fig. 4.15*. Due to these irregularities, I provide both foliation and pagination.

527 $I^{6\,(-3)}$ (ff. 1–2+41–43 [pp. [0],3+78–83]), II^{2} (ff. 3–4 [pp. 50–53]), III^{24} (ff. 5–28 [pp. 4–49]), 5 singletons (ff. 29–33 [pp. 54–63]), $IV^{8\,(-7)}$ (ff. 34–40 [pp. 64–77]).

528 Since either option seems plausible, I elected to describe ff. 29–33 [pp. 54–63] as a set of five singletons —rather than as $II^{10\,(-1,2,3,4,5)}$—to avoid imposing a specific interpretation.

manuscript's overall dimensions of c. 110–115×100–110 mm best taken as a guideline: individual folia often stray beyond those bounds. For instance, ff. 5[_28], 6[_27], and [34_]40 evince strikingly scooped edges, with f. 40 unfolding to a dramatic 186 mm at its greatest extent (*figs. 4.17–4.18*).[529] In addition to the classic offcut shape these thin, wrinkled leaves show poor ink adherence with prominent lingering hair follicles (ff. 5^{v}–6^{r}) and grain patterning (f. 40^{v}). Copied on parchment with a near-transparent, onion-skin quality and markedly poor ink-adherence, the noticeably undersized (94–105×64–85 mm) set of singletons (ff. 29–33 [pp. 54–63])—comprised of 40% (but perhaps as much as 60%) offcut zone parchment—feels almost like a separate booklet (*fig. 4.19*).[530] A similar pattern prevails throughout the 25% (possibly 50% or 75%) offcut quire IV (ff. 34–40 [pp. 64–77]) which includes the impressive f. 40, and consists of thin, translucent parchment with patches of glaze-like discolouration and grain patterning at ff. 37^{v} and 39^{v}.[531]

What are we to make of this peculiar little volume? Who would produce such a strange book? The manuscript's textual contents speak to a fluctuating purpose. Among them we find a collection of receipts and charms for humans and animals,[532] notes concerning the virtues of herbs, spells for love and practical matters, plus a few magical tricks, all in Middle English with occasional smatterings of questionable Latin. Much like Fr. Jackdaw, the anonymous fashioner of Ashmole 1378 —another textual collector whom we shall dub 'the Cunningman'—drew freely from a variety of

---

529 Although trimmed to square, f. 4 [pp. 52–53] unfolds (to 146 mm width); the rough, thick parchment does not appear to be an offcut.

530 The bifolium ff. 8_25 also falls conspicuously short, with similar thinness and poor ink adherence. Its offcut status is uncertain.

531 The ranges of percentages given here reflects the difficulty of assessing parchment which features multiple weakly diagnostic offcut traits, but no primary diagnostic traits (see p. 74).

532 F. 42^{v} [p. 81]: "for a horse þ*at* is blynde" and "for a farsye on a horse".

sources, albeit often with a focus on healing and protection. A fair amount of the material is attested elsewhere. The nine rosemary receipts (ff. 10^{v}–11^{r} [pp. 16–17]) make this codex one of thirty-four extant manuscript witnesses of the Middle English prose version of *The Virtues of Rosemary*,[533] and a selection of other receipts appear to have counterparts in London, Wellcome Library, MS 542, an early fifteenth-century English medical collection.[534] Although described by S.A.J. Moorat as a "leech-book",[535] the Wellcome manuscript fails to follow "the classical head-to-foot structure" of leech-books and contains no medical treatises[536]—details equally true of Ashmole 1378. Instead, like

---

533 George R. Keiser, "Rosemary: Not Just for Remembrance", in *Health and Healing from the Medieval Garden*, ed. P. Dendle and A. Touwaide (Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 2015), 197–98. Repeatedly translated from assorted Latin versions, this collection of anywhere from a dozen to thirty simple rosemary-based receipts "was probably first put into English not long after [Henry] Daniel had completed his longer work" on the herb following its c. 1342 introduction to England (ibid., 184–85 at 185).

534 Similar items include a mugwort recipe for "sorenes of a manes fete" (f. 11^{v} [p. 18]): compare Wellcome, MS 542, f. 3^{r}; and recipes "for the morfewe" (f. 18^{r} [p. 28]): MS 542, f. 3^{r}; "for on þ*at* is scalded on þ*e* pintill" (f. 21^{v} [p. 35]): MS 542, f. 2^{v}; "for on that hase his ballokes swollen or sore" (f. 22^{r} [p. 36]): MS 542, f. 2^{v}; "for on þ*at* cane not holde his water" (f. 22^{v} [p. 37]): MS 542, f. 3^{v}; "for a stynking brethe" (f. 24^{r} [p. 40]): MS 542, f. 7^{r}; "for a canker in a womans papp*es*" (f. 25^{r} [p. 42]): MS 542, f. 11^{r}; and "for the parlys cowghe" (f. 25^{v} [p. 43]): MS 542, f. 2^{r}. In Calle Martín and Castaño-Gil's edition of MS 542, see pages 56, 58, 56, 56, 59, 71, 88, and 54, respectively. More vaguely related are Ashmole's recipes "for þ*e* hede ache" (f. 14^{v} [p. 23]): MS 542, f. 7^{r}; "for wormes" (f. 25^{r} [p. 42]): MS 542, f. 12^{r}; and "to a mende yo*r* eye syght" (f. 20^{v} [p. 33]): MS 542, f. 6$^{r–v}$ (Javier Calle Martín and Miguel Ángel Castaño-Gil, eds., *A Late Middle English Remedy-Book (MS Wellcome 542, ff. 1^{r}–20^{v})* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2013), 72, 91, 69).

535 S.A.J. Moorat, *Catalogue of Western Manuscripts on Medicine and Science in the Wellcome Historical Medical Library, I: Mss. Written before 1650 A.D.* (London: Wellcome Historical Medical Library, 1962), 400–02.

536 George R. Keiser, *A Manual of the Writings in Middle English 1050–1500. Vol. 10: Works of Science and Information*, ed. A.E. Hartung (New Haven: Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences, 1998), 3365.

the Wellcome manuscript, the core of the Ashmole compilation is better described as a remedy-book.[537]

At least, the foregoing designation holds for the early stages of the manuscript. As we saw, however, Ashmole 1378 was assembled in stages and, over time, the Cunningman's interests shifted to more arcane matters. The volume's thick core—quires III (ff. 5–28 [pp. 4–49]) and II (ff. 3–4 [pp. 50–53])—mainly contains medical receipts and a few simple charms with an emphasis on herbalism. Medical remedies likewise populate the first two leaves of the initial, five singleton expansion of the manuscript (i.e. at ff. 29–33 [pp. 54–63]). Yet the end of the core and back half of the expansion reveal a shift. On f. 27^{r} [p. 46], amidst remedies for infertility and incontinence, lurks a short tip for those seeking "to goo in visoable",[538] and the expansion's last three folia (ff. 31^{r}–33^{v} [pp. 58–63]) provide instructions for magical 'tricks' such as uncovering a woman's inner thoughts (f. 31^{r} [p. 58]),[539] along with spells against enemies (ff. 32^{r}–33^{v} [pp. 60–63]), plus a few slightly more obscure workings (ff. 31^{v}, 33^{v} [pp. 59, 63]). Magic spells very similar to that on f. 27^{r} [p. 46] appear in London, British Library, Sloane MS 3850, at f. 145^{r}.[540] They derive from the *Liber*

---

537 George R. Keiser, "Verse Introductions to Middle English Medical Treatises", *English Studies* 84, no. 4 (2003), 302–03; Calle-Martín and Castaño-Gil, *A Late Middle English Remedy-Book*, 19–20.

538 "Take a stone w*hich* is in a blake lapewynk*es* neste / when she hathe jounge it is of dyuert collours / *and* bare it a bowt ye" (f. 27^{r} [p. 46]).

539 "To· know· womens· mindes and· secret*es* / take· þ*e*· hed· of a white pigio*n* or of a turtell / doue burne þ*e* blode *and* þ*e* hed to powder and / are it be thorow colde myxe it w*ith* a qua*n*tite / of stone hony · and when ye lyste to proue / it a noynte þ*e* brestes of a woman *and* thow / shalte know all hyr mynd *and* what thow / desyerst thow shalte haue it of hir" (f. 31^{r} [p. 58]). Ashmole 1378 also proffers a further spell for the same purpose, but deploying "þ*e* harte of a douue *and* the hed of afrogge", at f. 39^{r} [p. 74].

540 Frank Klaassen and Katrina Bens, "Achieving Invisibility and Having Sex with Spirits: Six Operations from an English Magic Collection ca. 1600", *Opuscula* 3, no. 1 (2013), 11.

aggregationis (a.k.a. *Liber secretorum de virtutibus herbarum, lapidum, et animalium quorundam*; *Experimenta Alberti*; *Secreta Alberti*; *Boke of Secretes*),[541] a medico-magical compilation falsely attributed to Albertus Magnus, but "partially (especially concerning the virtues of stones) based on [Albertus'] authentic works", and penned around the time of his death in 1280.[542] On f. 38^{r} [p. 72] the Cunningman provided an explicit reference to a related work,[543] noting that "~~A~~all thes Expedimen*tes* were trule / copied owt of an olde booke of frier / Roger bacon entituled þ*e* myrror of / lyght". The *Mirror of Light*, a late fourteenth- or early fifteenth-century redaction of the *Semita recta* oft attributed to Albertus Magnus, is best described as a beginner-level manual of alchemy.[544] Ashmole 1378 essentially lacks alchemical texts and references to alchemical workings—the sole

---

541 Spells for invisibility using a stone from a lapwing's nest (as on f. 27^{r}/p. 46) are found in Albertus Magnus' *Book of Minerals*; the *Book of Secrets*; and the (sixteenth-century) *Pharmacopoea Londininsis* (Nicola Erin Harris, "The Idea of Lapidary Medicine: Its Circulation and Practical Application in Medieval and Early Modern England: 1000–1750" (PhD diss., Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey, 2009), 152–53). The same indication appears in Mechlinia's 1483 edition of *Liber aggregationis* (Pseudo-Albertus Magnus, *Liber aggregationis seu liber secreto*[*rum*] *Alberti magni* ([London]: Wilhelmum de Mechlinia, [c. 1483]), sig. a$_{viii}$^{r}).

542 Benedek Láng, *Unlocked Books: Manuscripts of Learned Magic in the Medieval Libraries of Central Europe* (Pennsylvania: Penn State University Press, 2008), 55; see also: Frank Brightman and Michael Best, "Introduction", in *The Book of Secrets of Albertus Magnus of the Virtues of Herb, Stones and Certain Beasts, also A Book of the Marvels of the World* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1973), xi–xlviii.

543 The Bacon citation is in keeping with a general strategy of constructing legitimacy via appeals to established authorities, as in the references to Galen and Hippocrates peppering the booklet's medical receipts: "galyen saythe" (ff. 11^{r}, 18^{r} [pp. 16, 30]), "all auctores do saye and / affyrme þ*at*" (f. 13^{r} [p. 20]), "as many leches do saye" (f. 13^{v} [p. 21]), "So sayeth ypocras *and* galyen the good philosifers / they saye þ*at*" (f. 15^{v} [p. 25]).

544 Peter Grund, "Textual Alchemy: The Transformation of Pseudo-Albertus Magnus's *Semita Recta* into the *Mirror of Lights*", *Ambix* 56, no. 3 (2009), 204.

exception is a receipt deemed "good to a mende yo*r* eye syght" which calls for herbs to "be stylled [i.e., distilled] to gether" (f. 20^{v} [p. 33])—but our scribe–compiler may have understood their evolving collection in terms of the related medieval tradition of books of secrets.[545]

The manuscript's third expansion—namely, the addition of quire IV (ff. 34^{r}–40^{v} [pp. 64–77]) —and even part of the subsequently added quire I (namely, f. 41^{r} [p. 78]), consists purely of magical operations, sometimes incorporating sigils or codes. Although chiefly focused on evoking love (e.g., ff. 34^{r}–35^{r}, 36^{v} [pp. 64–66, 69]), they target a range of outcomes such as making a woman dance naked (f. 38^{v} [p. 73]),[546] "bind[ing] a house / a gynste thefes" (f. 38^{v} [p. 73]), and uncovering the location of stolen goods (f. 39^{r} [p. 74]).[547] Copied in sometimes questionable Latin, this stage of the manuscript features numerous textual and scribal peculiarities, possibly indicative of an inexperienced book-producer, a naïve maker still finding their feet in novel textual and codicological waters. For instance, early within this section, our scribe pairs a catchword with an idiosyncratic, conical arrow directing the reader to the facing page where the text continues (ff. 32^{v}–33^{r} [pp. 61–

---

545 Laura Mitchell, "Cultural Uses of Magic in Fifteenth-Century England" (PhD diss., University of Toronto, 2011), 53, 150; William Eamon, "Books of Secrets in Medieval and Early Modern Science", *Sudhoffs Archiv* 69, no. 1 (1985), 26–49.

546 "To make a woman Daunce nak*e*d / write thes names in a volume of pur parchmen[t] / w*ith* the blode of an owle· also· molo· vita· rasta / aia·*and* put it vnder the threshould of þ*e* dore· / or of þ*e* house wher she is·*and* she shall w*ith* in / a whill daunce naked· *and* take it awaye *and* / she shall leaue· So þ*at* it be burned· ther be / letters to do the same feate·".

547 On the latter two workings, see: J.M. McBryde, "Charms for Thieves", *Modern Language Notes* 22, no. 6 (1907), 168–70; Frank Klaassen and Christopher Phillips, "The Return of Stolen Goods: Reginald Scot, Religious Controversy, and Magic in Bodleian Library, Additional B. 1", *Magic, Ritual, and Witchcraft* 1, no. 2 (2006), 135–76.

62]). The item occupying these pages, a charm "Agaynst thy Enemyes",[548] seems to have fostered some confusion. Opening in Middle English, it continues onto the facing page in the same language (linked via the catchword and conical arrow mentioned above). After the facing page's narrow opening column, however, it continues in Latin. Our scribe takes care to link the two columns, adding an explicit annotation bas de page at column one: "then saye Dismas et gismas" (f. 33^{r} [p. 62]).[549] Oddly, the "Dismas et gismas" continuation has been copied thrice (ff. 33^{r}, 33^{v}, and 40^{v} [pp. 62, 63, 77]), with minor variations of layout and orthography:

> Dismas et gismas / Dismas· et gismas / medioque deuina / · potestas / Summa· petit· dismas / Infelix· ad· Infima· / · Gismas· / nos· et res· nostras· / Saluet· deuina· / · potestas· / finis·

---

548 *DIMEV* 685. See also: Theodore Silverstein, *Medieval English Lyrics* (London: Edward Arnold, 1971), 125. Here, the Middle English runs: "As þ*e* lord dyddest stope *and* staye / for thy chesen pe*o*pell the red sea / the ragyng see waues lacking ther course / tyll they had passed pharaoos forse / and as at Josue his Jnvocation / þ*e* son abode ouer gabaon / the mone aboue *and* made hir staye / in aialon that valleye / *and* as thy sone Jesus did appease / the wynd *and* see *and* made them sease / when his disciples w*ith* fearefull spryte / from his shape ded hym excyte / so lorde of hop*es* staye othe one / of those that seake me confusyon (f. 33^{r} [p. 62]:) make them stonde / as styll at stone / w*ith* owt corporall mouing / vntyll my stretched / arme shall make / a sygne to them / ther way to take / As moses stretched / the red sea moued / to show his course / as be houed / As thow lord arte / the king of blesse / lord messyas / grante me this / then saye Dismas et gismas".

549 Variations of the names of the thieves crucified with Christ on Calvary. According to the Syriac Gospel of the Infancy (ch. 23), they held up the Holy Family on the way to Egypt. Dismas paid Gestas (the usual form of the name) forty drachmas to leave the group unmolested; Jesus predicted that the duo would be crucified with him, with Dismas joining him in Paradise (see also: Narrative of Joseph of Arimathea, ch. 03; Gospel of Nicodemus, ch. 10). The unsubstantiated myth was very popular in the medieval era (see McBryde, "Charms for Thieves", 168 n.1).

Dismas et gismas medioque / deuina potestas / Summa· pocat dismas· / Infelix ad Infima Gismas / nos et res nostras / saluet diuine potestas finis

Dismas *et* / gismas / medioque / deuina / potestas / Summa / dismas / Infelix ad / Infima· Gismas / nos· et· res· <nostras> / saluet· diui<ne> / potestas

Did the Latin stymy our scribe? Elsewhere in these later stages of Ashmole 1378, the Cunningman pairs the text of a magical operation in either Middle English or in Latin with a second version added nearby in the other language. For instance, he initially copies "the Coniuration of the aple", a Middle English love spell, on f. 34^{r} [p. 64],[550] reproducing a Latin version overleaf (f. 34^{v} [p. 65]).[551] Further, as Frank Klaassen remarks, slightly later, at f. 36^{r} [p. 68], our scribe "slavishly copied a Latin text, including the empty space for an initial left in the original text. [E]vidently not aware of this common medieval practice[, he] seems to have considered the empty square area somehow important. This, combined with his poor knowledge of Latin", yielded a curious opening with rectified copying errors: "<ŧ>Equanłtur orations cu*m* predidentia / experimenta cenaris probare".[552]

---

550 "Take an aple *and* cut it in iiij p*artes and* <in> <dr..> / <.ot> write these names : sathiell + sathiell + / obiniget + singell + and the Coniuration of the / aple is to be sayd iij I Coniurd the Aple by / the trew *and* lyuing god by the holy god <... .av.> / created the *and* by the iiij euangelist*es and* by samuell / *and* by the holy virgen mary *and* by all the Innocent*es* / That y*n* <versess> not vntill ye <...> gyue it /her\ to eat"

551 "Accepi poma et post deuisam in / quatuor partem singulis· p*ar*tibus / fracti vel in fracti scribi hec nomines / sathiel sathiel obgniget siagel et / coniuracio pome est trium dicenda / coniuro te poma*m* p*er* deu*m* sanctu*m* vinu*m* / *v*nus et veru*m* p*er*deu*m* sanctu*m* et deu*m* / te creauit et p*er* quatuor evangile / p*er* samuele*m* et p*er* sancta*m* maria*m* et p*er* / omnes inosentes quod no*n* sesses <don..> / abia amore illu*m* et dato ei eibere"

552 Frank Klaassen, *The Transformations of Magic: Illicit Learned Magic in the Later Middle Ages and Renaissance* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2013), 242 n.21.

Additional peculiarities emerge in Ashmole 1378's material characteristics. Devoid of discernible pricking, the manuscript features only occasional rough frame ruling, in ink, rarely bounding the entire text (e.g., f. 31^{r} [p. 58]) (*fig. 4.19*), but more often delineating only the left margin, or taking the form of clumsy extended brackets. Thus we receive a sense of the text block, but no consistent layout—merely a vague hint of a *pagina*, seldom even bounded by cadres de justification. The inconsistent mise-en-page occasionally adopts either a vertical (inside front cover, ff. 29^{r}, 32^{r}, 42^{r} [pp. 54, 60, 80]), or a mixed vertical and horizontal (ff. 30^{r}, 33^{r} [pp. 56, 62]) orientation, once employing multiple, messy columns (f. 33^{r} [p. 62]) (*figs. 4.20–4.21*). While parchment hair and flesh side are not always discernible, their disposition is inconsistent, regularly violating Gregory's rule,[553] and, as we saw at the head of this section, Ashmole 1378's maker exerted little effort to conceal the offcuts incorporated into his book. Like the other irregularities we have explored, this haphazardness could be construed as a symptom of lower familiarity with bookmaking norms. Together these aspects of the book paint a picture of a particular type of domestic production —a trickle-down both of medical and of occult knowledge, but also of elements of established bookmaking practices, and even bookmaking materials, in the form of conspicuously poor offcuts and parchment scraps recycled from other codices.

4.5. Conclusion

This chapter has engaged with the challenges that emerge within the offcut corpus when one moves away from the relative coherence of the units covered in chapter three. We commenced by diving into the complexity of the rest of the corpus, for convenience called our non-legal units, attempting

---

[553] Certain hair sides: ff. 3^{v}, 4^{r}, 5^{v}, 6^{r}, 7^{r}, 8^{v}, 9^{r}, 10^{v}, 11^{v}, 12^{r}, 13^{v}, 14^{r}, 15^{v}, 16^{r}, 17^{v}, 19^{v}, 24^{v}, 27^{v}, 28^{r}, 29^{r}, 32^{r}, and 33^{r} [pp. 51, 52, 5, 6, 8, 11, 12, 15, 17, 18, 21, 22, 25, 26, [28*], 31, 41, 47, 48, 54, 60, and 62].

to make sense of their perplexing mixed-messages and map out how they resembled or departed from their legal counterpart. As one might perhaps have expected, some clarity emerged upon dividing this half of our corpus into two smaller groups, or subcorpora, roughly defined by medieval categories of knowledge (namely, the quadrivium and trivium), Quad and Triv. Analysis revealed that the two diverged, to greater or lesser degree, across all material features we considered, including their uptake of offcut zone bifolia, with the smaller, plainer, more structurally mutable Quad units making heavier use of offcuts, whereas the typically larger, more structurally coherent, and often more ornate Triv units were less likely to incorporate this material. Although the Triv subcorpus bears elements of resemblance to the law books discussed in chapter three—and all three subcorpora show similar correlations between lower 'ornateness' (level of decoration) and higher 'offcutness' (extent of offcut zone bifolia)—both Quad and Triv lack the relative internal coherence of the legal subcorpus, rendering further conclusions slightly elusive at this stage of the research. Yet, although more fine-grained study of the Quad and Triv manuscripts remains a desideratum, it is clear that these books emerged from a broader range of production contexts, and undoubtedly aimed at a much more variable set of owners. The diversity of the non-legal subcorpus speaks to the variety of attitudes and motivations underpinning offcut usage, including financial concerns, supply-chain issues, convenience, or even indifference.

That diversity was especially foregrounded during our scrutinization of a pair of multi-unit manuscripts from this subcorpus, Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Ashmole 1378 and London, British Library, Harley MS 912 (herein referred to, respectively, as the book of the Cunningman and Fr. Jackdaw's book or Liber Graculi). Despite their obvious contrasts—in date, contents, sophistication, and so on—these two codices exhibit intriguing commonalities. Arguably, each volume serves a kind of mendicant, pastoral purpose, its creation seemingly animated by a desire to

provide succour, to minister to souls or to bodies. Their materiality reflects this ethos, with each book suitable for easy carrying on one's person (especially the billfold-esque Ashmole). In both cases the object morphed over time, growing in perhaps unexpected directions. Neither maker seems to have set out to produce their highly personal and idiosyncratic manuscript with an especially settled or rigid end state in mind. Nonetheless, a distinction is detectable. Perhaps it is one of attitude or of experience or some mixture of the two. Although a tad chaotic in spots, Fr. Jackdaw's book, much like those produced by and for common lawyers in chapter three, demonstrates a very high degree of 'codicological literacy'. His manuscript looks like, and is structured like, not merely a 'regular' manuscript, but a strikingly sophisticated one—our Jackdaw did not implement those cutting-edge indexing techniques by accident. Clearly he had a plan or plans for his book, however much he fell short of realizing that plan or those plans. That seems much less the case with the Cunningman's book. This scribe seems to have acquired a bit of passing familiarity with established conventions of manuscript production, yet lacked the advanced bookmaking know-how displayed by our homiletic corvid. Nonetheless, even in the Cunningman's scruffy little codex we discover hints of aspiration to some level of artisanship. Clearly this less experienced book producer encountered things in other books—books more like those made and used by the common lawyers discussed in chapter three, or by Fr. Jackdaw—which he wished to reproduce in some way, though he did not quite grasp their functions (catchwords, space left for initials, and so on). Still, he took a stab at their purpose and tried them on for size, making them his own, with inevitable missteps. In part, then, these two manuscripts reflect discrepancies in their makers' levels of expertise, giving us a concrete glimpse of differing levels of literacy.

That said, at least a portion of the contrast between the two does appears to be attitudinal. Ashmole 1378 exhibits an odd admixture of formal and casual elements: attempts to borrow

(imperfectly understood) codicological conventions coexist with topsy-turvy collation and layout, on bifolia and singletons of radically different sizes and sources (offcuts and strips cut from a much bigger, finer manuscript) with little sign of attempts to impose uniformity. The state of this tiny wad of parchment suggests opportunism alongside indifference to the idea of morphing it into a more predictably 'bookish' artefact like Harley 912—which, despite its own irregularities, remains a clearly recognizable manuscript codex. Thus, the two manuscripts share complexity, but not the same kind of complexity. Although an 'open' or 'living book', a codex in the process of becoming, Harley 912 reeks of much more formal para-institutional knowledge and/or production, whereas Ashmole 1378 suggests a domestic product. These books show that uptake of offcut zone parchment as writing support extended far beyond legal and professional contexts, even facilitating manuscript production in more peripheral environments and by unconventional scribes.

These two case studies also demonstrate, finally, how close examination of the materiality of these two volumes, including the presence of offcut parchment and the ways it was incorporated, reveals something of the range of comprehension and of competence amongst those who would make their own books, and thereby opens another window onto the late-medieval world of book production and readership. Ultimately, this chapter has shown how examining offcut materials can impact our thinking about some of the broader processes behind manuscript production, for example regarding the availability of different parchment grades and scribes' motivations for choosing from the lower end of the spectrum; while, concomitantly, the chapter has shown how this scruffy writing support material may shed light on our understanding of individual manuscripts and their varied contexts of use.

CONCLUSION

As shown through the examples of the books discussed in greatest detail—e.g., the legal collection Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Ashmole 1152 (with its extensive inscriptions and annotations), as well as the collections of Fr. Jackdaw (London, British Library, Harley MS 912) and of the Cunningman (Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Ashmole 1378)—English medieval manuscripts incorporating offcuts into their construction as writing support exhibit as much physical heterogeneity and variety as medieval books generally. Still, the descriptive statistical work conducted with the data derived from this dissertation's corpus uncovered patterns emerging from close examination of a particular kind of 'cheap' parchment—the offcut—in books produced in later medieval England. Briefly, as the reader will recall, analysis of the collected data identified within my corpus two large subcorpora: the one, consisting of legal, specifically English common law, books and fairly coherent as a body; the other, non-legal in nature and appreciably more heterogeneous. Overall, then, the corpus remains dominated by *Fachliteratur*, or practical writings—whose material and textual presentation suggest production for some sort of personal use—and characterized by a nearly complete absence of works typically thought of as 'popular', whether religious (devotional texts) or literary (vernacular romances).

5.1. WAYS INTO THE OFFCUT ZONE

Undertaken as a proof-of-concept study engaging in depth with an understudied phenomenon—namely, the use of offcut zone parchment as writing support in medieval manuscript books—this

dissertation has thus clearly achieved its goal in demonstrating the viability of studying offcut zone parchment through statistical methods, supplemented by detailed codicological examination of several individual codices, and developing a low-tech methodology for pursuing such work. Shedding some light on the murky and hitherto unwritten history of offcuts, I have also laid out what distinguishes this material from other types of parchment, showing that offcut zone parchment constitutes a physical category in itself—one which appears rather useful to look at, and capable of elucidating typically concealed or less frequently examined dimensions of medieval manuscript creation, like production processes outside of commercial and other more formalized contexts, or by professionals creating their own reference works; unusually extended production by scribe–users creating codices in private contexts for personal consultation; and book-making by individuals with lower levels of codicological literacy and experience. We have seen how looking closely, and methodically recording details helps us find patterns in such things as offcut distribution and decoration, which then prove useful for the purposes of digging into possible producer and consumer attitudes and motivations in manuscript production, and reverse engineering both general processes (i.e., the making of parchment and of books) and particular manuscripts. Both Fr. Jackdaw and the Cunningman left us messily made codices, but in each case, in different ways and for different reasons, that messiness points to, amongst other things, differing levels of acquaintance with books, levels of literacy, and likely contexts of production and use. Deploying quantitative methodologies enables us to identify patterns of physical features at multiple scales, starting from fluctuations across individual parchment bifolia, up through variation in offcut use within specific codices, and onwards to much broader correlations between recruitment of this kind of writing support and particular genres of texts, approaches to copying, and contexts of book production in later medieval England.

The detailed case studies demonstrate how to drill down into this aspect of manuscript materiality (as well as how useful such in-depth case studies can be for exposing where, and how, and by whom poor-quality parchment, like offcuts, can be used), but also show us how to continue on beyond it, using the data in tandem with other forms of evidence (e.g., qualitative, archival) to transform them into arguments much broader and more revealing than the merely material, thereby allowing for informed speculation on the contexts of both the production and the use of medieval manuscript books containing offcut zone parchment. In the process, I have attempted to open up the area of offcuts for further study, identifying it as a topic of inquiry within the broader areas of medieval English literary studies, intellectual history, and manuscript studies. To invite such future endeavours, this study provides resources for those wishing to tackle similar work, including relevant secondary literature, a list of offcut zone parchment diagnostic traits, and a selection of different types of manuscripts to which they can be applied.[554]

In undertaking this research, I also inevitably encountered some challenges and obstacles, as one would expect for any novel or large-scale research project. Some of these were products of COVID-related disruptions to data-gathering. Yet others arose from the exploratory nature of the work, and a relative dearth of models for codicological research integrating an 'aerial' view (i.e., corpus-based descriptive statistics) with sample digs on the ground (case studies). Enumerated below, they too can be taken as productive research outcomes insofar as they offer learning

---

[554] A caveat is warranted. The iterative nature of the research process, along with the findings of this study, led me to revise both my understanding of offcuts, and my judgment regarding some manuscripts within the dissertation corpus. Consequently, a number of units herein will be eliminated from future iterations of the offcut corpus. The exact list is evolving; researchers would be advised to await updates from the projects' next stage before proceeding.

opportunities, point to work remaining to be done, and indicate ways we can move forward, further advancing our understanding of offcut zone parchment.

5.2. Challenges, Obstacles, and Opportunities

All research is unavoidably provisional and characterized by limitations; this dissertation is no different. I contend that, far from undermining our work, honesty regarding its scope directs us to opportunities to dig deeper and develop more robust hypotheses, in tandem with directions for future research.[555] This dissertation's challenges can be grouped under three general headings:

5.2.1. Compiling the Research Corpus

Assembling the lists of manuscripts studied over the two stages of this investigation proved one of the most laborious, time-consuming aspects of my project. Following older scholarship and catalogues in mainly prioritizing manuscripts' textual contents, authors, and dates and regions of production, many digital finding aids offer little-to-no capacity to facilitate materially-oriented research.[556] In light of my focus on hand-written books produced in later medieval England and taking offcuts as a primary, or at least significant, writing support (and given that manuscripts copied on offcuts necessarily measure under 150 mm along the longest dimension), compiling a list of codices to search for offcut zone parchment entailed, (*i*) locating online manuscript handlists or

---

555 I will pursue expansion and refinement of this project, 2021–2023, under the auspices of the Old Books and New Sciences Lab, Centre for Mediaeval Studies, University of Toronto (SSHRC Postdoctoral Fellowship no. 756–2021–0351).

556 Alas, some recent digital tools actively hinder materially-focused work, e.g., digitized manuscript portals providing access to gorgeous, high-resolution images of manuscript codices, albeit with no rectification cards nor measurement guides included in the images, and with no data on physical measurements nor collations provided in linked metadata.

catalogues, and repeatedly clicking through to individual entries, thence back to the master-list; and (*ii*) methodically leafing through printed catalogues, page by page—in both cases, making note of books meeting my basic criteria (i.e., produced in England, c.1200–c.1500, with a maximum dimension of about 150 mm). In assembling lists of manuscripts to consult, working through the print catalogues proved significantly faster and easier.[557] Despite growing interest in quantitative, materially-focused studies of medieval manuscripts, some of our most fundamental tools—finding aids—remain rooted in older research paradigms. For instance, even the most *au courant* digital catalogues and finding aids rarely permit searches by material features, such as dimensions. Since digital finding aids often impose additional steps or barriers to perusal (depending on user interface design and other issues), they offer materially-oriented researchers little advantage over the old print catalogues. We need "manuscript cataloguing which properly takes into account material and structural issues",[558] search tools which ease accessing the latter, and websites which expedite assembly of large corpora (via, for example, capacity to export data in CSV format). Improving the efficiency of codicological research and fostering novel investigative approaches to the medieval book necessitates taking a long, hard look at these tools and working together with our closest longstanding allies, Library and Archives Specialists, to develop strategies to address finding-aids' 'epistemological hangover' from textually-focused case studies. As it stands, "we are restricted by the available data", certainly, but also by "the pragmatics of collecting and using" that data.[559] We cannot do much to change the former, but we can improve the latter.

---

557 See § 2.2.2, *supra* (especially p. 74 n.243), for related discussion.

558 Da Rold and Maniaci, "Medieval Manuscript Studies", 13. Although prioritizing non-western collections, a recent monograph of potential utility in this discussion is L.W.C. van Lit's *Among Digitized Manuscripts: Philology, Codicology, Palaeography in a Digital World* (Leiden: Brill, 2020).

559 A.R. Bennett, "What Do the Numbers Mean?", 49.

5.2.2. Finding the Scholarly Contexts

A further quandary arose in the early stages of this project, lingering throughout: a relative dearth of closely-related scholarly models for the later medieval British context, and therefore also of a scholarly conversation or conversations to which this study could directly contribute. Materially- (as opposed to textually-) focused, biologically- and chemically-informed studies of medieval books—i.e., what Da Rold and Maniaci term "archaeological analysis of materials and manufacturing techniques of the manuscript book"[560]—including those incorporating statistical methods, certainly are not novel, though they remain a bit uncommon,[561] and may have been somewhat underutilized for the medieval British context until fairly recently.[562] Nevertheless, even the more current examples

---

560 Da Rold and Maniaci, "Medieval Manuscript Studies", 7. Recent examples of how such disciplines can contribute to the history of the book include: Jorien R. Duivenvoorden, et al., "Hidden Library: Visualizing Fragments of Medieval Manuscripts in Early-Modern Bookbindings with Mobile Macro-XRF Scanner", *Herit. Sci.* 5 (2017), art. 6; Sarah Fiddyment, et al., "Girding the Loins? Direct Evidence of the Use of a Medieval English Parchment Birthing Girdle from Biomolecular Analysis", *R. Soc. open sci*. 8 (2021), art. 202055; A. Radini, et al., "Medieval Women's Early Involvement in Manuscript Production Suggested by Lapis Lazuli Identification in Dental Calculus", *Sci. Adv*. 5, no. 1 (2019), eaau7126; Inez Dorothé van der Werf, et al., "Chemical Characterization of Medieval Illuminated Parchment Scrolls", *Microchemical J.* 134 (2017), 146–53.

561 Fortunately, research of this kind has steadily grown in popularity. Along with the work noted earlier, consider that of fellow traveller Mike Kestemont, whose current project borrows "[s]tatistical methods from ecology to study the survival" rates of medieval manuscripts ("Libraries as Book Traps: Statistical Methods from Ecology to Study the Survival of Historic Literature", paper read at: *Old Books and New Technologies: Medieval Books and the Digital Humanities in the Low Countries* (KBR, Brussels, 06 May 2021); see also: Mike Kestemont and Folgert Karsdorp, "Estimating the Loss of Medieval Literature with an Unseen Species Model from Ecodiversity (Software and Data)", *Computational Humanities Research Workshop*. Amsterdam, 18–20 November 2020).

562 As Da Rold and Maniaci observe, the field of manuscript studies is "marked by an evident caesura between anglophone tradition … and Continental conventions" ("Medieval Manuscript Studies", 3).

of such work sit a bit distant from my specific research interests.[563] This issue gave rise to frustration. Much of the value of case studies, or narrowly-focused corpus studies, derives from situating findings against a broader population for comparative purposes. Alas, as noted above (p. 62), that we still await a comprehensive census or union list of medieval British manuscripts stymies full interpretation of some quantitative analyses by hindering comparative assessment of subpopulation-specific findings (like those detailed in this dissertation) and claims made about those findings.[564] To that extent, the fuller implications of this work remain to be discovered through subsequent work of this kind, as well as through the sorts of scholarly conversations that map out fields and what can be known or said about them. As the first book-length study investigating the incorporation of offcut parchment into manuscript codices, this dissertation marks a kind of beginning—an addition to the larger picture (which remains lacking). Ideally, others will also begin, with offcuts as well as other types of parchment, so we can compare our findings and strengthen our analyses. "One of the intrinsic limit[ations of] quantitative analysis", observes A.R. Bennett, "is that it is always only a beginning. More work, more data and more aggregation must follow for the picture to approach the scale at which we can approximate any kind of totality, particularly if the quantitative method is to influence how we understand the literary-historical culture that produced

---

563 Orietta Da Rold offers an overview in "Materials", in *The Production of Books in England 1350–1500*, ed. A. Gillespie and D. Wakelin (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 12–33. Much of this work has tended to focus on Continental manuscripts.

564 Some of my findings may not be unique (indeed, likely are not unique) to the offcut corpus. Profoundly surprising results may lurk in my data, failing to jump to my attention due to a lack of baselines against which to compare them. For instance, whether the traits I found to be correlated with offcut use are unique to that corpus remains unclear. Perhaps any analysis of manuscripts produced c. 1200–1500, and measuring under c. 150 mm would yield the same trends. We cannot know until that wider work is done.

it".[565] Other scholars undertaking similar research will enable comparative work, leading to development of more robust hypotheses and informative findings.

5.2.3. Defining the Uncertainties

The most challenging aspects of this project pertained to sampling issues, namely, obtaining a good-sized corpus, balancing subcorpora, and reliance on a limited number of repositories.[566] Even though our corpus is significantly larger than what is normally encountered in most studies of medieval manuscripts, it might have benefitted from expansion to help counteract potential sampling issues. Due to chance variation and historical contingencies, different repositories may have taken in very different types of collections, leading to inadvertent bias when confining a study to a smaller number of collections; the unbalanced subcorpora in this study possibly constitutes an artefact of the low number of repositories consulted.[567] Factors of this kind (e.g., corpus size, corpus balance, sampling procedures) warrant attention as they can interfere with a study's power,[568] potentially reducing the reliability of our findings. Increasing sample size, drawing upon a wide range of repositories, and attempting to ensure more equal observations for different subcorpora can help strengthen our

---

565 A.R. Bennett, "What Do the Numbers Mean?", 49.

566 COVID-related interruptions, as well as the proof-of-concept nature of this project, made reliance on a few large repositories a pragmatic decision.

567 Concomitantly, the imbalance may be a natural feature of the broader offcut English corpus, of small format manuscripts produced in medieval England, or even of the medieval English manuscript corpus as a whole. Future research may help shed some light on the situation.

568 Put very simply, a study with greater power is more likely to be accurate in its findings: as statistical power increases, the probability of certain types of errors (e.g., false positives, false negatives) falls. Statistical power depends on several aspects of the population under study as well as of study design. Increasing sample size offers a fairly straightforward way to increase a study's power.

results.[569] These changes are among those to be implemented during the postdoctoral stage of this project. This study's narrow geographical range offers further occasion for development. Orietta Da Rold and Marilena Maniaci have stressed the value of "a summative and comparative approach" situating regional manuscript output "within a broad European context"[570]—a position bolstered by Erik Kwakkel's informal observations regarding the distribution of offcuts in the fourteenth-century Dutch corpus (p. 86). In hopes of addressing this intriguing discrepancy, my project's expansion involves comparative work with codices from different geographical regions, namely, Austria, France, Germany, and the Low Countries.

Potential human error and inconsistency may have complicated our findings, as well. This dissertation was an exploratory, observational study undertaken as I gained deeper knowledge of the parchment-related literature and of parchment itself. Accordingly, inevitably, my methodology, perception, and details of my approach evolved over time. What's more, since the project was a dissertation, all data collection and data entry were performed by hand, by a single individual, working entirely alone. Errors may have persisted despite data cleaning. Since COVID-related travel restrictions precluded returning to repositories in the United Kingdom for verification of some data, minor errors may linger, along with slight inconsistencies between the data for the earliest-assessed and later-assessed manuscripts. Now that international travel is reopening, however, and groundwork has been laid via establishment of a fixed parchment assessment methodology and set of primary diagnostic traits, the door is open to confirmatory studies and analyses, both by myself and by others,

---

569 Improved precision will also help; see § 5.3, below.

570 Orietta Da Rold and Marilena Maniaci, "Medieval Manuscript Studies: A European Perspective", *Essays and Studies* 68 (2015), 6, 11.

along with case studies of individual manuscripts within this corpus, many of which have received little or no attention in the literature.

Finally, the statistical approaches deployed in this preliminary work were less detailed than I would have preferred. More granular analyses of unit features (e.g., textual contents, decorative elements, hands, signs of user interaction, etc.), in tandem with more in-depth analysis of how offcut zone parchment traits cluster, may prove fruitful. Perhaps most crucially, however, next stages of the project will make use of confidence intervals (in an effort to sidestep the notorious issues arising from p values), and include experimentation with k-means clustering (versus the imperfect, artificial generic division of subcorpora used here).

5.3. Directions for Future Research

Offcut zone parchment research would benefit from incorporation, where feasible, of techniques from biocodicology. For instance, a particular concern during my research was the possibility of animal species functioning as a confound, leading to spurious associations vis-à-vis the relationship between offcut status and specific parchment features. To what extent are some 'offcut zone' traits actually characteristic of parchment made from particular species?[571] Broadening the project's geographical range may help partially resolve the issue due to geographical discrepancies in the

[571] Sheep raises especial concerns due to the unique anatomy of the ovine dermis, together with widespread use of sheepskin for English manuscripts, and particularly English legal documents.

primary species used for parchment manufacture (pp. 24–25). Nonetheless, at least spot-checking the corpus for species via eZooMS[572] seems advisable.

Parchment topology offers another potential avenue for future research. As discussed in chapter one (§ 1.3), during parchment manufacture, the random, felt-like network of collagen fibrils undergoes reorientation into a more parallel configuration. The extent of the effect varies across the hide, with this variability implicated in certain offcut traits. By mapping micro-patterns in surface structure across a selection of prepared hides, it may be possible to develop a set of topographic norms (i.e., a map of the degree of variance, and typical orientation of, fibres within the parchment across the surface of treated hides[573]) to help diagnose offcuts concealed through close trimming and other methods. Initial attempts to develop such maps will form part of my postdoctoral continuation of this work.

Finally, in future, our corpus might be radically expanded through application of machine learning techniques for preliminary offcut identification. While confirmation of offcut zone parchment does require in situ consultation, with a suitable dataset it should be possible to train an algorithm to identify possible or probable offcuts. The resultant software could search digitized

---

572 eZooMS, a technique adapted from ZooMS ('zooarchaeology by mass spectrometry'), is a non-invasive method of peptide mass fingerprinting which can be used to identify the animal species from which parchment was made. On ZooMS see: M. Buckley. et al. "Species Identification of Archaeological Marine Mammals Using Collagen Fingerprinting", *J. Archaeol. Sci*. 41 (2014), 631–41; for eZooMS, see: Sarah Fiddyment, et al., "Animal Origin of 13th-Century Uterine Vellum Revealed Using Noninvasive Peptide Fingerprinting", *PNAS* 112 (2015): 15066–071.

573 For early work of this nature, albeit with rather different goals, see: the pertinent studies in Peter Rück's *Pergament: Geschichte, Struktur, Restaurierung, Herstellung* (Sigmaringen: Jan Thorbecke Verlag, 1991). René Larsen also provides useful findings in his edited collection *IDAP: Improved Damage Assessment of Parchment—Assessment, Data Collection, and Sharing of Knowledge* (Luxembourg: European Commission, 2007), and his *Microanalysis of Parchment* (London: Archetype, 2002).

facsimiles, outputting lists of manuscripts warranting in situ follow up, thereby saving researcher time and funds. Such an approach stands to increase the efficiency of parchment studies.

For the moment, though, this field of research remains labour-intensive. Much like medieval scribes, we remain reliant on limited, betimes fickle, access to books, and partly at the mercy of the exemplars available in any given collection. Concomitantly, however, I believe that the study of parchment generally, and offcuts more specifically, proves sufficiently rich and rewarding to emerge as a distinct field of study within materially-based medieval codicology. Clearly, our repositories hold medieval manuscript books, even classes of books, exhibiting varied and sometimes extensive use of parchment which would otherwise have been subverted to distinctly unbookish ends, including (but certainly not limited to) transformation into adhesive or reinforcement for clothing. Such codices as have been examined within this dissertation come from pretty well every domain of medieval culture that one can think of, with the (puzzling?) exception or near-exception of the canonically literary. As such, while the offcut parchment evidence may prompt us to reassess aspects of our understanding of medieval books, literacy, and the changing historical understandings of what counts as (especially 'popular') literature, it also carries the potential to bring us into productive contact not only with the design and making of individual books, but also with overlooked or neglected aspects of medieval life, particularly where material, cultural, and intellectual history meet.

References

Archives, Manuscripts, and Artefacts

Manuscripts listed below have been cited or discussed within the body of the dissertation, but are not part of the corpus under study. For the full list of manuscripts analyzed (most of which are neither cited nor discussed in the body of the dissertation) see "Manuscript Corpus" in volume two.

Austria

Graz, Universitätsbibliothek, MS 1025

Klagenfurt, Studienbibliothek, MS 154

Wien, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, MS 795

Belgium

Bruges, Stadsbibliotek, MS 373

Canada

Victoria, University of Victoria, Special Collections and University Archives, Doc.Brown.2

Czech Republic

Prague, Archiv Prazského Hradu, Knihovna Metropolitní Kapituly, N. VI

Denmark

Copenhagen, Arnamagnæanske Samling, MS AM 666 b 4to

Copenhagen, Arnamagnæanske Samling, MS AM 732 b 4to

Copenhagen, Kongelige Bibliotek, MS GKS 4 2°

France

Amiens, Bibliothèque municipale, MS 0042

Amiens, Bibliothèque municipale, MS 0043

Arras, Bibliothèque municipale, MS 331

Avignon, Bibliothèque municipale, MS 305

Avignon, Bibliothèque municipale, MS 306

Lille, Bibliothéque municipale, MS 447

Paris, Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal, MS 408A

Paris, Bibliothéque de l'Arsenal, MS 937

Paris, Bibliothèque historique de la ville de Paris, MS n° 125 Réserve

Paris, Bibliothèque Mazarine, MS 686

Paris, Bibliothéque de Mazarine, MS 774

Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS lat. 3227

Sens, Musées de Sens, Trésor de la Cathédrale Saint-Etienne, J 36

Sens, Musées de Sens, Trésor de la Cathédrale Saint-Etienne, J 50

Tours, Bibliothèque municipale, MS 327

Germany

Bamberg, Staatsbibliothek, MS Patr.5 (B.II.5)

Berlin, Kunstgewerbemuseum, Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, K 6156

Nürnberg, Germanische Nationalmuseum, KG709

Nürnberg, Stadtbibliothek Nürnberg, Amb. 317.2°

Wolfenbüttel, Herzog August Bibliothek, Cod. Guelf. 42 Gud. lat.

Italy

Bologna, Biblioteca Universitaria, Cod. Bonon. 963

Cortona, Biblioteca del Comune di Cortona e dell'Accademia Etrusca, MS 62

Firenze, Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale, Portolano 1

Lucca, Biblioteca Capitolare, MS 490

Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, MS Pal.lat.1993

Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, MS Vat.lat.955

Netherlands

Deventer, Stadsarchief en Atheneumbibliotheek, Suppl. 198 / 101 E 26

Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek, BPL 191 D

Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek, VLO 92

Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek, VLQ 67

Zwolle, Historisch Centrum Overijssel, Coll. Van Rhemen inv. 1

Norway

Oslo, Schøyen Collection, MS 710

Spain

Madrid, Archivo Histórico Nacional, Clero Regular-Secular, carpeta 1082, nº 18

Switzerland

Basel, Universitätsbibliothek, MS C.V.37

Berne, Burgerbibliothek, Bongarsiana Cod. 434

Berne, Burgerbibliothek, Cod. 462

Genève, Bibliothèque publique et universitaire, MS lat. 140

United Kingdom

Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum, MS 1-2005

Cambridge, Peterhouse Library, MS 24

Cambridge, Peterhouse Library, MS 25

Cambridge, Peterhouse Library, MS 88

Cambridge, Peterhouse Library, MS 110

Cambridge, Peterhouse Library, MS 114

Cambridge, Peterhouse Library, MS 142

Cambridge, Peterhouse Library, MS 192

Cambridge, Trinity College Library, MS B.2.1

Cambridge, Trinity College Library, MS O.8.36

Cambridge, Trinity College Library, MS R.17.1

Cambridge, Trinity College Library, MS R.14.45

Cambridge, University Library, MS Ff.IV.37

Cambridge, University Library, MS Ii.6.13

Cardiff, Public Library, MS 3.174

Chichester, Diocesan Record Office, Cap/I/17/2

Hereford, Cathedral Chapter Library, Mappa Mundi

Hereford, Cathedral Chapter Library, MS P.III.11

Hereford, Cathedral Chapter Library, MS P.III.12

Kew, The National Archives, C 1/302/80

Kew, The National Archives, C 1/410/35

Kew, The National Archives, C 1/568/54

Kew, The National Archives, C 74/1–C 74/8

Kew, The National Archives, C 131/229/37B

Kew, The National Archives, C 241/227/17

Kew, The National Archives, CP 25/1/179/96, no. 26

Kew, The National Archives, CP 25/1/280/159, no. 30

Kew, The National Archives, CP 25/1/281/160, no. 91

Kew, The National Archives, E 122/62/14

Kew, The National Archives, E 122/62/17

Kew, The National Archives, E 159/227

Kew, The National Archives, PROB 11/16/284

Kew, The National Archives, PROB 11/18/466

Kew, The National Archives, PROB 11/19/400

Kew, The National Archives, PROB 11/22/63

Kew, The National Archives, PROB 11/24/289

Kew, The National Archives, PROB 11/28/396

Kew, The National Archives, PROB 11/28/505

Kew, The National Archives, PROB 11/31/152

Kew, The National Archives, PROB 11/31/386

Kew, The National Archives, SC 8/194/9700

Kew, The National Archives, SC 8/297/14828

Kew, The National Archives, SC 8/297/14830

Kew, The National Archives, SC 8/331/15669

Kew, The National Archives, SC 8/331/15947

Leicester, Record Office for Leicestershire, Leicester, and Rutland, 26D53/924

Lincoln, Lincolnshire Archives, CRAGG/4/10

Lincoln, Lincolnshire Archives, Spalding Sewers/473/2

London, British Library, Additional MS 5923

London, British Library, Additional MS 33996

London, British Library, Additional MS 48978

London, British Library, Arundel MS 310

London, British Library, Arundel MS 8365

London, British Library, Cotton MS Julius D. II

London, British Library, Cotton MS Vitellius A XII

London, British Library, Harley MS 172

London, British Library, Harley MS 1037

London, British Library, Harley MS 1245

London, British Library, Harley MS 1758

London, British Library, Harley MS 2409

London, British Library, Harley MS 2851

London, British Library, Harley MS 3049

London, British Library, Harley MS 3601

London, British Library, Harley MS 3915

London, British Library, Harley MS 5977

London, British Library, Harley MS 6579

London, British Library, Lansdowne MS 348

London, British Library, Lansdowne MS 475

London, British Library, Royal MS 7 A VII

London, British Library, Royal MS 7 E IV

London, British Library, Royal MS 16 E II

London, British Library, Sloane MS 3850

London, British Library, Stowe MS 68

London, British Library, Stowe MS 386

London, Lambeth Palace Library, MS 697

London, London Metropolitan Archives, MS COL/CH/01/001/A

London, London Metropolitan Archives, MS COL/CH/01/001/B

London, St Paul's Cathedral Library, MS 4

London, Society of Antiquaries, MS 544

London, Wellcome Library, MS 542

Norwich, Castle Museum, MS 158-926/4d

Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Ashmole 1152

Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Bodley 809

Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Eng. Poet. a. 1

Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Digby 84

Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Digby 93

Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Douce 34

Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Hamilton 53

Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Hatton 10

Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Junius 1

Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Laud misc. 6

Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Rawlinson B.520

Oxford, Christ Church College Library, MS 103

Oxford, Jesus College Library, MS 20

Oxford, Jesus College Library, MS 22

Oxford, Merton College Library, MS 248

Oxford, Merton College Library, MS 266

Oxford, Merton College Library, Coxe MS 48

Oxford, Merton College Library, MS D.3.7

Oxford, Oriel College, MS 10

Oxford, St John's College Library, MS 154

United States of America

Cambridge, MA, Harvard Law School, HLS MS 12

New York, Columbia University, Rare Books and Manuscript Library, MS Plimpton 273

New York, Pierpont Morgan Library, MS B.21

New York, Pierpont Morgan Library, MS M.761

Princeton, NJ, Princeton University, Princeton University Library, MS Garrett 146

Princeton, NJ, Princeton University, Scheide Library, MS 30

San Marino, CA, Huntington Library, MS HM 19920

FINDING AIDS

Black, William Henry. *A Descriptive, Analytical, and Critical Catalogue of the Manuscripts Bequeathed unto the University of Oxford by Elias Ashmole Esq., M.D., F.R.S., Windsor Herald, Also of Some Additional MSS. Contributed by Kingsley, Lhuyd, Borlase, and Others*. Oxford, 1845.

Bodleian Library. *Catalogue of the Printed Books and Manuscripts Bequeathed by Francis Douce, Esq. to the Bodleian Library*. Oxford: University Press, 1890.

—. *Medieval Manuscripts in Oxford Libraries*. [N.d.] medieval.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/.

[Botfield, Beriah, editor]. *Catalogi Veteres Librorum Ecclesiæ Cathedralis Dunelm: Catalogues of the Library of Durham Cathedral … Including Catalogues of the Library of the Abbey of Hulne and of the MSS. Preserved in the Library of Bishop Cosin at Durham*. Surtees Society 7. London: J.B. Nichols & Son, 1838.

British Library. "Cotton Manuscripts (5th Century–19th Century) (Cotton MS)". *Archives and Manuscripts: Browse Collections*. [N.d.] Accessed 22 May 2017. hviewer.bl.uk/IamsHViewer/Default.aspx?mdark=ark:/81055/vdc_100000000035.0x0000b4.

—. "Harley Manuscripts (c1300–c1700) (Harley MS 1–7661)". *Archives and Manuscripts: Browse Collections*. [N.d.] Accessed 22 May 2017. hviewer.bl.uk/IamsHViewer/Default.aspx?mdark=ark:/81055/vdc_100000000046.0x00031c.

—. "Lansdowne Manuscripts (c1200–c1700) (Lansdowne MS 1–1245)". *Archives and Manuscripts: Browse Collections*. [N.d.] Accessed 22 May 2017. hviewer.bl.uk/IamsHViewer/Default.aspx?mdark=ark:/81055/vdc_100000000039.0x0003ae.

—. "Sloane Manuscripts (c1000–c1750) (Sloane MS 1–4100)". *Archives and Manuscripts: Browse Collections*. [N.d.] Accessed 22 May 2017. hviewer.bl.uk/IamsHViewer/Default.aspx?mdark=ark:/81055/vdc_100000000040.0x00011c.

—. "Stowe Manuscripts (c1000–c1800) (Stowe MS 1–1085)". *Archives and Manuscripts: Browse Collections*. [N.d.] Accessed 22 May 2017. hviewer.bl.uk/IamsHViewer/Default.aspx?mdark=ark:/81055/vdc_100000000035.0x00035e.

—. "Western Manuscripts. Arundel Manuscripts (c1100–c1640) (Arundel MS 1–550)". *Archives and Manuscripts: Browse Collections*. [N.d.] Accessed 22 May 2017. hviewer.bl.uk/IamsHViewer/Default.aspx?mdark=ark:/81055/vdc_100000000046.0x000187.

British Museum. *A Catalogue of the Harleian Manuscripts in the British Museum* …. 4 vols. Printed by Command of His Majesty King George III. [S.n.], 1808–1812.

—. *A Catalogue of Manuscripts Formerly in the Possession of Francis Hargrave, Esq. … Now Deposited in the British Museum*. London: G. Woodfall, 1818.

—. *Catalogue of the Stowe Manuscripts in the British Museum*. London: Oxford University Press, for Trustees of the British Museum, 1895.

Coxe, Henry O., editor. *Catalogus Codicum Mss. qui in Colegiis Aulisque Oxoniensibus Hodie Adservantur*. Oxford: University Press, 1852.

De la Mare, Albinia. *Catalogue of the Collection of Medieval Manuscripts Bequeathed to the Bodleian Library Oxford by James P.R. Lyell*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1971.

The Electronic Sawyer: Online Catalogue of Anglo-Saxon Charters. Dir. Simon Keynes. London: King's College London, 2021. esawyer.lib.cam.ac.uk.

Hackman, Alfred. *Catalogi Codicum Manuscriptorum Bibliothecæ Bodleianæ Partis Quarta … Thomæ Tanneri, S.T.P.* ….. Oxford: University Press, 1860. Repr. Oxford: University Press, 1966.

Hagen, Hermannus, editor. *Catalogus codicum bernensium (Bibliotheca Bongarsiana): Edidit et praefatus est Hermannus Hagen. Addita est Bongarsii imago. Bibl. publ. ber. collegii auspiciis*. Bern: B.F. Haller, 1875.

Hunt, R.W., editor. *Bodleian Library Quarto Catalogues II: Laudian Manuscripts by H.O. Coxe. Reprinted from the Edition of 1858–1885, with Corrections and Additions* …. Oxford: Bodleian Library, 1973.

—, editor. *A Summary Catalogue of Western Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library at Oxford*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1953.

—, and A.G. Watson, editors. *Bodleian Library Quarto Catalogues IX: Digby Manuscripts. A Reproduction of the 1883 Catalogue by W.D. Macray* …. Oxford: Bodleian Library, 1999.

Macray, W.D. *Catalogi Codicum Manuscriptorum Bibliothecæ Bodleianæ … Ricardi Rawlinson, J.C.D.* ….. 5 vols. Oxford: University Press, 1862–1900.

—. *Index to the Catalogue of the Manuscripts of Elias Ashmole, Formerly Preserved in the Ashmolean Museum, and Now Deposited in the Bodleian Library, Oxford*. Oxford, 1866.

Madan, Falconer, H.H.E. Craster, and N. Denholm-Young, editors. *A Summary Catalogue of Western Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library at Oxford Which Have Not Hitherto Been Catalogued in the Quarto Series* …. 6 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1895–1937.

The Manuscripts of His Grace the Duke of Rutland, KG, Preserved at Belvoir Castle. Edited by H.C. Maxwell-Lyte, et al., 4 vols. London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, for HMSO, 1888–1905.

Meyïer, Karel Adriaan de. *Codices Vossiani Latini, Pars II: Codices in Quarto*. Leiden: Universitaire Pers Leiden, 1975. hdl.handle.net/1887.1/item:109990.

Moorat, S.A.J. *Catalogue of Western Manuscripts on Medicine and Science in the Wellcome Historical Medical Library, I: Mss. Written before 1650 A.D*. Publications of the Wellcome Historical Medical Library, Catalogue Series. London: Wellcome Historical Medical Library, 1962. wellcomecollection.org/works/scscncqd.

Mynors, R.A.B., and R.M. Thomson, editors. *Catalogue of the Manuscripts of Hereford Cathedral Library*, with a contribution on the bindings by Michael Gullick. Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, for the Dean and Chapter of Hereford Cathedral, 1993.

Pelteret, David Anthony Edgell. *Catalogue of English Post-Conquest Vernacular Documents*. Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 1990.

Planta, J. *A Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Cottonian Library Deposited in the British Museum*. Printed by Command of His Majesty King George III. [S.n.], 1802.

Podlaha, Antonin. *Soupis rukopisu knihovny Metropolitní Kapitoly prazské. F–P*. Praze: Ceské Akademie Ved a Umení, 1922. archive.org/details/soupisrukopisukn02kapiuoft.

Thomson, Rodney M. *Catalogue of the Manuscripts of Lincoln Cathedral Chapter Library*. Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, for the Dean and Chapter of Lincoln, 1989.

University of Toronto. *Pre−1600 Manuscripts in the Thomas Fisher Rare Book Library University of Toronto*. [N.d.] Accessed 06 December 2017. fisher.library.utoronto.ca/sites/fisher.library.utoronto.ca/files/Pre-1600%20MSS%20in%20Fisher.pdf.

Warner, George F., and Julius P. Gilson. *Catalogue of Western Manuscripts in the Old Royal and King's Collections*. 2 vols. Oxford: Humphrey Milford, for Trustees of the British Museum, 1921.

Published Primary Sources

Albertus Magnus. “Tractatus II: De lapidibus pretiosis et eorum virtutibus”. In *Liber Primus: Mineralium, B. Alberti Magni. Opera Omnia*, edited by Augusti Borgnet, 5:30–47. Paris: Ludovicum Vives, Bibliopolam editorem, 1890.

Anselm. *Sancti Anselmi Cantuariensis Archiepiscopi Opera Omnia*. Edited by Franciscus Salesius Schmitt. 6 vols. Edinburgh: Nelson and Sons, 1946.

Arnoldus Leodiensis. *Alphabetum Narrationum*. Edited by Elisa Brilli, et al. Corpus Christianorum Continuatio Mediaevalis 160; Exempla Medii Ævi 6. Turnhout: Brepols, 2015.

Badius, Jodocus. *Ortus Vocabulorum*. [Winandu*m* de worde], M.CCCCC. [1500]. STC (2nd ed.) 13829.

Baildon, William Pailey, and James Douglas Walker, editors and translators. *The Records of the Honourable Society of Lincoln’s Inn. The Black Books. Vol. I: From A.D. 1422 to A.D. 1586*. London: H.S. Cartwright, 1897.

Barnum, Priscilla Heath, editor. *Dives and Pauper. Vol. 1, Part 1*. EETS, OS 275. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1976.

Bates, David, editor. *Regesta Regum Anglo-Normannorum: The Acta of William I, 1066–1087*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.

Besançon, Etienne de, [attrib.]. *Alphabet of Tales: An English 15th Century Translation of the Alphabetum Narrationum of Etienne de Besançon, from Additional MS. 25719 of the British Museum*. Edited by Mary Macleod Banks. EETS, os 126–127. Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 1904.

Brightman, Frank, and Michael Best. “Introduction”. In *The Book of Secrets of Albertus Magnus of the Virtues of Herb, Stones and Certain Beasts, also A Book of the Marvels of the World*, xi–xlviii. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1973.

Bond, Edward Augustus, editor. *Facsimiles of Ancient Charters in the British Museum. Part 2*. London: Chiswick for the British Museum, 1873–1878.

Bromyard, Johannes de. *Summam predicantium*: *op*[*us*] *vtiq*[*ue*] *co*[*m*]*me*[*n*]*datissimu*[*m*]. Nurenbergk: Anthoniu[m] koberger, M.cccclxxxv [= 1485]. ISTC no. ij00261000; GW no. M13116.

Buttimer, Charles Henry, editor. *Hugonis de Sancto Victore Didascalicon de Studio Legendi: A Critical Text*. Studies in Medieval and Renaissance Latin 10. Washington D.C.: Catholic University Press, 1939.

Calle Martín, Javier, and Miguel Ángel Castaño-Gil, editors. *A Late Middle English Remedy-Book (MS Wellcome 542, ff. 1r–20v): A Scholarly Edition*. Late Middle English Texts 5. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2013.

Camden, William. *Visitation of the County of Leicester in the Year 1619*. Edited by John Fetherston. Harleian Society Visitation ser. 2. London: Taylor & co., 1870. archive.org/details/visitationofcoun02camd/.

Clarke, Mark. *The Crafte of Lymmyng and The Maner of Steynyng: Middle English Recipes for Painters, Stainers, Scribes, and Illuminators*. EETS, OS 347. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016.

Clay, Charles Travis, editor. *Yorkshire Deeds: Volume 4*. 1924. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.

[Clay, John William, editor]. *North Country Wills; Being Abstracts of Wills Relating to the Counties of York, Nottingham, Northumberland, Cumberland, and Westmorland, at Somerset House and Lambeth Palace 1383 to 1558*. Surtees Society. Durham: J. Whitehead & Son, 1908.

Conradus de Mure. *De natura animalium*. In: Gall Morel. « Zur Kunde des Schriftwesens im Mittelalter ». *Anzeiger für Kunde der Deutschen Vorzeit* 19, no. 10 (1872): col. 313–315.

A Collection of Ordinances and Regulations for the Government of the Royal Household, Made in Divers Reigns: From King Edward III to King William and Queen Mary, Also Receipts in Ancient Cookery. London: Society of Antiquaries of London, 1790.

Dashwood, G.H., editor. *Visitation of Norfolk in the Year 1563, Vol. I*. Norfolk & Norwich Archaeological Society. Norfolk: Miller & Leavins, 1878. archive.org/details/visitationnorfo00dashgoog/.

Dimock, James F., editor. *Itinerarium Kambriæ et Descriptio Kambriæ. Giraldi Cambrensis Opera 6*. Rerum Britannicarum medii aevi scriptores 21/6. London: Longmans, Green, Reader, & Dyer, 1868.

Fitzherbert, Anthony. *The Book of Husbandry, by Master Fitzherbert, Reprinted from the Edition of 1534* .... Edited by Walter W. Skeat. English Dialect Society. London: Trübner & co., 1882.

FitzNigel, Richard. *Dialogus de Scaccario: The Dialogue of the Exchequer; Constitutio Domus Regis: Disposition of the King's Household*. Rev. edn. Edited and translated by Emilie Amt and S.D. Church. Oxford Medieval Texts. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.

Gildea, Joseph, ed. *Remediarium Conversorum: A Synthesis in Latin of Moralia in Job by Gregory the Great*. Villanova: Villanova University Press, 1984.

[Guallensis], Johannes. *Summa collationum, sive communiloquium*. Ulm: Johann Zainer, 1[4]81. ISTC no. ij00331000; GW no. M13990.

Gwara, Scott, and David W. Porter, editors. *Anglo-Saxon Conversations: The Colloquies of Aelfric Bata*. Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 1997.

Hedfors, Hjalmar, editor and translator. « Compositiones ad tingenda musiva: herausgegeben, übersetzt und philologisch erklärt ». Inaugural diss., Uppsala Universitet, 1932. Uppsala: Almqvist och Wiksell, 1932.

Heinrich, Fritz, editor. *Ein Mittelenglisches Medizinbuch*. Halle: Max Niemeyer, 1896. archive.org/details/einmittelenglisc00heinuoft.

Herrtage, Sidney J.H., editor. *Catholicon Anglicum: An English–Latin Wordbook Dated 1483*. EETS, OS 75. Camden n.s. 30. London: Trübner, 1881.

Hockey, Stanley F., editor. *Account-Book of Beaulieu Abbey*. Camden, 4th s. 16. London: Royal Historical Society, 1975.

Holmstedt, G., editor. *Speculum Christiani: A Middle English Treatise of the Fourteenth Century*. EETS. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1930.

Hopwood, Charles Henry, editor. *Middle Temple Records*. 4 vols. London: Butterworth & co., for the Honourable Society of the Middle Temple, 1904.

Horman, William. *Vulgaria Viri Doctissimi Guil ...* . [Richard Pynson], M.D.XIX. [1519]. STC (2nd ed.) 13811.

Horstmann, Carl, editor. *Sammlung Altenglischer Legenden*. Heilbronn: Henninger, 1878.

Inderwick, F.A., editor. *A Calendar of the Inner Temple Records. Vol. 1: 21 Hen. VII. (1505)–45 Eliz. (1603)*. Published by order of the Masters of the Bench. London: Henry Sotheran & co., 1896.

Isidore of Seville. *The Etymologies of Isidore of Seville*. Translated with introduction and notes by Stephen A. Barney, W.J. Lewis, J.A. Beach, and Oliver Berghof, with Muriel Hall. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

De la Lande, M. [Jérôme]. *Art de faire le parchemin*. Saillant et Nyon, 1761. Descriptions des arts et métiers, faites ou approuvées par Messieurs de l'Académie royale des sciences avec figures en taille-douce. Bibliothèque nationale de France. ark:/12148/bpt6k1067200p.

Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, Henry VIII, 4, 1524–1530. Edited by J.S. Brewer. London: HMSO, 1875.

Liebermann, Felix, editor. *Die Gesetze der Angelsachsen*. 3 vols. Halle: Max Niemeyer, 1903–1916.

Lister, John, editor. *The Early Yorkshire Woollen Trade: Extracts from the Hull Customs Rolls and Complete Transcripts of the Ulnagers' Rolls 1304–1471 and 1378–1478*, 33–34. Yorkshire Archaeological Society Record Series 64. Leeds: Yorkshire Archaeological Society, 1924. archive.org/details/YASRS064.

Lyte, H.C. Maxwell, editor. *A Descriptive Catalogue of Ancient Deeds: Vol. 4*. London: HMSO, 1902.

Maitland, F.W., and G.J. Turner, editors. *Year Books of 3 and 4 Edward II (1310)*. Selden Society Annual 22; Year Books 4. London: Selden Society, 1907.

Marshall, George William, editor. *Visitations of the County of Nottingham in the Years 1569 and 1614 with Many Other Descents of the Same County*. London: Taylor & co., 1871. archive.org/details/visitationscoun03britgoog/.

Maximus of Turin. "Homilia Prima de Ieiunio Quadragesimæ". In *Salviani, Episcopi Massiliensis. De Vero Judicio et Providentia Dei, Libri VIII*, 108–110. Rome: Paulum Manutium, Aldi F., 1564.

Mayhew, A.L., editor. *The Promptorium Parvulorum: The First English–Latin Dictionary*. EETS, ES 102. London: Henry Frowde, 1908.

Medieval Libraries of Great Britain. Dir. Richard Sharpe and James Willoughby. Oxford: Bodleian Libraries, University of Oxford, 2015. mlgb3.bodleian.ox.ac.uk.

Migne, Jacques Paul, editor. *Patrologiae Cursus Completus. Series Latina*. Vol. 22. Paris, 1845.

Nicolas, Nicholas Harris, editor. *Testamenta Vetusta: Being Illustrations from Wills, of Manners, Customs, &c. as Well as of the Descents and Possessions of Many Distinguished Families … Volume 2*. London: Nichols & Son, 1826.

Nichols, John. *History and Antiquities of the County of Leicester*. Vol. 3, Part 1. London: John Nichols, 1800. specialcollections.le.ac.uk/digital/collection/p15407coll6/id/6231/rec/6.

Nighman, Chris L., editor. "Viridarium consolationis. Pars 1: De peccatis, caput 1: De superbia (24)". *Digital Viridarium consolationis Project*. Waterloo, ON: Wilfrid Laurier University, 2021. web.wlu.ca/history/cnighman/VC/Fontes/1.1.24.pdf.

Oschinsky, Dorothea, editor. *Walter of Henley and Other Treatises on Estate Management and Accounting*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1971.

Palmer, Robert C., et al., editors. *Anglo-American Legal Tradition*. O'Quinn Law Library, University of Houston Law Center, 2006–. aalt.law.uh.edu/AALT.html.

Piper, Paul, editor. *Libri Confraternitatum Sancti Galli, Augiensis, Fabariensis*. Monumenta Germaniæ Historica. Berlin: Weidmannos for Societas Aperiendis Fontibus Rerum Germanicarum Medii Ævi, 1884.

Pseudo-Albertus Magnus. *Liber aggregationis seu liber secreto*[*rum*] *Alberti magni de virtutibus herba*[*rum*] *lapidum* [*et*] *animalium quorumd*[*am*] *Liber primus de viribus quarumd*[*am*] *herba*[*rum*]. [[London]: Per me Wilhelmum de Mechlinia impressus in opulentissima ciuitate Londoniaru[m] iuxta pontem qui vulgariter dicitur flete brigge, [c. 1483]]. STC (2nd ed.) 258.

Raine, James, and John William Clay, editors. *Testamenta Eboracensia: A Selection of Wills from the Registry at York. Vol. 4*. Surtees Society. Durham: Andrews & co., 1869. archive.org/details/testamentaebora00socigoog.

Reaney, P.H., and Marc Fitch, editors. *Feet of Fines for Essex, Vol. IV: 1423–1547*. Colchester: Essex Archaeological Society, 1964. esah1852.org.uk/images/pdf/ffines/F1400000.pdf.

Records of London's Livery Companies Online: Apprentices and Freemen 1400–1900. London: Centre for Metropolitan History, 2008. www.londonroll.org/.

Riccobaldo of Ferrara, "Historia episcoporum Urbis successorum Patri Apostoli vicarii Christi". *Pomerium Ravennatis Ecclesie*, lib 6.2, no. 159 (anno MIII). Edited by Gabriele Zanella. Rerum Italicarum, 173. Cremona, 2001. www.gabrielezanella.it/Pubblicati/Pomerium.html.

Sanders, William Basevi, et al., editors. *Facsimiles of Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts*. Vol. 3. London: Ordnance Survey Office, 1884.

The Schedula diversarum artium—*A Digital Critical Edition*. Project leads Andreas Speer, Hiltrud Westermann-Angerhausen, and Mattias Gärtner. Thomas-Institut, Universität zu Köln, 2010. schedula.uni-koeln.de/.

Schmeller, J.A., editor. *Carmina Burana: Lateinische und Deutsche eiser Handschrift des XIII Jahrhunderts aus Benedictbeuern auf der K. Bibliothek zu München*. Breslau: Verlag von Wilhelm Koebner, 1883. archive.org/details/carminaburanalat00schmuoft.

Schulte, Johann Friedrich von, editor. *Die Summa des Paucapalea über das Decretum Gratiani*. Giessen: Roth, 1891.

Shakespeare, William. *Hamlet*. *The Norton Shakespeare*, 3rd edn. Edited by Stephen Greenblatt, et al. 2 vols. New York: Norton, 2015.

Taylor, Jerome, translator. *The Didascalion of Hugh of St. Victor: A Medieval Guide to Arts*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1961.

Trithemius, Johannes. *In Praise of Scribes; De Laude Scriptorum*. Edited with an introduction by Klaus Arnold. Lawrence: Coronado, 1974.

Wattenbach, Wilhelm. *Das Schriftwesen im Mittelalter*. 3rd expanded edn. Leipzig: S. Hirzel, 1896. archive.org/details/dasschriftweseni00wattuoft.

Whitelock, Dorothy, editor. *English Historical Documents, 1: c. 500–1042*. 2nd edn. New York: Routledge, 1979.

Wilkins, David, editor. "Convocatio Prælatorum et Cleri Provinciæ Cant. 30 Die Octobris in Ecclesia S. Pauli London". In *Concilia Magnæ Britanniæ et Hiberniæ, ab anno MCCCL ad annum MDXLV. Vol. 3*, 393–95. London: R. Gosling, 1737.

Secondary Sources

Acquoy, Johannes Gerhardus Rijk. *Het Klooster te Windesheim en Zijn Invloed*. Vol. 2. Provinciaal Utrechtsch Genootschap van Kunsten et Wetenschappen. Utrecht: Gebr. van der Post, 1876. mdz-nbn-resolving.de/urn:nbn:de:bvb:12-bsb11324237-1.

Adams, Robert. "The R/F MSS of *Piers Plowman* and the Pattern of Alpha/Beta Complementary Omissions: Implications for Critical Editing". *Text* 14 (2002): 109–37.

A.E.W. "Swillington of Swillington". *The Herald and Genealogist. Vol. 4*, edited by John Gough Nichols, 225–37. London: J.G. Nichols and R.C. Nichols, 1867. archive.org/details/heraldgenealogis04nich.

Albarella, Umberto. "Size, Power, Wool, and Veal: Zooarchaeological Evidence for Late Medieval Innovations". In *Environment and Subsistence in Medieval Europe: Papers of the 'Medieval Europe Brugge 1997' Conference*, edited by Frans Verhaeghe and Guy De Boe, 19–30. I.A.P. Rapporten 9. Zellik: Institut voor het Archeologisch Patrimonium, 1997.

Alderson, G.L.H. "The Development of a System of Linear Measurements to Provide an Assessment of Type and Function of Beef Cattle". *Animal Genetic Resources Info.* 25, no. 3 (1999): 45–55. doi: 10.1017/S1014233900005782.

Baker, John Hamilton. "The Books of the Common Law". In Hellinga and Trapp, *History of the Book in Britain, Vol. 3*, 411–32.

—. *Collected Papers on English Legal History*. 3 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014. doi: 10.1017/CBO9781316090930.

—. "Essex, Sir William (c. 1470–1548), of Lainbourn, Berks." In *History of Parliament Online*. Dir. Paul Seaward. London: Institute of Historical Research for the History of Parliament Trust, 2020. www.histparl.ac.uk/volume/1509-1558/member/essex-sir-william-1470-1548.

—. *An Introduction to English Legal History*. 5th edn. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019.

—. "Learning Exercises in the Medieval Inns of Court and Chancery". In Baker, *Collected Papers*, vol. 1, 315–334.

—. "Legal Education in London 1250–1850". In Baker, *Collected Papers*, vol. 1, 270–307.

—. *The Men of Court 1440–1550*. Selden Society Suppl. Ser. 18. London: Selden Society, 2012.

—. "The Pekynnes". In Baker, *Collected Papers*, vol. 1, 308–314.

—, editor. *The Oxford History of the Laws of England, 4: 1483–1558*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.

Barrington, Candace, and Sebastian Sobecki, editors. *The Cambridge Companion to Medieval English Law and Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2019.

Barrett, James H. "The Pirate Fishermen: The Political Economy of a Medieval Maritime Society". In *West over Sea: Studies in Scandinavian Sea-Borne Expansion and Settlement Before 1300—A Festschrift in Honour of Dr Barbara E. Crawford*, edited by Beverley Ballin Smith, et al., 299–341. Northern World 31. Leiden: Brill, 2007.

Barrett, Timothy, et al. *Paper through Time: Nondestructive Analysis of 14th- through 19th-Century Papers*. UI Center for the Book, University of Iowa. 22 December 2011. paper.lib.uiowa.edu/.

Barrett, Timothy, and Cynthea Mosier. "The Role of Gelatin in Paper Permanence". *J. Am. Inst. Conserv.* 34, no. 3 (1995): 173–86. doi: 10.2307/3179538.

Baty, John, and Timothy Barrett. "Gelatin Size as a pH and Moisture Content Buffer in Paper". *J. Am. Inst. Conserv*. 46, no. 2 (2007): 105–21. doi: 10.1179/019713607806112332.

Beadle, Richard. "English Autograph Writings of the Later Middle Ages: Some Preliminaries". In *Gli Autografi Medievali: Problemi Paleografici e Filologici*, ed. Paolo Chiesa and Lucia Pinelli, 248–68. Spoleto: Centro Italiano di Studi sull'Alto Medioevo, 1994.

Beasts2Craft: Biocodicology as a New Approach to the Study of Parchment Manuscripts. Dir. Matthew Collins. 2020–. sites.google.com/palaeome.org/ercb2c/home.

Beckerman, John S. “Law-Writing and Law Teaching: Treatise Evidence of the Formal Teaching of English Law in the Late Thirteenth Century”. In Bush and Wijffels, *Learning the Law*, 33–50.

Beenk, Jody, et al. “Archives Conservation Discussion Group 2009: Conservation and Preservation Approaches for Stabilizing Large-Scale Collections”. *Book and Paper Group Annual* 28 (2009): 99–106. cool.conservation-us.org/coolaic/sg/bpg/annual/v28/bp28-18.pdf.

Bell, H.E. “The Price of Books in Medieval England”. *The Library*, 4th ser., 17, no. 3 (1936–1937): 312–32. doi: 10.1093/library/s4-XVII.3.312.

Bennett, Adelaide. “Anthony Bek’s Copy of Statuta Angliæ”. In *England in the Fourteenth Century: Proceedings of the 1985 Harlaxton Symposium*, edited by W.M. Ormrod, 1–28. Woodbridge: Boydell, 1986.

Bennett, A.R. “What Do the Numbers Mean? The Case for Corpus Studies”. In *Manuscript Culture and Medieval Devotional Traditions: Essays in Honour of Michael G. Sargent*, edited by Jennifer N. Brown and Nicole R. Rice, 48–83. Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 2021. doi: 10.1017/9781787448223.

Benoit, Paul. « L’Atelier de parcheminier de l’Abbaye Cistercienne de Beaulieu (Hampshire) ». In Zerdoun Bat-Yehouda and Bourlet, *Matériaux*, 43–54.

Bicchieri, Marina, Michaela Monti, Giovanna Piantanida, et al. “Inside the Parchment”. *e-Journal of Nondestructive Testing* 13, no. 9 (2008–2009). www.ndt.net/article/art2008/papers/140Bicchieri.pdf.

Bicchieri, Marina, Michaela Monti, Giovanna Piantanida, and Armida Sodo. “Non-Destructive Spectroscopic Characterization of Parchment”. *Vib. Spectrosc*. 55, no. 2 (2011): 267–72. doi: 10.1016/j.vibspec.2010.12.006.

Bicchieri, Marina, Paola Biocca, Piero Colaizzi, and Flavia Pinzari. “Microscopic Observations of Paper and Parchment: the Archaeology of Small Objects”. *Herit. Sci.* 4 (2019): art. 7. doi: 10.1186/s40494-019-0291-9.

Binkley, Peter. “Bromyard [Bromyarde], John (d. c. 1352), Dominican Friar and Preacher”. In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 23 September 2004. doi: 10.1093/ref:odnb/3521.

—. “John Bromyard and the Hereford Dominicans”. In *Centres of Learning: Learning and Location in Pre-Modern Europe and the Near East*, edited by Jan Willem Drijvers and Alaisdair A. MacDonald,

255–64. Brill's Studies in Intellectual History 61. Leiden: Brill, 1995. doi: 10.1163/9789004247154_021.

Bischoff, Frank M. « Observation sur l'emploi de différentes qualités de parchemin dans le livre médiéval ». In Maniaci and Munafò, *Ancient and Medieval*, 1:57–94.

Blair, Ann. "Student Manuscripts and the Textbook". In *Scholarly Knowledge: Textbooks in Early Modern Europe*, edited by Emidio Campi, et al., 39–74. Travaux d'Humanisme et Renaissance 447. Genève: Librairie Droz S.A., 2008.

—. *Too Much to Know: Managing Scholarly Information before the Modern Age*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2010.

Bloomfield, Morton W. *Incipits of Latin Works on the Virtues and Vices, 1100–1500 A.D.: Including a Section of Incipits of Works on the Pater Noster*. Cambridge, MA: Mediaeval Academy of America, 1979.

Bodleian Digital Library Systems and Services. "Sheepskin defects that don't quite produce holes are called 'sheep windows' by @BodCons. Opinion in the office is divided on this, so help us settle an argument. Sheep windows are: …". *Twitter*, 21 March 2019. twitter.com/BDLSS/status/1108729921717919744?s=20.

Borland, Jennifer. "Unruly Reading: The Consuming Role of Touch in the Experience of a Medieval Manuscript". In Wilcox, *Scraped, Stroked, and Bound*, 97–114. doi: 10.1484/M.USML-EB.5.100893.

Boudet, Jean-Patrice. "Jean de Murs, Astrologer". *Erudition and the Republic of Letters* 4, no. 1 (2019): 123–45. doi: 10.1163/24055069-00401006.

Boyle, Leonard E. "The Date of the *Summa Praedicantium*". *Speculum* 48 (1973): 533–37. doi: 10.2307/2854448.

Bozzolo, Carla, and Ezio Ornato. *Pour une histoire du livre manuscrit au moyen âge: Trois essais de codicologie quantitative*. Textes et etudes: Equipe de recherche sur l'Humanisme Francais des xiv^{e} et xv^{e} siècles 2. Paris: Éditions du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1983.

Brand, Paul. "Courtroom and Schoolroom: The Education of Lawyers in England Prior to 1400". *Historical Research* 60, no. 142 (1987): 147–165. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-2281.1987.tb02289.x.

—. "The Development of Professional Lawyers and a Legal Profession in the English Lay Courts: The Relationship between the Earliest Professional Lawyers and Their Clients". In *Patrons and*

Professionals in the Middle Ages: Proceedings of the 2010 Harlaxton Symposium, edited by Paul Binski and Elizabeth A. New, 41–60. Harlaxton Medieval Studies 22. Donington: Shaun Tyas, 2012.

—. *Kings, Barons, and Justices: The Making and Enforcement of Legislation in Thirteenth-Century England*. Cambridge Studies in Medieval Life and Thought, 4th s. 56. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

—. "The Languages of the Law in Later Medieval England". In *Multilingualism in Later Medieval Britain*, edited by D.A. Trotter, 63–76. Rochester: D.S. Brewer, 2000.

—. "Legal Education in England before the Inns of Court". In Bush and Wijffels, *Learning the Law*, 51–84.

—. *Observing and Recording the Medieval Bar and Bench at Work*. London: Selden Society, 1999.

—. *The Origins of the English Legal Profession*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1992.

Brandin, Louis. « Un fragment de la Vie de Saint Gilles, un vers français ». *Romania* 33, no. 129 (1904): 94–98. doi: 10.3406/roma.1904.5333.

Brown, Michelle P. *Understanding Illuminated Manuscripts: A Guide to the Technical Terms*. London: British Library, 2004.

Buckley, M., S. Fraser, J. Herman, et al. "Species Identification of Archaeological Marine Mammals Using Collagen Fingerprinting". *J. Archaeol. Sci.* 41 (2014), 631–41. doi: 10.1016/j.jas.2013.08.021.

Bucklow, Spike. *The Riddle of the Image: The Secret Science of Medieval Art*. London: Reaktion, 2014.

Buringh, Eltjo. *Medieval Manuscript Production in the Latin West: Explorations with a Global Database*. Global Economic History 6. Leiden: Brill, 2011.

Burnett, Charles. "Give Him the White Cow: Notes and Note-Taking in the Universities in the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries". In *History of Universities. Vol. 14: 1995–1996*, edited by Peter Denley, 1–30. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.

Bush, Jonathan A., and Alain Wijffels, editors. *Learning the Law: Teaching and the Transmission of Law in England 1150–1900*. London: Hambledon, 1999.

Van Caenegem, Raoul C. *The Birth of the English Common Law*. 2nd edn. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.

Cains, Anthony G. "Techniques of Preservation Based on Early Binding Methods and Materials". *Paper Conserv.* 1, no. 1 (1976): 2–8. doi: 10.1080/03094227.1976.9638473.

—, and Maria Fredericks, “The Bindings of the Ellesmere Chaucer”. *Huntington Library Quarterly* 58, no. 1 (1995): 127–57. doi: 10.2307/3817900.

Chahine, Claire. « De la peau au parchemin: Évolution d’un support de l’écriture ». *Quinio* 3 (2001): 17–50.

Chaplais, Pierre. “Some Early Anglo−Saxon Diplomas on Single Sheets: Originals or Copies?”. *J. Soc. Archivists* 3, no. 7 (1968): 315–336. doi: 10.1080/00379816509513877. First published in: *Prisca Munimenta: Studies in Archival and Administrative History Presented to A.E.J. Hollaender*, edited by Felicity Ranger, 63–87. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1973.

Chartraire, Eugène, et Maurice Prou. « Authentiques de Reliques Conservées au Trésor de la Cathédrale de Sens ». *Mémoires de la Société Nationale des Antiquaires de France*, sér. 6, 59 (1900): 129–72.

Chedzey, Jane. “Manuscript Production in Medieval Winchester”. *Reading Medieval Studies* 29 (2003), 1–18.

Cherry, John. “Leather”. In *English Medieval Industries: Craftsmen, Techniques, Products*, edited by John Blair and Nigel Ramsay, 295–318. London: Hambledon, 1991.

Christianson, C. Paul. *A Directory of London Stationers and Book Artisans, 1300–1500*. New York: Bibliographical Society of America, 1990.

—. “The Rise of London’s Book-Trade”. In Hellinga and Trapp, *History of the Book in Britain, Vol. 3*, 128–47.

Christie’s. “Valuable Printed Books and Manuscripts including Maps and Atlases”. Sale 7088, Lot 19. London, King St, 16 November 2005. www.christies.com/lot/lot-nova-statuta-statutes-of-the-realm-from-4601733/.

Clanchy, Michael T. *From Memory to Written Record: England 1066–1307*. 1979. 3rd edn. Oxford: Wiley Blackwell, 2012.

Clarkson, Christopher. “Rediscovering Parchment: The Nature of the Beast”. *Paper Conserv.* 16, no. 1 (1992): 5–26. doi: 10.1080/03094227.1992.9638571.

Clemens, Raymond, and Timothy Graham. *Introduction to Manuscript Studies*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2007.

Coates, Ben. “Skeffington, Sir John (c. 1584–1651), of Skeffington, Leics.; later of Fisherwick, Staffs.” In *History of Parliament Online*. Dir. Paul Seaward. London: Institute of Historical Research for the

History of Parliament Trust, 2020. www.historyofparliamentonline.org/volume/1604-1629/member/skeffington-sir-john-1584-1651.

Collins, Matthew James. "Biomolecular Codicology: Books, Beasts, and Bees". Lecture given at *ManuSciences'19: Manuscripts from Fragments to Books, from Identification to Interpretation*. Franco-German Summer School organized by BAM, CSMS, and EPHE/PSL. Fréjus, France, 14 March 2019.

Constable, Giles. *Letters and Letter-Collections*. Typologie des sources du moyen âge occidental 17. Turnhout: Brepols, 1976.

Conway, John, C.M. Kosemen, and Darren Naish. *All Yesterdays: Unique and Speculative Views of Dinosaurs and Other Prehistoric Animals*. [N.p.]: Irregular, 2012.

Courtenay, William J. *Adam Wodeham: An Introduction to His Life and Writings*. Leiden: Brill, 1978.

Crowfoot, Elisabeth, et al. *Textiles and Clothing, c. 1150–c. 1450*. Medieval Finds from Excavations in London 4. 1992. Woodbridge: Boydell, for the Museum of London, 2001.

Da Rold, Orietta. "Materials". In Gillespie and Wakelin, *Production of Books*, 12–33.

—. *Paper in Medieval England: From Pulp to Fictions*. Cambridge Studies in Medieval Literature 112. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2020. doi: 10.1017/9781108886536.

—. "The Tacit Knowledge of Medieval Paper". Annual Riddy Lecture. Centre for Medieval Studies, University of York [online], 16 June 2021.

—, and Marilena Maniaci. "Medieval Manuscript Studies: A European Perspective". *Essays and Studies* 68 (2015): 1–24.

Davis, Simon J.M. *The Archaeology of Animals*. 1987. New York: Routledge, 2002.

Derolez, Albert. *The Palaeography of Gothic Manuscript Books: From the Twelfth to the Early Sixteenth Century*. Cambridge Studies in Palaeography and Codicology. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Designing English: Graphics on the Medieval Page. Dir. Daniel Wakelin. Weston Library, Oxford, 01 December 2017–22 April 2018. visit.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/event/designingenglish.

Deutsch, Christina. « Vom Zettel zum Gerichtsurteil: Aufzeichnungspraxis und Mediale Transformation Gerichtlicher Kommunikation im Spätmittelalter ». *Frühmittelalterliche Studien* 40, no. 1 (2007): 283–96. doi: 10.1515/9783110186383.283.

Diepeveen, Caroline. “Continental European Indexing: Then and Now”. *The Indexer* 25, no. 2 (2006): 74–78. www.cdiep-indexing.com/wp-content/uploads/Continental_Indexing.pdf.

Dinkova-Bruun, Greti. “Notes on Poetic Composition in the Theological Schools ca.1200 and the Latin Poetic Anthology from Ms. Harley 956: A Critical Edition”. *Sacris Erudiri* 43 (2004): 299–391. doi: 10.1484/J.SE.2.300126.

Doležalová, Lucie. “Latin Mnemonic Verses Combining the Ten Commandments with the Ten Plagues of Egypt Transmitted in Late Medieval Bohemia”. In *The Ten Commandments in Medieval and Early Modern Culture*, edited by Youri Desplenter, Jürgen Pieters, and Walter S. Melion, 152–72. Leiden: Brill, 2017. doi: 10.1163/9789004325777_010.

Duivenvoorden, Jorien R., et al. “Hidden Library: Visualizing Fragments of Medieval Manuscripts in Early-Modern Bookbindings with Mobile Macro-XRF Scanner”. *Herit. Sci.* 5 (2017): art. 6. doi: 10.1186/s40494-017-0117-6.

Eamon, William. “Books of Secrets in Medieval and Early Modern Science”. *Sudhoffs Archiv* 69, no. 1 (1985): 26–49.

Easton, Timothy. “Spiritual Middens”. In *Physical Evidence for Ritual Acts, Sorcery and Witchcraft in Christian Britain*, edited by Ronald Hutton, 147–63. Palgrave Historical Studies in Witchcraft and Magic. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015.

Edsall, Mary Agnes. “*Arma Christi* Rolls or Textual Amulets?: The Narrow Roll Format Manuscripts of ‘O Vernicle’”. *Magic, Ritual, and Witchcraft* 9, no. 2 (2014): 178–209. doi: 10.1353/mrw.2014.0019.

Edwards, A.S.G. “Northern Magnates and their Books”. *Textual Cultures* 7, no. 1 (2012): 176–86.

—, and Orietta Da Rold, editors. *English Manuscript Studies 1100–1700. Vol. 17: English Manuscripts before 1400*. London: British Library, 2012.

Faulkner, Mark. “Oxford, Bodleian Library, Junius 1: The *Orrmulum*”. In *The Production and Use of English Manuscripts 1060 to 1220*, edited by Orietta Da Rold, Takako Kato, Mary Swan, and Elaine Treharne. University of Leicester, 2013. www.le.ac.uk/english/em1060to1220/mss/EM.Ox.Juni.1.htm.

Fennell, Claire. *A Middle English Statute-Book. Part I: Statuta Antiqua. Edited from Oxford, Bodleian Library, Rawlinson MS B 520*. Middle English Texts 44. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter, 2011.

Fiddyment, Sarah, Bruce Holsinger, C. Ruzzier, et al. “Animal Origin of 13th-Century Uterine Vellum Revealed Using Noninvasive Peptide Fingerprinting”. *PNAS* 112, no. 49 (2015): 15066–071. doi: 10.1073/pnas.1512264112.

Fiddyment, Sarah, Matthew D. Teasdale, Jiří Vnouček, et al. “So You Want to Do Biocodicology? A Field Guide to the Biological Analysis of Parchment”. *Herit. Sci*. 7 (2019): art. 35. doi: 10.1186/s40494-019-0278-6.

Fiddyment, Sarah, Natalie J. Goodison, Elma Brenner, et al. “Girding the Loins? Direct Evidence of the Use of a Medieval English Parchment Birthing Girdle from Biomolecular Analysis”. *R. Soc. open sci*. 8 (2021): art. 202055. doi: 10.1098/rsos.202055.

Fourneau, Marc, Caroline Canon, Daniel Van Vlaender, et al. “Histological Study of Sheep Skin Transformation During the Recreation of Historical Parchment Manufacture”. *Herit. Sci*. 8 (2020): art. 78. doi: 10.1186/s40494-020-00421-z.

France, James. *Separate but Equal: Cistercian Lay Brothers, 1120–1350*. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2012.

Fredell, Joel. “The Pearl-Poet Manuscript in York”. *Studies in the Age of Chaucer* 36 (2014): 1–39. doi: 10.1353/sac.2014.0004.

—. “The Thornton Manuscripts and Book Production in York”. In *Robert Thornton and His Books: Essays on the Lincoln and London Thornton Manuscripts*, edited by Susanna Fein and Michael Robert Johnston, 109–30. Woodbridge: Boydell, for York Medieval Press, 2014.

Friedman, John Block. *Northern English Books, Owners, and Makers in the Late Middle Ages*. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1995.

Frison, Guido, and Giulia Brun. “*Compositiones Lucenses* and *Mappæ Clavicula*: Two Traditions or One? New Evidence from Empirical Analysis and Assessment of the Literature”. *Heritage Science* 6, no. 24 (2018): art. 24. doi: 10.1186/s40494-018-0189-y.

Fuchs, Robert, Christiane Meinert, and Johannes Schrempf. *Pergament: Geschichte, Material, Konservierung, Restaurierung*. Kölner Beiträge zur Restaurierung und Konservierung von Kunst- und Kulturgut 12. München: Siegl, 2001.

Gaskell, Philip. *A New Introduction to Bibliography*. St Paul’s Bibliographies. New Castle: Oak Knoll, 1972.

Geary, Patrick J. *Furta Sacra: Thefts of Relics in the Central Middle Ages*. Rev. edn. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991.

Gee, Stacey. "'At the Sygne of the Cardynalles Hat': The Book Trade and the Market for Books in Yorkshire, c. 1450–1550". D.Phil. diss., York University, 1999. etheses.whiterose.ac.uk/9792/.

Gibson, A.J.S. "The Size and Weight of Cattle and Sheep in Early Modern Scotland". *Agric. Hist. Rev.* 36, no. 2 (1988): 162–71. bahs.org.uk/AGHR/ARTICLES/36n2a4.pdf.

Gillespie, Alexandra. "Bookbinding". In Gillespie and Wakelin, *Production of Books*, 150–70.

—, and Daniel Wakelin, editors. *The Production of Books in England 1350–1500*. Cambridge Studies in Palaeography and Codicology 14. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.

Goering, Joseph. "Introduction: Editing Robert Grosseteste". In *Editing Robert Grosseteste: Papers Given at the Thirty-Sixth Annual Conference on Editorial Problems, University of Toronto, 3–4 November 2000*, edited by Joseph Ward Goering and Evelyn Anne Mackie, xi–xv. Conference on Editorial Problems Series 36. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2003.

Gómez, Antonio Castillo. "The New Culture of Archives in Early Modern Spain". *European Hist. Quarterly* 46, no. 3 (2016): 545–67. doi: 10.1177/0265691416649100.

Gonzalez, Lee G., and Timothy J. Wess. "The Effects of Hydration on the Collagen and Gelatine Phases within Parchment Artefacts". *Herit. Sci*. 1 (2013): art. 14. doi: 10.1186/2050-7445-1-14.

—, and —. "The Importance of Understanding the Terminology of Collagen and Gelatine in the Study of Parchment". *J. Inst. Conserv.* 36, no. 2 (2013): 104–08. doi: 10.1080/19455224.2013.815121.

Gottscher, Leandro. "Ancient Methods of Parchment Making. Discussion on Recipes and Experimental Essays". In Maniaci and Munafò, *Ancient and Medieval*, 1:41–56.

Griffiths, Alan. "A Family of Names: Rune-Names and Ogam-Names and Their Relation to Alphabet Letter-Names". PhD diss., Universiteit Leiden, 2013. hdl.handle.net/1887/20979.

Griffiths, Jeremy, and Derek Pearsall, editors. *Book Production and Publishing in Britain 1375–1475*. Cambridge Studies in Publishing and Printing History. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.

Grund, Peter. "Textual Alchemy: The Transformation of Pseudo-Albertus Magnus's *Semita Recta* into the *Mirror of Lights*". *Ambix* 56, no. 3 (2009): 202–25. doi: 10.1179/000269809X12529013496257.

Grundhauser, Eric. “The Bad Hair, Incorrect Feathering, and Missing Skin Flaps of Dinosaur Art: Inside the Pitfalls of Illustrating Prehistoric Creatures”. *Atlas Obscura*. 21 September 2017. www.atlasobscura.com/articles/dinosaurs-art-paleoartists-mistakes.

Gullick, Michael. “From Parchmenter to Scribe: Some Observations on the Manufacture and Preparation of Medieval Parchment Based upon a Review of the Literary Evidence”. In Rück, *Pergament*, 145–57.

Gumbert, J. Peter. “The Bearable Lightness of Parchment”. *Gazette du livre médiéval* 59, no. 2 (2012): 70–72. doi: 10.3406/galim.2012.2018.

—. « Livre grand, livre petit: Un problème de taille ». *Gazette du livre médiéval* 38 (2001): 55–58. doi: 10.3406/galim.2001.1519.

—. “Sizes and Formats”. In Maniaci and Munafò, *Ancient and Medieval*, 1:227–63.

—. “Skins, Sheets, and Quires”. In *New Directions in Later Medieval Manuscript Studies: Essays from the 1998 Harvard Conference*, edited by Derek Pearsall, 81–90. Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, for York Medieval Press, 2000.

—. “Times and Places for Initials”. *Quærendo* 39 (2009): 304–27. doi: 10.1163/001495209X12555713997411.

—. “The Tacketed Quire: An Exercise in Comparative Codicology”. *Scriptorium* 65, no. 2 (2011): 299–320. www.persee.fr/doc/scrip_0036-9772_2011_num_65_2_4134.

Hagadorn, Alexis. “Parchment Making in Eighteenth-Century France: Historical Practices and the Written Record”. *J. Inst. Conserv.* 35, no. 2 (2012): 165–88. doi: 10.1080/19455224.2012.730783.

Hägele, Günther, and Friedrich Pukelsheim. “The Electoral Writings of Ramon Llull”. *Studia Lulliana* 41, no. 97 (2001): 3–38.

—, and —. “The Electorial Systems of Nicholas of Cusa in the *Catholic Concordance* and Beyond”. In *The Church, the Councils, and Reform: The Legacy of the Fifteenth Century*, edited by Gerlad Christianson, et al., 229–49. Baltimore: Catholic University of America Press, 2008.

Hahn, Cynthia. “What Do Reliquaries Do for Relics?”. *Numen* 57 (2010): 284–316. doi: 10.1163/156852710X501324.

Haines, B.M. “The Manufacture of Parchment”. In Kite and Thomson, *Conservation*, 198–200.

Hall, Stephen J.G., and Lawrence Alderson. “Cattle”. In *Mason’s World Encyclopedia of Livestock Breeds and Breeding*. 6th edn., edited by Valerie Porter, et al., 1:83–342. Boston: CAB International, 2016.

Hall, G.D.G., and Elsa de Haas, editors. *Early Registers of Writs*. Selden Society 87. London: Bernard Quaritch for Seldon Society, 1970.

Halleux, Robert. « Les Adhésifs dans les recettes de l'antiquité et du moyen âge ». In Zerdoun Bat-Yehouda and Bourlet, *Matériaux*, 269–73.

Hamerow, Helena. *Early Medieval Settlements: The Archaeology of Rural Communities in Northwest Europe 400–900*. Medieval History and Archaeology. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.

Hammer, Paul E.J. "Manners, Roger, Fifth Earl of Rutland (1576–1612), Nobelman". In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 03 January 2008. doi: 10.1093/ref:odnb/17962.

Hanna, Ralph. *London Literature, 1300–1380*. Cambridge Studies in Medieval Literature 57. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Hansen, Gitte. "Itinerant Craftspeople in 12th Century Bergen, Norway—Aspects of Their Social Identities". In *Everyday Products in the Middle Ages: Crafts, Consumption, and the Individual in Northern Europe, c. AD 800–1600*, edited by Gitte Hansen, et al., 28–50. Oxford: Oxbow, 2015.

Harris, K. "Patrons, Buyers, and Owners: The Evidence for Ownership, and the Rôle of Book Owners in Book Production and the Book Trade". In Griffiths and Pearsall, *Book Production and Publishing*, 163–99.

Harris, Nicola Erin. "The Idea of Lapidary Medicine: Its Circulation and Practical Application in Medieval and Early Modern England: 1000–1750". PhD diss., Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey, 2009.

Hawkyard, A.D.K. "Allen, John (by 1510–54), of Stamford, Lincs." In *History of Parliament Online*. Dir. Paul Seaward. London: Institute of Historical Research for the History of Parliament Trust, 2020. www.historyofparliamentonline.org/volume/1509-1558/member/allen-john-1510-54.

Hellinga, Lotte, and J.B. Trapp, editors. *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain, Vol. 3: 1400–1557*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Hendy, Jessica, Frido Welker, Beatrice Demarchi, et al. "A Guide to Ancient Protein Studies". *Nat. Ecol. Evol*. 2, no. 5 (2018): 791–99. doi: 10.1038/s41559-018-0510-x.

Henry, Walter. "Resizing Following Aqueous Treatment: Current American Practice". *Book and Paper Group Annual* 5 (1986): n.p. cool.conservation-us.org/coolaic/sg/bpg/annual/v05/bp05-12.html.

Hermann-Mascard, Nicole. *Les reliques des saints: Formation coutumière d'un droit*. Paris: Klincksieck, 1975.

Hines, John. "From **Anleifr* to *Havelok*: The English and the Irish Sea". In *Celtic–Norse Relationships in the Irish Sea in the Middle Ages 800–1200*, edited by Jón Viðar Sigurðsson and Timothy Bolton, 187–214. Northern World 65. Leiden: Brill, 2014.

Hinton, David A. *Gold and Gilt, Pots and Pins: Possessions and People in Medieval Britain*. Medieval History and Archaeology. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Hoffmann, Richard C. *An Environmental History of Medieval Europe*. Cambridge Medieval Textbooks. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014.

Hogg, R. Malcolm. "Some Thirteenth-Century English Book Prices". In *Thirteenth Century England 5: Proceedings of the Newcastle Upon Tyne Conference*, edited by Peter R. Coss and Simon D. Lloyd, 179–94. Woodbridge: Boydell, 1995.

Houzeau, Jean-Charles, and A. Lancaster. *Bibliographie générale de l'astronomie, Tome I, Partie I*. Bruxelles: F. Hayez, 1887.

Hudson, John. *The Formation of the English Common Law: Law and Society in England from King Alfred to Magna Carta*. 2nd edn. New York: Routledge, 2018.

—, editor. *The Oxford History of the Laws of England, 2: 871–1216*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.

Hunt, Richard William. "The Library of Robert Grosseteste". In *Robert Grosseteste, Scholar and Bishop: Essays in Commemoration of the Seventh Centenary of his Death*, edited by D.A. Callus, with an introduction by Sir Maurice Powicke, 121–45. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1955.

Ives, E[ric] W[illiam]. *The Common Lawyers of Pre-Reformation England. Thomas Kebell: A Case Study*. Cambridge Studies in English Legal History. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982.

Jack, Sybil M. "Manners, Edward, Third Earl of Rutland (1549–1587), Magnate". In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 17 September 2015. doi: 10.1093/ref:odnb/17952.

Jarman, Peter J. "On Being Thick-Skinned: Dermal Shields in Large Mammalian Herbivores". *Bio. J. Linn. Soc*. 36, no. 1–2 (1989): 169–91. doi: 10.1111/j.1095-8312.1989.tb00489.x.

Jones, Leslie Webber. "The Scriptorium at Corbie: I. The Library". *Speculum* 22, no. 2 (1947): 191–204. doi: 10.2307/2854726.

Johnson, Rozelle Parker. “Compositiones Variae”. In *Compositiones Variae from Codex 490 Biblioteca Capitolare, Lucca, Italy: An Introductory Study*, 18–29. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1939. catalog.hathitrust.org/Record/001510366.

Johnston, Michael. “Copying and Reading *The Prick of Conscience* in Late Medieval England”. *Speculum* 95, no. 3 (2020): 742–801. doi: 10.1086/709360.

—, and Michael van Dussen. “Introduction: Manuscripts and Cultural History”. In Johnston and Dussen, *Medieval*, 1–16.

—, and —, editors. *The Medieval Manuscript Book: Cultural Approaches*. Cambridge Studies in Medieval Literature 94. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015.

Jørgensen, Dolly. “‘All Good Rule of the Citee’: Sanitation and Civic Government in England, 1400–1600”. *J. Urban Hist.* 36, no. 3 (2010): 300–15. doi: 10.1177/0096144209359141.

—. “Local Government Responses to Urban River Pollution in Late Medieval England”. *Water Hist.* 2, no. 1 (2010): 35–52. doi: 10.1007/s12685-010-0016-1.

Keiser, George R. *A Manual of the Writings in Middle English 1050–1500. Vol. 10: Works of Science and Information*. Edited by Albert E. Hartung. New Haven: Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences, 1998.

—. “Practical Books for the Gentleman”. In Hellinga and Trapp, *History of the Book in Britain, Vol. 3*, 470–94.

—. “Rosemary: Not Just for Remembrance”. In *Health and Healing from the Medieval Garden*, edited by Peter Dendle and Alain Touwaide, 180–204. Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 2015.

—. “Verse Introductions to Middle English Medical Treatises”. *English Studies* 84, no. 4 (2003): 301–17. doi: 10.1076/enst.84.4.301.17386.

Kelly, Susan. “Anglo-Saxon Lay Society and the Written Word”. In *The Uses of Literacy in Early Mediaeval Europe*, edited by Rosamund McKitterick, 36–62. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

Kennedy, Craig, and Tim J. Wess. “The Structure of Collagen within Parchment—A Review”. *Restaurator* 24, no. 2 (2003): 61–80. doi: 10.1515/REST.2003.61.

Kestemont, Mike. “Libraries as Book Traps: Statistical Methods from Ecology to Study the Survival of Historic Literature”. Paper read at: *Old Books and New Technologies: Medieval Books and the Digital Humanities in the Low Countries*. KBR, Brussels [online], 06 May 2021.

—, and Folgert Karsdorp. “Estimating the Loss of Medieval Literature with an Unseen Species Model from Ecodiversity (Software and Data)”. *Computational Humanities Research Workshop*. Amsterdam [online], 18–20 November 2020. doi: 10.5281/zenodo.4030681.

Kite, Marion. “Collagen Products: Glues, Gelatine, Gut Membrane, and Sausage Casings”. In Kite and Thomson, *Conservation*, 192–97.

—, and Roy Thomson, editors. *Conservation of Leather and Related Materials*. Butterworth–Heinemann Series in Conservation and Museology. Amsterdam: Elsevier, 2006.

Klaassen, Frank. *The Transformations of Magic: Illicit Learned Magic in the Later Middle Ages and Renaissance*. Magic in History. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2013.

—, and Katrina Bens. “Achieving Invisibility and Having Sex with Spirits: Six Operations from an English Magic Collection ca. 1600”. *Opuscula: Short Texts of the Middle Ages and Renaissance* 3, no. 1 (2013): 1–14. journalhosting.ucalgary.ca/index.php/opuscula/article/view/36310.

—, and Christopher Phillips. “The Return of Stolen Goods: Reginald Scot, Religious Controversy, and Magic in Bodleian Library, Additional B. 1”. *Magic, Ritual, and Witchcraft* 1, no. 2 (2006): 135–76. doi: 10.1353/mrw.0.0004.

Kornbluth, Genevra. “Historical Archive: Manuscripts”. *Kornbluth Photography*. 21 March 2015. web.archive.org/web/20170828121819/http://www.kornbluthphoto.com/Manuscripts.html.

Kwakkel, Erik. *Books before Print*. Leeds: Arc Humanities P, 2018.

—. “Classics on Scraps: Classical Manuscripts Made from Parchment Waste”. In *Manuscripts of the Latin Classics 800–1200*, edited by Erik Kwakkel, 107–29+204–11. Studies in Medieval and Renaissance Book Culture. Leiden: Leiden University Press, 2015. library.oapen.org/handle/20.500.12657/25890.

—. “Commercial Organization and Economic Innovation”. In Gillespie and Wakelin, *Production of Books*, 173–91.

—. “Decoding the Material Book: Cultural Residue in Medieval Manuscripts”. In Johnston and Dussen, *Medieval*, 60–76.

—. “Discarded Parchment as Writing Support in English Manuscript Culture”. In Edwards and Da Rold, *English*, 238–61.

—. “Late Medieval Text Collections: A Codicological Typology Based on Single-Author Manuscripts”. In *Author, Reader, Book: Medieval Authorship in Theory and Practice*, edited by Erik Kwakkel and Stephen Partridge, 56–79. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2012.

—. “The Pro-Active Scribe: Preparing the Margins of Annotated Manuscripts”. *Glossatur*, special edition ed. Katie Menendez and Markus Stock [Forthcoming].

Lähnemann, Henrike. « Text und Textil. Die Beschriebenen Pergamente in den Figurenornaten ». In *Heilige Röcke: Kleider für Skulpturen in Kloster Wienhausen*, edited by Charlotte Klack-Eitzen, et al., 71–78+79–173. Regensburg: Schnell + Steiner, 2013.

Láng, Benedek. *Unlocked Books: Manuscripts of Learned Magic in the Medieval Libraries of Central Europe*. Magic in History. Pennsylvania: Penn State University Press, 2008.

Lapidge, Michael. “The Origin of the Collectanea”. In *Collectanea Pseudo-Bedæ*, edited by Martha Bayless and Michael Lapidge, 1–12. Scriptores Latini Hiberniae 14. Dublin: School of Celtic Studies, Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies, 1998.

Larsen, René, editor. *IDAP: Improved Damage Assessment of Parchment—Assessment, Data Collection, and Sharing of Knowledge*. Research Report (Directorate General for Research, Directorate I—Environment) 18; EUR (Luxembourg) 22838. Luxembourg: European Commission, 2007. op.europa.eu/s/pgKK.

—. “Introduction to Damage and Damage Assessment of Parchment”. In Larsen, *IDAP*, 19–23.

—, editor. *Microanalysis of Parchment*. London: Archetype, 2002.

Latour, Gaël, et al. “Correlative Nonlinear Optical Microscopy and Infrared Nanoscopy Reveals Collagen Degradation in Altered Parchments”. *Sci. Rep.* 6 (2016): art. 6:26344. doi: 10.1038/srep26344.

Leclercq, Jean. *The Love of Learning and the Desire for God: A Study of Monastic Culture*. Translated by Catharine Misrahi. 3rd edn. New York: Fordham University Press, 1982. Translation of: *L’Amour des lettres et le désir de Dieu: Initiation aux auteurs monastiques du moyen âge*. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1957.

LeFèvre, Sylvie. « La lettre et ses adresses ». In *Medieval Letters—Between Fiction and Document*, edited by Elisabetta Bartoli and Christian Høgel, with a preface by Francesco Stella and Lars Boje Mortensen, 335–358. Utrecht Studies in Medieval Literacy 33. Turnhout: Brepols, 2015.

Lindenbaum, Sheila. “London Texts and Literate Practice”. In *The Cambridge History of Medieval English Literature*, edited by David Wallace, 284–309. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Lindsay, Jen. “A Limp Vellum Binding Sewn on Alum-Tawed Thongs”. *New Bookbinder: J. of Designer Bookbinders* 11 (1991): 3–19. web.archive.org/web/20050901054830/http://members.xoom.virgilio.it/buchbinden/NEWBOOKBINDER-limp_vellum_binding.pdf.

van Lit, L.W.C. *Among Digitized Manuscripts: Philology, Codicology, Palaeography in a Digital World*. Handbook of Oriental Studies / Handbuch der Orientalistik, § 1: The Near and Middle East 137. Leiden: Brill, 2020.

Lobel, Mary D., editor. *A History of the County of Oxford: Volume 6*. London: Victoria County History, 1959.

López, Carlos A. Matheus. “About the Devil, Literature, and Arbitration”. *Law and Literature* 27, no. 3 (2015): 383–94. doi: 10.1080/1535685X.2015.1024922.

Lusher, Adam. “Vellum: UK’s Last Producer of Calf-Skin Parchment Fights on after Losing Parliament’s Business”. *The Independent*. 12 February 2016, 21.54 UTC. web.archive.org/web/20170213090750/http://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/home-news/vellum-uks-last-producer-of-calf-skin-parchment-fights-on-after-losing-parliaments-business-a6870966.html.

Maitland, William Frederic. *The Collected Papers of Frederic William Maitland*. Edited by H.A.L. Fisher. 3 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.

Maniaci, Marilena, and Paola Munafò, editors. *Ancient and Medieval Book Materials and Techniques (Erice, 18–25 September 1992)*. Vol. 1. Studi e Testi 357. Città del Vaticano: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1993.

Mann, Thomas E., and Gary R. Orren. “To Poll or Not to Poll … and Other Questions”. In *Media Polls in American Politics*. Edited by Thomas E. Mann and Gary R. Orren, 1–18. Washington D.C.: Brookings Institute, 1992.

Marti, Berthe M. “Hugh Primas and Arnulf of Orléans”. *Speculum* 30, no. 2 (1955): 233–38. doi: 10.2307/2848472.

Mastroberti, Francesco. “The Liber Belial: An European Work between Law and Theology. Introductory Notes for an Ongoing Research Project”. *Historia et Ius. Rivista di Storia Giuridica dell'età*

Medievale e Moderna 1 (2012): art. 12. www.historiaetius.eu/uploads/5/9/4/8/5948821/mastroberti.pdf.

Matoltsy, A. Gedeon. "Structure and Function of the Mammalian Epidermis". In *Biology of the Integument 2: Vertebrates*, edited by Jürgen Bereiter-Hahn, et al., 255–71. Berlin: Springer-Verlag, 1986.

Maxwell, Clark A., et al. "X-Ray Diffraction Study into the Effects of Liming on the Structure of Collagen". *Biomacromolecules* 7, no. 8 (2006): 2321–326. doi: 10.1021/bm060250t.

McBryde, J.M. "Charms for Thieves". *Modern Language Notes* 22, no. 6 (1907): 168–70. doi: 10.2307/2916662.

McCormick, Michael. *Origins of the European Economy: Communications and Commerce AD 300–900*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

McGerr, Rosemarie Potz. *A Lancastrian Mirror for Princes: The Yale Law School New Statutes of England*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2011.

—. "A Statute Book and Lancastrian Mirror for Princes: The Yale Law School Manuscript of the Nova Statute Angliæ". *Textual Cultures: Texts, Contexts, Interpretation* 1, no. 2 (2006): 6–59.

McHardy, A.K. "Patronage in Late Medieval Colleges". In *The Late Medieval English College and Its Context*, edited by Clive Burgess and Martin Heale, 89–109. Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer for York Medieval Press, 2008.

McMenamin, Mark A.S. *Dynamic Paleontology: Using Quantification and Other Tools to Decipher the History of Life*. Springer Geology. New York: Springer, 2016.

McSweeney, Thomas J. "Creating a Literature for the King's Courts in the Later Thirteenth Century: *Hengham Magna*, *Fet Asaver*, and *Bracton*". *J. Legal Hist*. 37, no. 1 (2016): 41–71. doi: 10.1080/01440365.2016.1143222.

Meaney, Audrey L. "Variant Versions of Old English Medical Remedies and the Compilation of Bald's *Leechbook*". In *Anglo-Saxon England 13*, edited by Peter Clemoes, et al., 235–68. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984.

Mertens, Thom. « Rapiarium ». En *Dictionaire de spiritualité: Ascétique et mystique, doctrine et histoire. Vol. 13*, édité par M. Viller, et al., col. 114–19. Paris: Éditions Beauchesne pour la Compagnie de Jésus, 1988.

Meyer, Jesse. "Parchment Production: A Brief Account". In Wilcox, *Scraped, Stroked, and Bound*, 93–96.

Michael, Michael A. “English Illuminators *c*. 1190–1450: A Survey from Documentary Sources”. In *English Manuscript Studies 1100–1700. Vol. 4*, edited by Peter Beal and Jeremy Griffiths, 62–113. Oxford: Blackwell, 1993.

— “A Manuscript Wedding Gift from Philippa of Hainault to Edward III”. *The Burlington Magazine* 127, no. 990 (1985): 582+584–599.

—. “Urban Production of Manuscript Books”. In Morgan and Thomson, *History of the Book in Britain, Vol. 2*, 168–94.

Miles, Dillwyn. “Owen, William (c. 1488–1574), Lawyer”. In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 06 January 2011. doi: 10.1093/ref:odnb/21036.

Mills, Anthony David. *A Dictionary of British Place-Names*. 1st rev. edn. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Mitchell, Laura. “Cultural Uses of Magic in Fifteenth-Century England”. PhD diss., University of Toronto, 2011. tspace.library.utoronto.ca/handle/1807/31869.

Mooney, Linne R. “Vernacular Literary Manuscripts and Their Scribes”. In Gillespie and Wakelin, *Production of Books*, 192–211.

Morgan, Nigel J. “The Liturgical Manuscripts of the English Franciscans c. 1250–c. 1350”. In *The English Province of the Franciscans (1224–c. 1350)*, edited by Michael J.P. Robson, 214–44. The Medieval Franciscans 14. Leiden: Brill, 2017.

—, and Rodney M. Thomson. “Language and Literacy”. In Morgan and Thomson, *History of the Book in Britain, Vol. 2*, 22–38.

Morgan, Nigel J, and Rodney M. Thomson, editors. *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain, Vol. 2: 1100–1400*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.

Možir, Alenka, et al. “Material Properties of Historic Parchment: A Reference Collection Survey”. *Stud. Conserv.* 59, no. 3 (2014): 136–49. doi: 10.1179/2047058413Y.0000000100.

Musson, Anthony. “Law and Text: Legal Authority and Judicial Accessibility in the Late Middle Ages”. In *The Uses of Script and Print, 1300–1700*, edited by Julia Crick and Alexandra Walsham, 95–115. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

—. “Legal Culture: Medieval Lawyers’ Pretensions and Aspirations”. In *Fourteenth Century England. Vol. 3*, edited by W.M. Ormrod, 17–30. Woodbridge: Boydell, 2004.

—. “Magna Carta and Statutory Law”. In Barrington and Sobecki, *Companion to Medieval English Law and Literature*, 54–65.

—. “Ruling Virtually? Royal Images in Medieval English Law Books”. In *Every Inch a King: Comparative Studies on Kings and Kingship in the Ancient and Medieval Worlds*, edited by C. Melville and L. Mitchell, 151–71. Leiden: Brill, 2012.

Muzerelle, Denis. « Pour revenir sur et à la ‹ taille › des manuscrits ». En *Les débuts du codex—Actes de la journée d’étude organisée à Paris le 3 et 4 juillet 1985 par l’Institut de papyrologie de la Sorbonne et l’Institut de recherche et de l’histoire des textes*, édité par A. Blanchard, 125–56. Bibliologia 9. Brepols: Turnhout, 1989.

Neville, Cynthia. “Common Knowledge of the Common Law in Later Medieval England”. *Canadian Journal of History/Annales canadiennes d'histoire* 29, no. 3 (1994): 462–78.

Norris, M.M. “Manners, Henry, Second Earl of Rutland (1526–1563)”. In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 03 January 2008. doi: 10.1093/ref:odnb/17955.

Ornato, Ezio. « L’histoire du livre et les méthodes quantitatives: bilan de vingt ans de recherches ». In *La face cachée du livre médiéval. L’histoire du livre vue par Ezio Ornato, ses amis, et ses collègues*, édité par Ezio Ornato and Carla Bozzolo, 607–79. Libri di Viella 10. Rome: Viella, 1997.

Overty, Joanne Filippone. “The Cost of Doing Scribal Business: Prices of Manuscript Books in England, 1300–1483”. *Book History* 11 (2008): 1–32. doi: 10.1353/bh.0.0007.

Palgrave, Francis. *The Rise and Progress of the English Commonwealth: Anglo-Saxon Period*. 2 vols. London: John Murray, 1832.

Parkes, Malcolm B. “A List of Medieval Oxford Stationers”. *The Library* 17, no. 2 (2016): 167–78. doi: 10.1093/library/17.2.167.

—. “The Literacy of the Laity”. In *Scribes, Scripts, and Readers: Studies in the Communication, Presentation, and Dissemination of Medieval Texts*, 275–97. London: Hambledon, 1991.

—. *Their Hands before Our Eyes: A Closer Look at Scribes. The Lyell Lectures Delivered in the University of Oxford 1999*. New York: Routledge, 2008.

Parsons, Mary Prescott. “Some Scribal Memoranda for Anglo-Saxon Charters of the 8th and 9th Centuries”. *Mitteilungen des Österreichischen Instituts für Geschichtsforschung* 14 (1939): 13–32.

Peikola, Matti. “Aspects of *Mise-en-Page* in Manuscripts of the *Wycliffite Bible*”. In *Medieval Texts in Context*, edited by Denis Renevey and Graham D. Caie, 28–67. New York: Routledge, 2008.

Petrucci, Armando. *Writers and Readers in Medieval Italy: Studies in the History of Written Culture*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995.

"Petrus Londoniensis Archdiaconus m. post 1194: Remediarium Conversorum". *Mirabile: Archivio Digitale della Cultura Medievale*. Dir. Lucia Pinelli. S.l.: Società Internazionale per lo Studio del Medioevo Latino and Fondazione Ezio Franceschini, 2016. www.mirabileweb.it/title/remediarium-conversorum-petrus-londoniensis-archid-title/331.

Pezzini, Domenico. « Le ‹ Ore della Croce › nelle Liriche Inglesi Tardo-Medievali ». *Ævum* 83, no. 3 (2009): 669–710.

Pfaff, Richard W. *The Liturgy in Medieval England: A History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

Philbin, Patrick F. "The *Excepciones Contra Brevia*: A Late Thirteenth-Century Teaching Tool". In Bush and Wijffels, *Learning the Law*, 135–56.

Pickwoad, Nicholas. "Codicology and Palaeography". In *The Eadwine Psalter: Text, Image, and Monastic Culture in Twelfth-Century Canterbury*, edited by Margaret T. Gibson, et al., 4–12. Publications of the Modern Humanities Research Association 14. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1992.

Pollard, Graham. "Notes on the Size of the Sheet". *The Library*, 4th ser., 22, no. 2–3 (1941): 105–37.

Pouzet, Jean-Pascal. "Book Production Outside Commercial Contexts". In Gillespie and Wakelin, *Production of Books*, 212–38.

Pronay, Nicholas, and John Taylor. *Parliamentary Texts of the Later Middle Ages*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1980.

Rabin, Ira. "Building a Bridge from the Dead Sea Scrolls to Mediaeval Hebrew Manuscripts". In *Jewish Manuscript Cultures: New Perspectives*, edited by Irina Wandrey, 309–22. Studies in Manuscript Cultures 13. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2017. doi: 10.1515/9783110546422-012.

—, and Oliver Hahn. "Characterization of the Dead Sea Scrolls by Advanced Analytical Techniques". *Analytical Methods* 5, no. 18 (2013): 4648–654. doi: 10.1039/C3AY41076E.

Radini, A., M. Tromp, A. Beach, et al. "Medieval Women's Early Involvement in Manuscript Production Suggested by Lapis Lazuli Identification in Dental Calculus". *Sci. Adv*. 5, no. 1 (2019): eaau7126. doi: 10.1126/sciadv.aau7126 .

Ramsay, Nigel. "Law". In Morgan and Thomson, *History of the Book in Britain, Vol. 2*, 250–90.

Reed, Ronald. *Ancient Skins, Parchment, and Leathers*. Studies in Archaeological Science. London: Seminar Press, 1972.

—. *The Nature and Making of Parchment*. Leeds: Elmete, 1975.

Richardson, H.G., and George Sayles. "The Early Statutes". *Law Q. Rev*. 50 (1934): 201–23+540–71.

Riddler, Ian D., and Nicola I.A. Trzaska-Nartowski. "Chanting upon a Dunghill: Working Skeletal Materials in Anglo-Saxon England". In *The Material Culture of Daily Life in Anglo-Saxon England*, edited by Maren Clegg Hyer and Gale R. Owen-Crocker, 116–41. Exeter Studies in Medieval Europe. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2011.

Roques, Mario. « Le billet de Jean de Gisors à Aélis de Liste ». En *Mélanges dédiés à la mémoire de Félix Grat*, édité par É.A. Van Moé, 2:277–91. Comptes rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres, séance du 14 février 1936. Paris: En dépôt chez Mme Pecqueur-Grat, 1946–1949.

Rose, Jonathan. "The Legal Profession in Medieval England: A History of Regulation". *Syracuse L. Rev.* 48 (1998): 1–138.

Rouse, Mary A., and Richard A. Rouse. « Concordances et index ». En *Mise en page et mise en texte du livre manuscrit*, édité par Henri-Jean Martin and Jean Vezin, 218–28. Paris: Editions du Cercle, 1990.

Rück, Peter, editor. *Pergament: Geschichte, Struktur, Restaurierung, Herstellung*. Historische Hilfswissenschaften 2. Sigmaringen: Jan Thorbecke Verlag, 1991.

Rudy, Kathryn M. "Dirty Books: Quantifying Patterns of Use in Medieval Manuscripts Using a Densitometer". *J. Historians Netherlandish Art* 2, no. 1–2 (2010): n.p. doi: 10.5092/jhna.2010.2.1.1.

Ryder, Michael L. "The Biology and History of Parchment". In Rück, *Pergament*, 25–33.

—. "Parchment—Its History, Manufacture, and Composition". *J. Soc. Archivists* 2, no. 9 (1964): 391–99. doi: 10.1080/00379816009513778.

Ryley, Hannah. "Constructive Parchment Destruction in Medieval Manuscripts". *Book 2.0* 7, no. 1 (2017): 9–19. doi: 10.1386/btwo.7.1.9_1.

—. "Waste Not, Want Not: The Sustainability of Medieval Manuscripts". *Green Letters: Studies in Ecocriticism* 19, no. 1 (2015): 63–74. doi: 10.1080/14688417.2014.986495.

Sabine, Ernest L. "Butchering in Mediaeval London". *Speculum* 8, no. 3 (1933): 335–53. doi: 10.2307/2848862.

—. "City Cleaning in Mediaeval London". *Speculum* 12, no. 1 (1937), 19–43. doi: 10.2307/2848659.

Sargent, Michael. "'What Do the Numbers Mean?' A Textual Critic's Observations on some Patterns of Middle English Manuscript Transmission". In *Design and Distribution of Late Medieval Manuscripts in England*, edited by Margaret Connolly and Linne R. Mooney, 205–44. York: York Medieval Press, 2008.

Sawyer, Daniel. "Missing Books in the Folk Codicology of Later Medieval England". *The Medieval Journal* 7, no. 2 (2017): 103–32.

—. "Navigation by Tab and Thread: Place-Markers and Readers' Movement in Books". In *Spaces for Reading in Later Medieval England*, edited by Mary C. Flannery and Carrie Griffin, 99–114. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016.

—. *Reading English Verse in Manuscript c.1350–c.1500*. Oxford English Monographs. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2020.

Saxl, H. "An Investigation of the Qualities, the Methods of Manufacture, and the Preservation of Historic Parchment and Vellum with a View to Identifying the Animal Species Used". MSc thesis, Department of Leather Industries, University of Leeds, 1954.

Scase, Wendy. "The Book in Culture". In Gillespie and Wakelin, *Production of Books*, 292–99.

Scheepsma, Wybren. *Medieval Religious Women in the Low Countries: The 'Modern Devotion', the Canonesses of Windesheim, and Their Writings*. Translated by David F. Johnson. Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 2004. Translation of: *Deemoed en Devotie: De Koorvrouwen van Windesheim en Hun Geschriften*. Prometheus, 1997.

Schiaparelli, L. « Il Codice 490 ». *Studi e Testi* 36 (1924): 4–7.

Schmidt, Ludwig. « Zwei Original-Briefe von c. 1188 ». *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung* 24, no. JG (1903): 345–52. doi: 10.7767/miog.1903.24.jg.345.

Schofield, John. *London 1100–1600: The Archaeology of a Capital City*. Studies in the Archaeology of Medieval Europe. Sheffield: Equinox, 2011.

Schummer, August, et al. *The Anatomy of the Domestic Animals, 3: The Circulatory System, the Skin, and the Cutaneous Organs of the Domestic Mammals*. Translated by Walter G. Siller and Peter A.L. Wight, Berlin: Springer-Verlag, 1981.

Scott, Kathleen L. *The Mirroure of the Worlde: MS Bodley 283 (England c. 1470–1480): The Physical Composition, Decoration, and Illustration*. Roxburghe Club Publications 241. Oxford: Roxburghe Club, 1980.

—. *Later Gothic Manuscripts, 1390–1490*. London: Harvey Miller, 1996. 2 vols.

Seipp, David J. "Introduction". In Nicholas Statham. *Statham's Abridgement of the Law*. Translated by Margaret Center Klingelsmith, i–xxxiv. Clark, NJ: Lawbook Exchange, 2007.

Semmler, Josef, editor. "Consuetudines Corbienses". In *Corpus Consuetudinum Monasticarum I: Initia Consuetudinis Benedictinæ. Consuetudines Sæculi Octavi et Noni*, 355–422. Siegburg: F. Schmitt, 1963.

Shailor, Barbara A. *The Medieval Book*. Medieval Academy Reprints for Teaching 28. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1991.

Sharpe, Richard. *A Handlist of the Latin Writers of Great Britain and Ireland before 1540*. Publications of the Journal of Medieval Latin 1. Turnhout: Brepols, 1997.

Silverstein, Theodore, editor. *Medieval English Lyrics*. York Medieval Texts. London: Edward Arnold, 1971.

Skemer, Don C. *Binding Words: Textual Amulets in the Middle Ages*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2010.

—. "From Archives to the Book Trade: Private Statute Rolls in England, 1285–1307". *J. Soc. Archivists* 16 (1995): 193–206.

—. "Magic Writ: Textual Amulets Worn on the Body for Protection". In *Schriftträger – Textträger: Zur Materialen Präsenz des Geschriebenen in Frühen Gesellschaften. Vol. 6*, edited by Annette Kehnel and Diamantis Panagiotopoulos, 127–49. Materiale Textkulturen. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2015.

—. "Reading the Law: Statute Books and the Private Transmission of Legal Knowledge in Late Medieval England". In Bush and Wijffels, *Learning the Law*, 113–32.

—. "Sir William Breton's Book: Production of *Statuta Angliæ* in the Late Thirteenth Century". In *English Manuscript Studies: 1100–1600, Vol. 6*, edited by Peter Beal and A.S.G. Edwards, 24–51. Oxford: Blackwell, 1997.

—. "Treatises, Tracts, and Compilations". In Barrington and Sobecki, *Companion to Medieval English Law and Literature*, 66–80.

Skillington, S.H., and G.F. Farnham. "The Skeffingtons of Skeffington". *Trans. Leicestershire Archaeological Soc.* 15 (1927–1928): 75–128.

Smith, Julia M.H. "Portable Christianity: Relics in the Medieval West (*c*. 700–1200)". *Proc. Brit. Acad.* 181 (2012): 143–67.

Snedegar, Keith. "Ashenden, John (d. in or before 1368?), Astrologer". In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 23 September 2004. doi: 10.1093/ref:odnb/39190.

Southern, R.W. *Robert Grosseteste: The Growth of an English Mind in Medieval Europe*. 2nd edn. Oxford: Clarendon, 1992.

Southward, John. *Dictionary of Typography and its Accessory Arts*. 1875. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

Spearing, A.C. *Textual Subjectivity: The Encoding of Subjectivity in Medieval Narratives and Lyrics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Stiefvater, Maggie. *The Scorpio Races*. London: Scholastic, 2011.

Stokes, Peter A. *English Vernacular Minuscule from Æthelred to Cnut, circa 990–circa 1035*. Publications of the Manchester Centre for Anglo-Saxon Studies 14. Woodbridge: D.S. Brewer, 2014.

Stokes, Roy Bishop. *Esdaile's Manual of Bibliography*. 6th edn. Edited by Stephen R. Almagno. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow, 2001.

Swanson, Jenny. *John of Wales: A Study of the Works and Ideas of a Thirteenth-Century Friar*. Cambridge Studies in Medieval Life and Thought, 4th ser. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.

—. "Wales, John of [John Wallensis] (d. 1285), Franciscan Friar and Theologian". In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 23 September 2004. doi: 10.1093/ref:odnb/28552.

Szczepanowska, Hanna M. *Conservation of Cultural Heritage: Key Principles and Approaches*. New York: Routledge, 2013.

Talbot, C.H. "A List of Cistercian Manuscripts in Great Britain". *Traditio* 8 (1952): 402–18.

Teasdale, Matthew D., N.L. van Doom, S. Fiddyment, et al. "Paging through History: Parchment as a Reservoir of Ancient DNA for Next Generation Sequencing". *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. Lond. B* 370 (2014): art. 20130379. doi: 10.1098/rstb.2013.0379.

Teasdale, Matthew D., Sarah Fiddyment, Jiří Vnouček, et al. "The York Gospels: A 1000-Year Biological Palimpsest". *R. Soc. open sci.* 4 (2017): art. 170988. doi: 10.1098/rsos.170988.

Thaisen, Jacob. "Secretary Letter Forms in Country Durham". *Folia Linguistica Historica* 38, no. s38-s1 (2017): 263–80. doi: 10.1515/flih-2017-0009.

Thomas, Richard, Matilda Holmes, and James Morris. "'So Bigge as Bigge May Be': Tracking Size and Shape Change in Domestic Livestock in London (AD 1220–1900)". *J. Archaeol. Sci.* 40, no. 8 (2013): 3309–325. doi: 10.1016/j.jas.2013.02.032.

Thompson, Daniel V. "Medieval Parchment-Making". *The Library*, 4th ser., 16, no. 1 (1935): 113–17. doi: 10.1093/library/s4-XVI.1.113.

Thomson, Rodney M. "Parchment and Paper, Ruling and Ink". In Morgan and Thomson, *History of the Book in Britain, Vol. 2*, 75–84.

Thorpe, S.M. "Campanett, John (by 1519–57), of London and Tickencote, Rutland". In *History of Parliament Online*. Dir. Paul Seaward. London: Institute of Historical Research for the History of Parliament Trust, 2020. www.historyofparliamentonline.org/volume/1509-1558/member/campanett-john-1519-57.

—. "Skeffington, Sir William (by 1467–1535), of Skeffington and Groby, Leics." In *History of Parliament Online*. Dir. Paul Seaward. London: Institute of Historical Research for the History of Parliament Trust, 2020. www.historyofparliamentonline.org/volume/1509-1558/member/skeffington-sir-william-1467-1535.

—. "Swillington, George (by 1508–58/60), of Sutton Bonnington, Notts. and Liddington, Rutland". In *History of Parliament Online*. Dir. Paul Seaward. London: Institute of Historical Research for the History of Parliament Trust, 2020. www.historyofparliamentonline.org/volume/1509-1558/member/swillington-george-1508-5860.

—. "Swillington, Ralph (by 1485–1525), of the Inner Temple, London and Stivichall, nr. Coventry, Warws." In *History of Parliament Online*. Dir. Paul Seaward. London: Institute of Historical Research for the History of Parliament Trust, 2020. www.historyofparliamentonline.org/volume/1509-1558/member/swillington-ralph-1485-1525.

Trapp, J.B. "Literacy, Books, and Readers". In Hellinga and Trapp, *History of the Book in Britain, Vol. 3*, 31–44.

Turner, Nancy K. "The Materiality of Medieval Parchment: A Response to 'The Animal Turn'". *Revista Hispánica Moderna* 7, no. 1 (2018): 39–67. doi: 10.1353/rhm.2018.0007.

Turville-Petre, Thorlac. "Some Medieval English Manuscripts in the North-East Midlands". In *Manuscripts and Readers in Fifteenth-Century England: The Literary Implications of Manuscript*

Study. Essays from the 1981 Conference at the University of York, edited by Derek A. Pearsall, 125–41. Woodbridge: D.S. Brewer, 1983.

Ustick, W. Lee. "'Parchment' and 'Vellum'". *The Library*, 4th ser., 16, no. 4 (1936): 439–43. doi: 10.1093/library/s4-XVI.4.439.

Vatican. Congregatio de Causis Sanctorum. « Instructio ad Peragendas Inquisitiones Dioecesanas vel Eparchiales de Causes Sanctorum ». *La Santa Sede*. Roma, 2007. web.archive.org/web/20150423225436/http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/csaints/documents/rc_con_csaints_doc_20070517_sanctorum-mater_lt.html.

Vinci, Stefano. "Liber Belial: A Vade Mecum for Roman-Canonical Procedure in Europe". *Forum Historiæ Iuris*. February 2015. forhistiur.de/2015-01-vinci/abstract/.

Visscher, J. "Looking back on a Lifetime in Parchmentmaking at William Cowley". In Rück, *Pergament*, 341–58.

Vnouček, Jiří. "Illustrations for Instruction, the Book as Evidence. The Story of the Production of a Medieval Codex as Recorded in the Hamburg Bible". In *From Nature to Script: Reykholt, Environment, Centre, and Manuscript Making*, edited by Helgi Þorláksson and Þóra Björg Sigurðardóttir, 199–229. Snorrastofa 7. Reykholt: Snorrastofa, 2012.

—. "The Manufacture of Parchment for Writing Purposes and the Observation of the Signs of Manufacture Surviving in Old Manuscripts". In *Care and Conservation of Manuscripts 8: Proceedings of the Eighth International Seminar Held at the University of Copenhagen 16th–17th October 2003*, edited by Gillian Fellows-Jensen and Peter Springborg, 74–92. Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press and University of Copenhagen, 2005.

—. "Typology of the Damage of the Parchment in Manuscripts of the Codex Form". In Larsen, *IDAP*, 27–30.

—, and Daniela Králová. "Parchment During the Process of Manufacture". In Larsen, *IDAP*, 23–26.

Waarden, Frans van. "Varieties of Private Market Regulation: Problems and Prospects". In *Handbook on the Politics of Regulation*, edited by David Levi-Faur, 469–85. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, 2011.

Wakelin, Daniel. *Scribal Correction and Literary Craft: English Manuscripts 1375–1510*. Cambridge Studies in Medieval Literature 91. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014.

—. "Writing the Words". In Gillespie and Wakelin, *Production of Books*, 34–58.

Wasselynck, René. « Les compilations des ‹ Remediarium Conversorum › du VII^e au XII^e siècle » *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale* 29 (1962): 5–32.

—. « Extraits du ‹ Remediarium Conversorum › de Pierre de Londres » *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale* 32 (1965): 121–32.

Weinberg, Bella Hass. "Book Indexes in France: Medieval Specimens and Modern Practices". *The Indexer* 22, no. 1 (2000): 2–13.

—. "Predecessors of Scientific Indexing Structures in the Domain of Religion". In *The History and Heritage of Scientific and Technological Information Systems: Proceedings of the 2002 Conference*, edited by W. Boyd Rayward and Mary Ellen Bowden, 126–34. ASIS&T Monograph Series. Medford, NJ: Information Today, for American Society for Information Science and Technology, 2004.

Wenzel, S. "The English Verses in the *Fasciculus Morum*". In *Chaucer and Middle English Studies: In Honour of Rossell Hope Robbins*, edited by B. Rowland, 230–48. New York: Routledge, 1974.

van der Werf, Inez Dorothé, Cosima Damiana Calvano, Giulia Germinario, et al. "Chemical Characterization of Medieval Illuminated Parchment Scrolls". *Microchemical J.* 134 (2017): 146–53. doi: 10.1016/j.microc.2017.05.018.

Whelan, Fiona. *The Making of Manners and Morals in Twelfth-Century England: The Book of the Civilised Man*. New York: Taylor & Francis, 2017.

Wilcox, Jonathan. "Introduction: The Philology of Smell". In Wilcox, *Scraped, Stroked, and Bound*, 1–13.

—, editor. *Scraped, Stroked, and Bound: Materially Engaged Readings of Medieval Manuscripts*. Utrecht Studies in Medieval Literacy 23. Turnhout: Brepols, 2013. doi: 10.1484/M.USML-EB.6.09070802050003050405040903.

Windeatt, Barry. *English Mystics of the Middle Ages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

Winfield, Percy H. *The Chief Sources of English Legal History*. Historical Reprints in Jurisprudence and Classical Legal Literature. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1925; repr.: Buffalo: W.S. Hein, 1983.

Winslow, Sean Michael. "Ethiopian Manuscript Culture: Practices and Contexts". PhD diss., University of Toronto, 2015. tspace.library.utoronto.ca/handle/1807/71392.

—. "Parchmenting". *Online Exhibit: Ethiopic Manuscript Production*. 2011. larkvi.com/mss/eth/production/parchmenting.php.

Wogan-Browne, Jocelyn. “The Apple’s Message: Some Post-Conquest Hagiographic Accounts of Textual Transmission”. In *Late-Medieval Religious Texts and Their Transmission: Essays in Honour of A.I. Doyle*, edited by A.J. Minnis, 39–54. Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 1994.

Wolfson, Arthur M. “The Ballot and Other Forms of Voting in the Italian Communes”. *Amer. Hist. Rev.* 5, no. 1 (1899): 1–21. doi: 10.2307/1832957.

Wolpoff, Milford H., Frederick Szalay, Robert B. Eckhardt, et al. ”Discussion” [comment on David Pilbeam and J. Rimas Vaišnys, “Hypothesis Testing in Paleoanthropology”, 3–13]. In *Paleoanthropology: Morphology and Paleoecology*, edited by Russell H. Tittle, 15–18. World Anthropology. Den Haag: Mouton, 1975.

Woodcock, Thomas, Janet Grant, and Ian Graham, editors. *Dictionary of British Arms: Medieval Ordinary*. 4 vols. London: Society of Antiquaries of London, 1992–2014.

Woodcock, Thomas, and John Martin Robinson. *The Oxford Guide to Heraldry*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988.

Woods, Christopher S. “The Conservation of Parchment”. In Kite and Thomson, *Conservation*, 200–24.

—. “From Skin to Parchment: A Short Description of the Nature of Skin, the Chemical and Physical Changes Brought about When Turning Skin into Parchment, and Their Implications for Conservation”. *PapierRestaurierung* 3, no. 4 (2002): 13–18.

Zerdoun Bat-Yehouda, Monique, and Caroline Bourlet, rédacteuses. *Matériaux du livre médiéval: Actes du Colloque du Groupement de Recherche (GDR) 2836 ‘Matériaux du Livre Médiéval’, Paris, CNRS, 7–8 novembre 2007*. Bibliologia 30. Turnhout: Brepols, 2010. doi: 10.1484/M.BIB-EB.6.090708020500030503030080605.