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The Evangelist Symbols in the Judith of Flanders Gospels:
Devotion, Prestige, and Cultural Production

Mary Dockray-Miller

While I have never had the opportunity to meet Thomas H. Ohlgren, his work has had an enormous impact on mine. For me, a visit to Anglo-Saxon Textual Illustration is one of the essential first steps for a project focused on Anglo-Saxon culture; more often than not, repeated visits are necessary as well to examine the clear reproductions complemented by Ohlgren’s trademark detailed and explicit descriptions. All of Ohlgren’s work demonstrates an unassuming presentation of vast amounts of knowledge and expertise, modeling the generosity senior scholars can show to those less conversant in the field. It is a privilege to contribute to a volume in his honor.

Anglo-Saxon Textual Illustration reproduces images from three late Anglo-Saxon gospel books made for Judith of Flanders. A daughter of Count Baldwin IV of Flanders, Judith was married to Tostig Godwinson (Earl of Northumbria) from 1051–66 and to Welf of Bavaria from 1071 to her death in 1094. Throughout her adult life, she owned numerous illustrated manuscripts and treasure objects; when Judith left England in 1065, in the wake of her husband’s loss of his earldom, she took with her into exile to Bruges at least four magnificent gospel books. Analysis of the books in the context of the political chaos in pre-Conquest England indicates that they were made between 1063 and 1065 in the southern part of England, most probably near Peterborough in East Anglia. Furthermore, these deluxe display books indicate one of the ways that literacy and literary patronage provided cultural legitimacy and social status for secular women in the late Anglo-Saxon period. The evangelist symbols in Judith’s English books—some of them very unusual—exemplify Judith’s use of patronage as a cultural strategy to proclaim her wealth and position in the political theater of northern Europe. She exemplifies the ways that aristocratic women, who generally did not control land or military forces, could successfully assert themselves through purchase and use of beautiful, luxurious objects.
Throughout her life, Judith’s social position was consistently minor while still definitively aristocratic. Judith was born sometime between 1031 and 1035 to Count Baldwin IV of Flanders and his second wife, Eleanor of Normandy (see figure 11.1 for their family tree). In 1030, the elderly Baldwin IV had married into the Norman ducal house to secure an alliance in the rebellion against him by his own son from his first marriage. The subsequent peace terms determined that the father and son would rule jointly, then the son would became Count Baldwin V when the father died (he passed away in 1035). It was thus Judith’s half-brother Baldwin V, roughly twenty years her senior, who arranged her marriage to Tostig Godwinson in 1051 when she was between sixteen and twenty years old. While no evidence exists to make any judgments about Judith’s relationship with her half-brother, his wife, or his children, it is safe to assume that she was not considered a dynastically important member of Baldwin’s comital family. Judith’s new father-in-law, Godwin, was the earl of Wessex as well as the father-in-law of Edward the Confessor, and (after the king) the richest and most powerful man in England. As one of the earl’s middle sons, the bridegroom Tostig must have seemed to Baldwin an acceptable but not too important a match, especially as Baldwin was also in the midst of negotiating his own daughter Matilda’s much more politically important marriage to William, duke of Normandy, which occurred sometime between 1049 and 1052.

Judith and Tostig’s marriage took place in the spring or summer of 1051. The dating of the marriage turns on the events of the “Crisis of 1051,” a power struggle between King Edward and Earl Godwin. While both pro- and anti-Godwin versions of the Crisis narrative exist, it’s clear
that both Earl Godwin and King Edward saw the aftermath of an armed skirmish in Dover as a referendum on power and legitimacy in Edward’s kingdom. The Godwins seemed to lose that referendum in August of 1051, when forces of the King and other earls mustered against Godwin, Godwin’s daughter Queen Edith was sent to a nunnery, and much of the family went to Bruges, named throughout the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle as the preferred destination for exiles from England in the years leading up to the Norman Conquest.

The Vita Ædwardi—more of an encomium than a hagiographic text—states that the skirmish at Dover occurred “in ipsis nuptiis filii sui duces Tostini, quando sortitus est uxorem Juditham” (during the very marriage celebrations of Godwin’s son, Earl Tostig, when he took Judith as wife). Therefore, we can postulate that after a ceremony and (presumably) celebrations in Bruges, the Godwins were celebrating the marriage in England when Eustace attacked (or was attacked by) the Dover townsfolk. Before the Crisis of 1051, a marriage into the powerful and wealthy Godwin family would have appealed to Baldwin V as something of an insurance policy in his rocky relationship with England.

Baldwin cannot have been pleased, then, when Judith and many of her inlaws reappeared in Flanders as refugees so soon after the marriage/alliance was formalized. Having cast his lot with the Godwins, however, Baldwin welcomed them to Bruges for the winter of 1051/52 and allowed Godwin to collect a fleet and an armed troop for the planned (and ultimately successful) return to England. Judith presumably remained in Bruges until the Godwins had made peace with Edward in mid-August of 1052.

Judith remained, however, the wife of only a middle son, even after the reinstatement of the Godwin lands and titles in 1052. Two deaths helped to improve her position: her father-in-law died in 1053, and Earl Siward of Northumbria passed away in 1055. In 1055, Tostig became earl of Northumbria in the subsequent reshuffling of lands and titles. Her husband’s promotion thus solidified Judith’s place as one of the most prominent ladies in the country after the queen her sister-in-law (Tostig’s older brother Harold was not formally married, although he had a common-law or hand-fasted wife named Edith about whom very little is known). It is after 1055, then, that Judith begins to have the political and financial ability to patronize religious institutions and to commission works of art for churches and for herself—to use literacy and patronage as a way to define and assert her status in the years leading up to the Norman Conquest.

When she became the lady of Northumbria, her patronage helped to
define her as pious, generous, wealthy, and sophisticated in the earldom and in the kingdom at large.

Literary and artistic patronage was bound up with religion throughout the Middle Ages, of course, and Judith’s religious devotion played a crucial role in her patronage. Primary source texts uniformly praise Judith’s piety and generosity. Symeon of Durham calls her “honesta ac religiosa” (worthy and pious); the author of the Life of St. Oswin says she is a “mulier devota” (devout woman); the author of the Life of King Edward terms her Tostig’s “religiose conjugis” (pious spouse). The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle specifically mentions her twice, first in reference to the Crisis of 1051 and then to note that she accompanied her husband and the archbishop of York to Rome in 1061. Since she was not on a royal or ecclesiastical mission, her main purpose must have been pilgrimage, a suggestion entirely in keeping with other descriptions of her piety.

While her husband and the archbishop met with the pope, Judith probably visited prominent churches in Rome to pray at their saints’ shrines and to see their treasures. In her work on English pilgrims in Rome, Veronica Ortenberg has argued that there was something of a standard list of destinations for those staying in the schola anglorum, the English hospice in Rome. W. J. Moore has described the schola anglorum to be the section of the city (rather than simply one building or institution) centered on S Spirito in Sassonia; pilgrims would stay in the schola each night and venture out to different destinations during the day, just as modern tourists do.

As noble companions to an archbishop, Judith and Tostig would have commanded the best lodgings available at the schola and had priority access to the most prized relics and shrines throughout the city. In Rome, Judith probably cultivated her sense of the ways that luxury objects proclaimed wealth and sophistication as well as religious devotion. Her patronage projects from the time of her English marriage certainly indicate a preference for opulent pieces crafted of the most precious materials. Judith is associated with a porphyry and silver portable altar, now in the Musée de Cluny in Paris. Art historians have suggested that she may have taken it to the continent when she left England in 1065, and it certainly would have been an appropriate object for religious use and display for a wealthy pious noblewoman.

The Anglo-Saxon altar’s engravings share stylistic similarities with some of the illustrations in the manuscripts discussed below; it could as well be categorized with other English objects associated with Judith for
which we have descriptions but that no longer exist. For instance, Symeon describes the statues she and Tostig gave to Durham in honor of St. Cuthbert: they “ordered to be made and clad in gold and silver an image of the crucified Christ [. . .] and also an image of St. Mary, the mother of God, and John the Evangelist, and they also gave to the church many other things for its adornment.”17 Judith is also said to have given to Oswin’s church at Tynemouth a now-lost shrine or case for some of his relics.18

In addition to these specific gifts to Durham and Tynemouth, we know as well that Judith commissioned at least four gospel books for herself and her household while she was in England. All four are deluxe productions that would have displayed Judith’s and Tostig’s wealth, piety, and good taste in the chapel in their household. When she died in 1094, Judith left three of them to Weingarten Abbey in Germany, a house patronized by the family of her second husband, Welf of Bavaria. It is through the Weingarten connections that we can identify Judith as the first owner of the books, now in three different archives. She wanted beautiful religious objects for herself as well as for the institutions she patronized. In this, she may have been typical, but because of the huge loss of Anglo-Saxon manuscripts through the later medieval period and the English reformation, she seems unique: we have no other “set” of personally commissioned books from the period, whether for a man or a woman.19 Two of the books are now in New York, at the Pierpont Morgan Library; the others are in Italy and Germany. All four are deluxe productions that would have displayed Judith’s wealth, piety, and good taste in the chapel of her household.

Figure 11.2: Scribe and Artist Detail of Judith of Flanders Gospels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shelfmark</th>
<th>Scribe</th>
<th>Contents</th>
<th>Artist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Morgan M.709</td>
<td>Almost all scribe 1</td>
<td>Full gospel texts</td>
<td>Same artist as Crowland Psalter (Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Douce 296)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan M.708</td>
<td>Some scribe 1, mostly scribe 2</td>
<td>All of Matthew and John; parts of Mark and Luke; full rubrics and titles</td>
<td>Scribe 2 was probably also the artist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monte Cassino 437</td>
<td>All scribe 1</td>
<td>Brief parts of Matthew and John, large parts of Mark and Luke omitted; full rubrics and titles</td>
<td>Scribe 1 was probably the artist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulda codex Aa.21</td>
<td>Almost all scribe 1</td>
<td>Parts of each gospel omitted</td>
<td>Flemish artist did the illustrations post-1065</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Jane Rosenthal and Patrick McGurk have demonstrated that one main scribe worked on all four of these gospel books, and they postulate that he was probably something of a director for the project as a whole (see figure 11.2). Figure 11.2 shows the level of involvement of that scribe—Scribe 1—with each book. He wrote some of MS Morgan M.708, but much of that manuscript was probably written by the artist (whose work does not appear in any of the other three books). Scribe 1 wrote almost all of MS Morgan M.709, which was illustrated by an artist who was not the artist of 708. Scribe 1 also wrote most of the text in the Fulda book; it was finished by a Flemish scribe who was probably also the artist. Finally, Scribe 1 wrote all of the Monte Cassino book, and he was probably also the artist. I would postulate as well that Scribe 1 was someone very close to Judith, perhaps her confessor as well as her main clerk, whom she trusted with the details of this deluxe and expensive group of commissions.

**Dating and Origin/Provenance**

Rosenthal and McGurk argue convincingly that the books were all made in the early to mid-1060s. Earlier art historians wanted to date the manuscripts, because of the illustrations, to an earlier part of the eleventh century. Art historical analysis aside, evidence from the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* and the *Chronicle* of John of Worcester points to 1063–65 as well. Judith had access to the wealth of the earldom of Northumbria after 1055; she and Tostig were gone for most of the year in 1061 when they went to Rome; they then left England in 1065 after Tostig lost his earldom in the Northern Rebellion. That uprising became irreconcilably violent in October of 1065, when the Northumbrians attacked and plundered Tostig’s stronghold in York, killing more than two hundred of his men and ransacking his treasury.21

Rosenthal and McGurk tentatively suggest that before that departure, the team of scribes and artists worked in Judith’s household in York, where her piety and patronage would certainly not have been out of place. York was traditionally the seat of the earls of Northumbria; the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* tells us that Tostig’s predecessor Siward was buried in 1055 in the church he founded at Galmanho, the Church of St. Olave.22 The ruins of the later medieval St. Mary’s Abbey dominate the site now, but in the eleventh century the area was called “Earlsburh” and encompassed the earl’s residence as well as his private church devoted to his favorite saint. Judith and Tostig probably stayed at Earlsburh when they
came to York. There has been no archaeological work done at the current St Olave’s church, since there has been a working church on the site since its founding in the early 1050s; all of the archaeological work in the area has focused on the later medieval abbey church. Two side streets nearby are still called “Galmanho Lane” and “Earlsburgh Terrace,” however, indicating the pre-Conquest usage of the site. Harald Lindkvist suggested in 1926 that the earl’s residence was probably on the higher ground near the church; although such higher ground would be more defensible, it was evidently not defensible enough during the northern uprising in 1065.

Rosenthal and McGurk’s placement of Judith’s scriptorium workshop at her household in York is thus unlikely. Their arguments for suggesting Judith’s household rather than a monastic or cathedral scriptorium are sound, but that household could not have been at York, as it was simply too dangerous. One of the Northumbrians’ complaints about Tostig was that he was an outsider, a southern absentee landlord who rarely came to his earldom; in a vicious cycle, the more he stayed away, the more unpopular he became. Judith was certainly in York at various times throughout her marriage; however, the violence and severity of the attack on Tostig’s court make it clear that the in-process gospel manuscripts, with their jeweled covers and gold decoration, would have been destroyed or taken if they had been there. Judith’s in-house scriptorium must have been elsewhere.

That “elsewhere” could include any of Tostig’s sizable holdings in the south. As its earl, Tostig held substantial estates in Northumbria, but he also controlled extensive lands in the south-central counties of Bedfordshire, Buckinghamshire, Oxfordshire, Hertfordshire, and Hampshire (as well as numerous smaller holdings in other southern counties). Robin Fleming has argued convincingly that Domesday land holdings should be tallied by “comital family” rather than by individual; she calculates that the Godwins, as a group, generated about 2500 pounds more revenue each year than the king. This financial advantage, according to Fleming, demonstrates the inherent weakness of Edward’s kingship: “the Godwines’ land and wealth had outstripped the king’s. If the Confessor approved of the family’s rapid aggrandizement, he was a fool; if he acquiesced, he cannot have been in full control of his kingdom.” Peter Clarke similarly counts all Godwin-held lands as one unit, since the family’s control of an estate was more important politically and economically than the name of the individual family member who technically held the land (Clarke notes, for example, that Earl Godwin himself is listed in Domesday Book as holding a number of estates, despite his death thirteen
years before the Conquest). Within the Godwin family lands, Clarke tallies those held by Tostig to be valued at 492 pounds, noting that this total is “probably an underestimate.”

Those individually noted estates, however, indicate possible locations where Tostig and Judith could reasonably have claimed some sort of personal residence, even as those estates should also be counted as part of the family’s overall wealth. In each of the five counties listed above—Bedfordshire, Buckinghamshire, Oxfordshire, Hertfordshire, and Hampshire—Tostig held estates substantial enough to support an aristocratic hall or manor house on the premises. Two properties in Hampshire even include specific reference to a hall on the estate. Any of these large, wealthy estates—Potton in Bedfordshire, Bayford in Hertfordshire, Haddenham in Buckinghamshire, Holdenhurst in Hampshire, or Bloxham-and-Adderbury in Oxfordshire—could have been Tostig and

Figure 11.3.1: Capital “Q.” New York, Pierpont Morgan Library, MS M.709, fol. 78r; purchased by J. P. Morgan (1867–1943) in 1926.
Judith’s main southern residence when they were not with the court. Any of them could also have been the location for Judith’s in-house scriptorium that housed the gospel-book project.

This information about Tostig’s premier southern land-holdings is especially interesting in light of the one relatively sure localization we have relevant to this group of four manuscripts: the connection between the Morgan M.709 artist and the artist of the Crowland Psalter (Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Douce 296). While Barbara Raw and others have noted the striking similarities between the illustrations of the two books,33 the Morgan Library’s file on Morgan M.709 contains a handwritten note from Francis Wormald, dated October 1951, stating that Douce 296 and Morgan M.709 were illustrated by the same artist.34 The connection is most immediately apparent in comparing the two capital Qs on fol. 78r of Morgan M.709 and fol. 40v of the Crowland Psalter (see figures 11.3.1 and 11.3.2, respectively). Since we know Douce 296 was made at Crowland, or perhaps at nearby Peterborough for Crowland,35 that connection provides some potential for hypothesizing the provenance of Morgan M.709 and possibly the rest of the group as well. If Judith’s gospel project was housed
at one of Tostig’s estates relatively near Peterborough, that artist could more easily have been hired for the job of illustrating the most deluxe (and also the most conventional) of the books. Of the premier manors listed above, Potton is the closest (only forty miles from Peterborough) with Bayford a more distant seventy miles. The analyses that follow do not depend on the project’s execution near Peterborough in the early to mid-1060s, but will proceed with such an origin as the most likely scenario.

The Evangelists and Their Symbols

The two books in New York are the most elaborate of the set, as well as the only two artifacts associated with Judith archived in the English-speaking world; the Morgan manuscripts have therefore received the overwhelming majority of the scholarly attention paid to the group. Of the four books, Monte Cassino’s miniatures are certainly the most unusual, but because of the Abbey’s low-tech library and relatively inaccessible location, they are not as well known in Anglo-Saxon studies as the Morgan illustrations. The Fulda book as well is not as recognized in English scholarship as its Morgan sisters, largely because its illustrations are continental rather than English (although it has received substantial attention from German scholars since late-twelfth-century documents concerning the holy blood relic have been copied onto its end-leaves).

The resonances among the English books’ miniatures are stylistic and compositional as well as thematic. Rosenthal and McGurk see the evangelist miniatures as a group to have been “designed to express in pictorial terms some of the well-known relationships and distinctions among the four authors and their texts expounded in the exegetical literature on the gospels.” They envision the images to have prompted or informed meditation upon the Life of Christ and/or the gospel texts. The evangelists’ relationships include those of the three synoptic gospels vis-à-vis the Gospel of John as well as the thematically contrasting relationship between the evangelist-disciples Matthew (who focused on Christ’s humanity) and John (on Christ’s divinity). While Rosenthal and McGurk’s thematic analysis focuses specifically on the illustrated figures of the evangelists at the beginning of each gospel, the investigation here concentrates on other compositional details in order to draw conclusions about practical as well as conceptual relationships among the books.

The illustration program of Morgan M.709 is the most traditional of the group. Rosenthal and McGurk term it “conventionally adorned”
with borders in “an eleventh-century version of the traditional Winchester frame,” initials “of the type customarily employed with Winchester frames in liturgical books,” and portraits that “represent a well-established type.” Rosenthal and McGurk posit that Morgan M.709 was the deluxe gospel for Judith’s household chapel, with its jeweled cover that proclaims its value even before it is opened (see figures 11.4.1–11.7.2). The frontispiece is the much-discussed crucifixion image that includes an early donor portrait showing Judith herself, prostrate at the foot of the cross. While the most elaborate of the illustration sequences, Morgan M.709’s is also the most conventional and the least exciting.

In contrast, Morgan M.708 is both less traditional and more visually interesting. Rosenthal and McGurk suggest that it was also a display book for the chapel that could have acted as a liturgical back-up to Morgan M.709 (see figures 11.8.1–11.11.2). The borders around the miniatures are not traditional Winchester acanthus, but plain rectangles (Matthew and Luke) or architectural frames (Mark and John); Rosenthal and McGurk note that the undecorated capitals use “variations in the size of the components, unusual juxtapositions, and a different arrangement [on the page]” to provide “unique character” to these illustrations.

The third wholly English book, now in the library at Monte Cassino, was probably made for Judith as a private devotional manual. It is the most finished of the four books in the sense that it includes all the headings and titles that she would have needed to use it (see figures 11.12–11.15). Rosenthal and McGurk refer to its “complex and idiosyncratic” decoration, most especially placement and presentation of the zoanthropomorphic evangelist symbols on the page facing the evangelist portraits. Elżbieta Temple notes the exceptional nature of the symbols in her description of the illustration program: “The placing of the evangelist symbols over the initial pages is most unusual [. . .]. The anthropomorphic representations of the lion and the ox [. . .] have few parallels in Anglo-Saxon illumination.” While I discuss the Monte Cassino evangelist symbols in detail below, other components of the Monte Cassino illustration program demonstrate links among the three manuscripts. Taken as a group, the three sets of evangelist miniatures executed in England show the three artists working closely together, aware of the others’ productions. They influenced each other’s decorative motifs, compositions, iconographical choices, and errors. These connections demonstrate some aspects of the process of manuscript production in a private space (rather than a monastic scriptorium) and for a specific, secular patron.
Figure 11.4.1: Matthew Portrait. New York, Pierpont Morgan Library, MS M.709, fol. 2v. Purchased by J. P. Morgan (1867–1943) in 1926.
Figure 11.4.2: Matthew Incipit. New York, Pierpont Morgan Library, MS M.709, fol. 3r. Purchased by J. P. Morgan (1867–1943) in 1926.
Figure 11.5.1: Mark Portrait, with Calf in Error for Lion. New York, Pierpont Morgan Library, MS M.709, fol. 48v. Purchased by J. P. Morgan (1867–1943) in 1926.
Figure 11.5.2: Mark Incipit, with Calf in Error for Lion. New York, Pierpont Morgan Library, MS M.709, fol. 49r. Purchased by J. P. Morgan (1867–1943) in 1926.
Figure 11.6.1: Luke Portrait, with Lion in Error for Calf. New York, Pierpont Morgan Library, MS M.709, fol. 77v. Purchased by J. P. Morgan (1867–1943) in 1926.
Figure 11.6.2: Luke Incipit, with Lion in Error for Calf. New York, Pierpont Morgan Library, MS M.709, fol. 78r. Purchased by J. P. Morgan (1867–1943) in 1926.
Figure 11.7.1: John Portrait. New York, Pierpont Morgan Library, MS M.709, fol. 122v. Purchased by J. P. Morgan (1867–1943) in 1926.
Figure 11.7.2: John Incipit. New York, Pierpont Morgan Library, MS M.709, fol. 123r. Purchased by J. P. Morgan (1867–1943) in 1926.
Figure 11.8.1: Matthew Portrait. New York, Pierpont Morgan Library, MS M.708, fol. 2v. Purchased by J. P. Morgan (1867–1943) in 1926.
Figure 11.8.2: Matthew Incipit. New York, Pierpont Morgan Library, MS M.708, fol. 3r. Purchased by J. P. Morgan (1867–1943) in 1926.
Figure 11.9.1: Mark Portrait. New York, Pierpont Morgan Library, MS M.708, fol. 26v. Purchased by J. P. Morgan (1867–1943) in 1926.
Figure 11.9.2: Mark Incipit. New York, Pierpont Morgan Library, MS M.708, fol. 27r. Purchased by J. P. Morgan (1867–1943) in 1926.
Figure 11.10.2: Luke Incipit. New York, Pierpont Morgan Library, MS M.708, fol. 43r. Purchased by J. P. Morgan (1867–1943) in 1926.
Figure 11.11.1: John Portrait. New York, Pierpont Morgan Library, MS M.708, fol. 66v. Purchased by J. P. Morgan (1867–1943) in 1926.
Figure 11.11.2: John Incipit. New York, Pierpont Morgan Library, MS M.708, fol. 67r. Purchased by J. P. Morgan (1867–1943) in 1926.
Most obviously, the borders of the evangelist portrait pages of Morgan M.708 and the Monte Cassino Book exhibit substantial stylistic overlap (as noted above, the frames of the Morgan M.709 evangelist folios are executed in a very traditional “Winchester” style43). While the Matthew and Luke borders of Morgan M.708 are simple gold rectangular frames, the Mark and John borders of Morgan M.708 use architectural and floral motifs very similar to those of the Monte Cassino gospel. Temple refers to these as “arch and column” frames and notes that the Morgan M.708 frames have “plant scrolls in the spandrels.”44 In both books, the columns have botanical motifs in the capitals and bases that harmonize with other ornamentation on the page.45 The plants in the spandrels seem to be growing out of the columns; those in Morgan M.708 seem restrained when compared to those of the Monte Cassino gospel, which include not simply plants but also human figures, lions, and an eagle.

There is no obvious pattern to the inclusion of the border figures on the various folios of Monte Cassino. Two human figures climb in the foliage on the Matthew incipit page, perhaps since Matthew’s symbol is a man, but then there are no beasts at all in the Mark opening, while an eagle and a lion both climb above the figure of Luke, two lions balance above the Luke incipit, and two lions rest above the figure of John. All of these various figures are evangelist symbols, so they certainly could have inspired meditation for the reader. Their inclusion and presentation seems somewhat haphazard, but they are also amusingly flamboyant and aesthetically pleasing. The Winchester-style borders of Morgan M.709 seem especially pedestrian when compared to the entertaining visual irregularities of the Monte Cassino borders. With their more reserved arches and foliage, the Morgan M.708 borders act as something of a stylistic bridge between the two extremes of the Morgan M.709 and Monte Cassino frames.

A direct connection between Morgan M.709 and Monte Cassino comes from their seemingly unrelated evangelist symbols. As noted above, the Monte Cassino evangelist symbols are in an unusual place (the facing/recto page), and the Monte Cassino calf and lion are zoo-anthropomorphic. In contrast, the Morgan M.709 symbols are conventionally presented to descend from the sky on the same page as the evangelist portraits. However, both artists mistakenly switched the symbols for Mark and Luke; the Monte Cassino miniatures were corrected while the errors remain in Morgan M.709. This shared mistake reconfirms the artists’ working relationship.

The uncorrected error in Morgan M.709 presents a calf bringing a scroll at the beginning of the Gospel of Mark and a lion at the begin-
ning of the Gospel of Luke. Temple and Ohlgren objectively record these details without calling them errors or trying to explain them. Rosenthal and McGurk state that “there appear to be no known grounds for assigning the calf to Mark” and discuss the possibility that the current Mark/calf miniature was created on a singleton and inserted incorrectly after its completion. They do note, however, that “why the error was not corrected rather than compounded by assigning the lion to Luke remains a question.” I suggest that the “visiting artist” from Peterborough must have returned to his monastic scriptorium before the error was discovered; the identical error in Monte Cassino, however, was corrected.

Close examination of the evangelist symbols in Monte Cassino 437 shows that the lion and the calf were initially switched in this manuscript as well. Faint marks of one of the calf’s horns are visible above the now-lion’s left ear; it would have been relatively easy to paint over the horns and add a mane to the beast’s head, which looks more like a bear’s than a lion’s or a calf’s. Similarly, the now-lion’s head looks more like a pig’s than a calf’s or a lion’s; its neck could easily have sported a mane, thus explaining the very strange shape of the now-calf’s neckline of its upper garment.

Students of the manuscript have also not noted or commented upon the two crucial, tiny, corrective inscriptions that appear just below each of these beast-symbols (see figures 11.16.1–11.17.2). Under the lion, a very small but clear hand provides the direction “Fac’ Leon’ Vox Clamantis in deserto (make a lion, the voice of one crying in the desert) (see figure 11.16.2); the implication is that the original figure was not a lion and needed correction. Similarly, under the calf, a less-legible, small inscription reads “Fac’ Vit’ propter sacerdotiu~ (make a calf, on account of the priesthood) (see figure 11.17.2). The figure was thus not originally a calf and so needed modification. The first phrase comes from Mark 1.3 but is also used in Jerome’s Adversus Jovinianum, which is also the source of the second phrase. In his rebuttal of Jovinian’s heresies, Jerome invoked the symbolism of the evangelists’ beasts precisely as referenced in the Monte Cassino correction inscriptions. The Adversus Jovinianum was widely enough known in Anglo-Saxon England to be cited by Bede, Aldhelm, and Ælfric; it is extant in three eleventh- or twelfth-century manuscripts made in England. The corrector knew Jerome’s text well enough to use it in directional notes. It is unclear from the script whether the corrector was the project director, one of the other artists, the other scribe, or someone else entirely.
Figure 11.12: Matthew Portrait and Incipit. Monte Cassino, Archivio della Badia, Cod. 437, fols. 2v–3r.
Reproduced by permission of Montecassino, Archivio dell'Abbazia.
Figure 11.13: Mark Portrait and Incipit. Monte Cassino, Archivio della Badia, Cod. 437, fols. 102v–103r.
Reproduced by permission of Montecassino, Archivio dell'Abbazia.
Figure 11.14: Luke Portrait and Incipit. Monte Cassino, Archivio della Badia, Cod. 437, fols. 126v–127r.
Reproduced by permission of Montecassino, Archivio dell’Abbazia.
Figure 11.15: John Portrait and Incipit. Monte Cassino, Archivio della Badia, Cod. 437, fols. 166v–167r.
Reproduced by permission of Montecassino, Archivio dell’Abbazia.
Either the Monte Cassino artist (who was also the project director) was referring to the already-completed Morgan M.709 as he illustrated his gospel, or vice versa. While it is unclear which manuscript contained the error first, we do know that the director was available to correct his mistake while the Morgan M.709 artist was not. If the Morgan M.709 artist was indeed a visiting artist from Peterborough or Crowland (as suggested above), it seems likely that he had returned there before the error was detected; Judith and the project director simply had to accept the manuscript with the erroneously assigned evangelist symbols. Rosenthal and McGurk note that Morgan M.709 does not show signs of extensive use, so the error would not have caused undue consternation either in

Figure 11.16.1: Mark Incipit, Correction Inscription. Monte Cassino, Archivio della Badia, Cod. 437, fol. 103r. Reproduced by permission of Montecassino, Archivio dell’ Abbazia.
Judith’s household (where, presumably, she would have used the Monte Cassino book, her private devotional gospel) or at Weingarten abbey, which received the book as part of her bequest to that house.

The Monte Cassino book’s miniatures provide other visual connections among the books as well. For example, in both the Morgan M.708 and Monte Cassino portraits of John, a bird perches somewhat comically on John’s head. Rosenthal and McGurk, Temple, and Ohlgren all identify the bird in 708 as John’s eagle (see figures 11.11.1–2).52 Identification of the bird on John’s head in Monte Cassino is problematized by the eagle in the palladium arch on the facing incipit page (see figure 11.15), obviously John’s evangelist symbol. Ohlgren simply identifies both of the birds as John’s eagles.53 Temple makes a cautious identification of the bird on John’s head as “The Holy Dove(?))” before she notes that the bird is “apparently dictating his text (a composition paralleled in [. . .] Morgan 708), and probably inspired by a common exemplar.”54 Rosenthal and McGurk refer to the Boulogne Gospels (which includes both an eagle and the holy dove on the same page as the figure of John the Evangelist) as part of their argument that the bird on John’s head in the Monte Cassino portrait is definitely the dove of the Holy Spirit.55 The differentiation between “dove” and the “eagle” must be entirely metaphorical, as the three birds (two on the Monte Cassino John incipit and one on the Morgan M.708 John portrait) are remarkably similar. The wings are gold in the upper coverts and pink in the primary and secondary flight feathers. All three birds have tail feathers which form a relatively even line across the bottom edge of the tail (most evident in the eagle in the arch in Monte Cassino); all three have u-shaped lines throughout their chests to represent layered feathers. The bird in the Monte Cassino arch has a definitively raptor-like beak, as does the Morgan M.708 bird; the beak of the bird on John’s head in Monte Cassino is partially hidden by his hair and thus hard to distin-
guish. Since Judith was the primary first user of the Monte Cassino book, she either understood the metaphorical differences between the two birds on the John incipit that distinguished them as John’s eagle and the dove of the Holy Spirit, or she saw them merely as two versions of John’s eagle. Because the two birds look so much alike (and so much like the bird in Morgan M.708, which is obviously John’s eagle), I hesitate to discount the latter possibility entirely, as Rosenthal and McGurk do. We must allow the possibility that the two birds of the John opening of the Monte Cassino gospel were simply intended as two versions of the same figure, the eagle that represents the transcendent nature of his gospel.

The Zoo-Anthropomorphs

The illustration program of the Monte Cassino gospel was unusual not only in its placement of the evangelist symbols on the incipit pages but also in the zoo-anthropomorphic representations of two of those symbols (which were originally confused, as noted above). Much more common were the winged beast symbols exemplified in the Morgan gospel books and innumerable other books and media; even in Rome, the Evangelist symbols Judith would have seen were the more traditional depictions of
the beasts floating among the clouds, as in the fifth-century mosaic from Sancta Maria Maggiore, still in situ. The more unusual zoo-anthropomorphic evangelist symbols were not unheard of in earlier Insular art. The Barberini Gospels, the Maeseycck Gospels, and the Book of Kells—all early Insular manuscripts—feature zoo-anthropomorphic Evangelist symbols in their canon tables, but these images are very unlike those in Monte Cassino 437. Like the earlier insular images, a tradition of zoo-anthropomorphic Evangelists from Landevennec and other Celtic scriptoria seems stylistically unrelated to the zoo-anthropomorphs of the Monte Cassino gospel.

Two sets of zoo-anthropomorphic evangelist symbols from the earlier part of the eleventh century present themselves as possible sources or analogues for the zoo-anthropomorphic figures in the Monte Cassino gospel. One pair of strikingly similar figures is in the early eleventh-century Trinity Gospels; the other is on the object now known as the Brussels Cross. Both are high-status luxury items that can be tangentially connected to Judith through her place in the royal and aristocratic circles of late Anglo-Saxon England.

The Trinity Gospels have both visual and textual connections with Judith’s Monte Cassino book. The symbolic Evangelist figures in the Trinity Gospels share considerable stylistic and compositional similarities with those in the Monte Cassino Gospels, even as some details differ. In the Trinity Gospels, the lion, the calf, and the eagle are all presented on the evangelist portrait pages, thus following compositional convention (see figures 11.18.1–2 and 11.19.1–2; the John portrait page is badly damaged and so is not reproduced here). The figures are unconventionally zoo-anthropomorphic, however; like the Monte Cassino figures, the half-length frontal figures stand with their animal heads in half- to full-profile, holding their gospel scrolls in human hands. The zoo-anthropomorphic figures from both books wear two articles of clothing: a lighter-colored
Figure 11.18.1: Mark Portrait with Zoo-anthropomorphic Evangelist Symbol. Cambridge, Trinity College, MS B.10.4, fol. 59v. By permission of the Master and Fellows of Trinity College Cambridge.
under-tunic with a contrasting, darker cloak over the left shoulder. The gestures and faces differ significantly (the Trinity “calf” looks more like a man with horns than an animal), but the overall correlation between the two sets of figures, created more than forty years apart, is substantial. H. R. Glunz argued in 1933 that the Trinity Gospels were made in 1008 at Winchester, while Dodwell and Ohlgren both follow Temple, who states that the Trinity Gospels were probably made at Canterbury.61 Heslop has provocatively and persuasively argued for a later date, associating the Trinity Gospels with Cnut and Emma’s patronage program of the 1020s. Heslop sees Trinity as part of a group of deluxe gospel books from the early eleventh century that demonstrates “a deliberate policy of royal largesse.”62 Heslop’s connection of the Trinity Gospels to Emma and Cnut indicates a royal pedigree for the manuscript in its making and probably then in the forms of its usage as well; Heslop postulates that Trinity was a gift from the royal couple to an institution or an individual that would have then displayed the book in order to proclaim that royal connection to the public. As an integral part of Edward and Edith’s court, Judith and Tostig certainly attended royal ceremonies and observances that could have provided the opportunity for Judith to have seen, perhaps closely, the book we now call the Trinity Gospels.
Figure 11.19.1: Luke Portrait with Zoo-anthropomorphic Evangelist Symbol. Cambridge, Trinity College, MS B.10.4, fol. 89v. By permission of the Master and Fellows of Trinity College Cambridge.
Interestingly enough, Rosenthal and McGurk have argued for a textual relationship (although probably not an immediate one) between the Trinity Gospels (written by the copyist designated ‘Scribe B’ by Alan Bishop) and all four of the Judith Gospels, noting that “the closeness of the Judith and Scribe B books can be seen in many readings.” Rosenthal and McGurk thus hypothesize for the Judith books “a single exemplar which belonged to a textual recension found in the books of Scribe B.”

These visual and textual connections between the Monte Cassino and Trinity Gospels strongly suggest that the Trinity Gospels were used in a mid-eleventh-century aristocratic/religious setting in such a way that Judith and her scribe had some sort of access to Trinity B.10.4, its illustration program, and its textual exemplars.

Similarly, a second set of zoo-anthropomorphic figures suggests a potential royal/aristocratic connection between Judith and one of the premier relics of the Holy Cross in pre-Conquest England. This relic was encased in what we now call the Brussels Cross but what was probably, during Judith’s time in England, an important property of Westminster Abbey. This Anglo-Saxon reliquary cross that is now in the Brussels Cathedral treasury has zoo-anthropomorphic evangelist symbols on its
back. The once-jeweled front has been looted, but the metal work on the back still clearly shows five medallions. The _agnus dei_ claims the center, with John’s eagle at the top, the man and the lion at the left and right ends of the horizontal shaft, and the calf about halfway down the lower vertical post. The lion, the calf, and the eagle are all zoo-anthropomorphic; they all have human hands to hold their gospel texts (see figures 11.20.1–3). As in the Monte Cassino and Trinity Gospels, the human bodies of the figures on the Brussels Cross are frontal, while the animal heads are in profile. The differences are largely in the details: on the Brussels Cross, only one human hand is visible in each medallion; the tilted angles of the animals’ heads on the Brussels Cross are more congruent with those of the Monte Cassino than the Trinity figures; the figures on the cross seem to be seated rather than standing.

In their basic presentations, the similarities between the Monte Cassino and Brussels figures are sufficient to suggest that Judith and/or her project director were familiar with the Brussels relic’s style of zoo-anthropomorphic evangelist symbol and tried to recreate that presentation in Judith’s personal devotional Gospel. During the mid-eleventh century, the reliquary was probably a supremely important item in the Westminster Abbey treasury. Judith and Tostig spent substantial amounts of time at Edward’s court, and Westminster Abbey was the primary recipient of Edward’s religious patronage at the end of his life, exactly the time when Judith’s gospel books were made. Judith and Tostig had to have been familiar with—and perhaps were deeply aware of—Westminster’s building project, relics, and feast days; it is thus quite likely that Judith knew the figures on Westminster’s reliquary cross.

Rosenthal and McGurk have alluded to the ways in which the Monte Cassino zoo-anthropomorphs, in their human/animal duality, represent the dual nature of Christ as both human and divine. Through their similarity to the figures on the back of the Brussels Cross reliquary, the Monte Cassino zoo-anthropomorphs also confirm Judith’s devotion to Christ and the relic of the cross. In myriad ways, these beast figures provided visual cues to assist in her devotion to Christ and the cross. They also demonstrated her familiarity and affinity with two royal patronage programs, the contemporary one at Westminster as well as (perhaps) Cnut and Emma’s manuscript patronage program of the previous generation. The zoo-anthropomorphs as well suggest a sense of her personal preferences: Judith was an independent enough patron that she commissioned an unusual—even extraordinary—illustration program for the gospel book intended for her own personal use.
Figure 11.20.1: Brussels Cross, Zoo-anthropomorphc Lion (Detail).

Figure 11.20.2: Brussels Cross, Zoo-anthropomorphc Calf (Detail).

Figure 11.20.3: Brussels Cross, Zoo-anthropomorphc Eagle (Detail).

Figures used by Permission of the Medieval North Atlantic On-line Archive, courtesy of Christopher R. Fee, James Rutkowski, and Gettysburg College.
Conclusion

Through their distinctive illustration programs and deluxe workmanship, the three gospel books made entirely in England announced Judith’s wealth and social status as well as her piety. The Monte Cassino book’s jeweled cover is now missing, but Judith’s personal gospel book originally had a treasure cover like those still on the Morgan books. The gold used in the capital letters and in the illustration programs of all the volumes marks them as precious display objects. There can be no doubt that Judith was genuinely pious, and the books represent that faith; in their material splendor, they also represent her more secular desire to proclaim her elite status as literate, sophisticated, and affluent.

In a striking act of cultural transition between aristocratic women, Judith later gave her personal gospel book to Empress Agnes, who then presented it to Monte Cassino, where it is today. The gift of the book implied a plethora of symbolic meanings: religious, diplomatic, aesthetic, and personal. Like any political exchange, the gift of the book assumed a bond between the women as well as a debt of some sort from Agnes to Judith. Financially, it implied that Judith was wealthy enough to commission such a book and then simply give it away. Such symbolic meanings were crucial as Judith left England in November of 1065. The books and other treasures that she took with her as she returned to Flanders declared that she was an important figure in the mid-eleventh century political theater of northern Europe, despite possible interpretation of her position as that of simply a refugee with a disempowered husband. Opulent and luxurious in their display of piety, the three gospel books completed in England were an important part of her assertion of status and power as the Northern Rebellion forced Judith to manage substantial change in her position and fortune.

Judith’s gospel books survived in European collections when potential equivalent artifacts from England did not survive the Norman Conquest and the English Reformation—so we have evidence of Judith’s patronage, evidence that probably existed but is now largely missing, for the patronage practices of other secular noblewomen. For example, Judith’s mother-in-law Gytha and her sister-in-law Gunnhild both bequeathed manuscripts to European monasteries, but records of these gifts again are extant because they are continental rather than English. Goda, sister of Edward the Confessor, supposedly gave at least one treasure gospel book to Rochester in the mid-eleventh century. We have hints and references...
like these, but very little other remaining evidence of what was probably a vibrant culture of wealthy women in Anglo-Saxon England as well as on the continent commissioning deluxe books and objects to proclaim their own and their families’ cultural and social status. Judith and her books thus indicate the ways that stylistic preference, personal piety, great wealth, and luxurious display intersected to provide a highly personalized means of religious, aesthetic, and cultural expression.

NOTES

1 New York, Pierpont Morgan Library, MS M.708; New York, Pierpont Morgan Library MS M.709; and Monte Cassino, Archivio della Badia, Cod. 437. In Ohlgren, Anglo-Saxon Textual Illustration, these manuscripts are numbers 11, 12, and 13. A fourth gospel book was copied in England but not illustrated there (Fulda, Hessische Landesbibliothek, Cod. Aa.21); it was illustrated by a Flemish artist soon after her arrival in Bruges in 1065.

2 A number of scholars erroneously refer to Judith as “Countess Judith of Flanders,” but she was a daughter, not a wife, of the Count of Flanders, and so was never a countess.

3 The name “Eleanor” is attributed only in an early modern source, although a number of family trees now present it as definitive. The identification of Judith’s mother (as an unnamed daughter of Richard II of Normandy) and father is provided in the Gesta Normannorum Ducum, a near-contemporary source. See Van Houts, Gesta Normannorum Ducum, 2:28–29. The Vita Æwardi, a contemporary source, identifies Judith as the “sister” of Baldwin V, with the obvious implication that she is the daughter of Baldwin IV. See Barlow, Life of King Edward, 38–39 and 39n91.

4 See Nicholas, Medieval Flanders, 48–49.

5 Various sources refer to Judith as the daughter, rather than the half-sister, of Baldwin V. He was certainly old enough to be her father, and she was probably about the same age as Baldwin V’s daughter Matilda, who married William the Conqueror. See note 3 above as well as McGurk and Rosenthal, “Anglo-Saxon Gospelbooks of Judith,” at 251n1, for discussion of the evidence showing Judith to be the daughter of Baldwin IV and half-sister of Baldwin V.

6 See the various versions of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle entries for 1051 and 1052; Katherine O’Brien O’Keeffe has demonstrated the anti-Godwin bias of MS C in her edition, Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, xc–xci. The Vita Æwardi is wholly biased towards the Godwins; see Barlow, Life of King Edward, 28–39. For analysis of the various versions of the events, see Barlow, The Godwins, esp. 56–65.

7 Barlow, Life of King Edward, 38–39.

8 Some historians have asserted that the marriage took place during the exile (see, for example, Tanner, Families, Friends, and Allies); it seems highly unlikely,
however, that Baldwin would have married his half-sister to the middle son of a currently dispossessed earl. Grierson follows similar logic in “Relations between England and Flanders,” 100.

9 As noted in MS C of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle for 1052, *bet was on one Monandæg æfter Sancta Marian measse bet Godwine mid his scipum to Sudgeweorce becom.* I am indebted to John W. Briggs for informing me that feast of Mary’s Assumption (August 15) fell on a Saturday in 1052, while the feast of the Nativity of Mary, September 8, fell on a Tuesday. Briggs notes that mentioning “the Monday after” a Saturday seems sensible, while “the Monday after” a Tuesday seems disjointed, so the *Sancta Marian measse* in question is most likely the Assumption.

10 See Barlow, *The Godwins,* 77–78, for discussion of the scant but intriguing evidence about Harold and Edith Swan-Neck.


12 G. P. Cubbin has noted the “northern interest” of MS D of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, which lists “Tostig 7 his wif, Baldwines maege” (Tostig and his wife, Baldwin’s kinswoman) in the group that left England with Godwin in 1051, and states that in 1061 “se eorl Tostig 7 his wif ecforon to Rome” (the earl Tostig and his wife also travelled to Rome); see Cubbin, Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, lvi–lvii, 71, and 76.

13 See Barlow, *Life of King Edward,* for a contemporary, if biased, account of the Roman journey, 52–57.

14 Ortenberg, *English Church and the Continent,* 132; see also her “Archbishop Sigeric’s Journey to Rome in 990,” 204.


18 Raine, “Vita Oswini,” chapter 6, 8–20. However, Paul Anthony Hayward has argued convincingly that much of this text, including the Judith episode, is a forgery: see “Sanctity and Lordship in Twelfth-Century England.” Even though the episode is not genuine, the text relies for its plausibility on an institutional memory of Judith as a generous patron.

19 An inscription in a much less ornate gospel book could suggest such a set of books owned by a woman: Mark Jonathan Faulkner has noted that the inscription “Textus de ecclesia Roffensi per Godam comitissam. III” at the bottom of fol. 9 of London, British Library, MS Royal 1 D iii could mean that Goda had given three books rather than just the one to Rochester; see Faulkner, “Uses of Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts.”


The Evangelist Symbols in the Judith of Flanders Gospels

22 Manuscript D of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle gives the most detailed account of Siward’s death; see Cubbin, Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, 74.
25 Full property descriptions and indices available in Williams and Martin, Domesday Book. For properties sorted and valued by owner, see appendix 1 of Clarke, English Nobility under Edward the Confessor, 191–94.
26 Fleming, Kings and Lords in Conquest England, 71.
28 Clarke, English Nobility under Edward the Confessor, 24–25.
29 Ibid., 24.
30 Ibid., appendix 1.
31 These premier holdings of Tostig’s seem to have been plum prizes for the Normans after the Conquest. At Holdenhurst in Hampshire, Bayford in Hertfordshire, and at Bloxham-and-Adderbury in Oxfordshire, William kept the manors and their lands for himself. In Buckinghamshire, Archbishop Lanfranc held Haddenham, while William’s niece Judith held Potton and its associated lands in Bedfordshire (this Judith is often confused with Judith of Flanders in historiography, but Judith of Flanders is not named in Domesday as having held any land). See Williams and Martin, Domesday Book, as well as Keats-Rohan and Thornton, Domesday Names.
32 The manors of Holdenhurst and Winkton are listed in Williams and Martin, Domesday Book, 92 and 116.
34 Letter from Francis Wormald to Meta Harrsen (Keeper of Manuscripts at the Morgan Library), Morgan Library in-house file on MS 709.
37 Ibid.
40 McGurk and Rosenthal, “Anglo-Saxon Gospelbooks of Judith,” 273. In a similar vein, the “Hereford Gospels,” Cambridge, Pembroke College, MS 302, may also have been made as a private devotional manual rather than a liturgical book; see Teviotdale, “Pembroke College, 302.”
42 Temple, Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts, 112.
43 As Temple describes them: “full or half ‘Winchester’ frames of two burnished gold bands supporting pink and blue to green foliage on black ground; they have large corner rosettes and median medallions containing various ornamental motifs” in Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts, 109.
44 Ibid., 110.
45 Morgan M.708’s John does not have any decoration at the base of the border columns.


48 This is previously unremarked upon in scholarly literature.

49 Jerome, *Adversus Jovinianum* 1 (PL 23:0248A); for a translation, see http://www.ccel.org/ccel/schaff/npnf206.vi.vi.i.html (accessed February 14, 2013). I am indebted to Stephen J. Harris for his advice and assistance concerning the Latin texts.

50 Lapidge, *Anglo-Saxon Library*, 313.


53 Ohlgren, *Anglo-Saxon Textual Illustration*, 73.

54 Temple, *Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts*, 112.


56 For reproduction of this mosaic, see http://www.flickr.com/photos/hen-magonza/7500355132/ (accessed March 24, 2016).

57 See Brown, *Book of Cerne*, chapter 4, which includes a comprehensive catalog of Insular evangelist images (pp. 88–103) that provides full descriptions of the evangelist symbols in the Barberini Gospels (Vatican, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, MS Barb. lat. 570; Brown no. 12), the Book of Kells (Dublin, Trinity College Library, MS 58; Brown no. 27), and the Maeseyck Gospels (Maeseyck, Church of St. Catherine, Treasury, s.n., fols. 1r–5v; Brown no. 7). London, British Library, MS Additional 40618, a late eighth-century book with tenth-century additions, also includes a zoo-anthropomorphic calf that is not stylistically related to the Monte Cassino figures.

58 See Morey et al., “Gospel-Book of Landevennec (the Harkness Gospels).” Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Auct D.2.16 is another gospel book from Landevennec with zoo-anthropomorphic evangelists; images are available at “Early Manuscripts at Oxford University” http://image.ox.ac.uk/show?collection=bodleian&manuscript=msauctd216 (accessed March 17, 2016). Folio 71v is especially representative of the lack of stylistic relationship between these manuscripts and Monte Cassino 437.

59 Cambridge, Trinity College, MS B.10.4.

60 Reliquary Cross, Brussels, Cathedral of S Michel. Description and discussion in Backhouse et al., *Golden Age of Anglo-Saxon Art*, 90–92. Much recent work on the Brussels Cross has focused on its inscription, which is textually related to both the *Dream of the Rood* and the *Ruthwell Cross Crucifixion Poem*. See discussion in Ó Carragáin, *Ritual and the Rood*, as well as chapter 5 of Karkov, *Art of Anglo-Saxon England* and Chaganti, “Vestigial Signs.” Another
zoo-anthropomorphic evangelist symbol in the corpus of Anglo-Saxon metalwork is the eagle-headed figure on the object known as the Brandon Plaque, which is an early-ninth-century engraved and inlaid square of gold. The differences between the Brandon eagle-figure and those in Trinity, Monte Cassino, and Brussels, however, are substantial enough to discount it in this discussion of zoo-anthropomorphic evangelist symbols. Note, for example, the Brandon Plaque figure's lack of wings, its pen and books (rather than scroll), and the style of the garments. For more information about the Brandon Plaque, consult the British Museum searchable collection online, http://www.britishmuseum.org/research/collection_online/collection_object_details.aspx?objectId=84963&partId=1&images=true, accessed March 17, 2016.

61 Glunz, History of the Vulgate in England, xvi, states that B.10.4 has “definite characteristics” of the Winchester school. See also Temple, Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts, 83–84; Ohlgren, Anglo-Saxon Textual Illustration, 5; Dodwell, Canterbury School of Illumination, 10.

62 Heslop, “Production of De Luxe Manuscripts,” at 156.


64 Ibid., 268.


66 See Barlow, Life of King Edward, for Edward’s patronage of Westminster, 8–10 and 110–15.

67 The loss is discussed in Newton’s The Scriptorium and Library at Monte Cassino, chapter 7, “Books Presented to the Abbey,” 240.

68 Ibid., 233–40.


70 The book, now missing its medieval treasure cover and binding, is London, British Library MS Royal 1 D iii. Mark Jonathan Faulkner calls it “rather wretched” in his discussion of Rochester’s ownership of the manuscript; see “The Uses of Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts,” 65.
Bibliography

Manuscripts
Fulda, Hessische Landesbibliothek, Cod. Aa.21
Monte Cassino, Archivio della Badia, Cod. 437
New York, Pierpont Morgan Library, MS M.708
New York, Pierpont Morgan Library, MS M.709

Cited Sources


Mary Dockray-Miller is Professor of English in the humanities department of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences at Lesley University. She has edited the *Wilton Chronicle* (Brepols, 2009) and is the author of *The Books and the Life of Judith of Flanders* (Ashgate, 2015), *Motherhood and Mothering in Anglo-Saxon England* (St Martin’s, 2000), as well as numerous articles about women’s literary production and gendered performance in the English Middle Ages.