

An unfinished *mappa mundi* from late-eleventh-century Worcester

MARTIN K. FOYS

ABSTRACT

This article discusses the unfinished *mappa mundi* found in Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 265, dates it to a late-eleventh-century (c. 1065–95) production in Worcester, identifying it as a nearly exact and earlier analogue of two later twelfth-century English maps of the world from the Ramsey area (Oxford, St John’s College 17 and London, British Library, Harley 3667). Contained as it is in a collection of Wulfstanian materials, the Worcester map’s relationship to these so-called ‘Bryhtferthian’ maps requires a rethinking of how such maps may have circulated and functioned outside of a computistical context. The close connections between these three maps further point to a unique, late Anglo-Saxon tradition of *mappae mundi* thus far unrecognized.

The incomplete map on page 210 of Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 265 (Worcester, s. xi^{med} – xi², xi^{ex} – xiiⁱⁿ)¹ has been known for almost a century – in his 1912 catalogue, M. R. James first records it as ‘a rudiment of a map’, while

¹ M. R. James, *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge*, 2 vols. (Cambridge, 1912) II, 14–21 (at 16), notes that the old pagination of CCC 265 is incorrect, but continues to be used. The layers of dating for CCC 265 are complicated and particularly important for the discussion of this *mappa mundi*. The first four sections (pp. 1–363) of the manuscript comprise an example of Wulfstan’s ‘Commonplace Book’, and were written by several scribes in stages at Worcester throughout the second half of the eleventh century, with specific additions of contemporary references to Bishop Wulfstan II of Worcester datable between 1062 and 1095. Section 5 (pp. 368–442) likely comes considerably later, as it is written in a Proto-Gothic minuscule, in marked contrast to the consistent Anglo-Caroline Style IV and Anglo-Saxon minuscule that precedes it. In addition, this manuscript is annotated in a late-eleventh-century hand, possibly that of Coleman. The most thorough discussions of the dating, contents and material aspects of CCC 265 remain James, *A Descriptive Catalogue* II, 14–21; and M. Budny, *Insular Anglo-Saxon and Early Anglo-Norman Manuscript Art at Corpus Christi College, Cambridge; an Illustrated Catalogue*, 2 vols. (Kalamazoo, MI, 1997) I, 599–608, and II, pl. 553. See also N. R. Ker, *Catalogue of Manuscripts Containing Anglo-Saxon* (Oxford, 1957), pp. 92–4, and *idem*, ‘Old English Notes Signed by “Coleman”’, in his *Books, Collectors and Libraries: Studies in the Medieval Heritage*, ed. A. G. Watson (London, 1985), pp. 27–30 (at 29). For specific discussions and cataloguing of the contents of the manuscript, see M. Bateson, ‘A Worcester Cathedral Book of Ecclesiastic Collections’, *EHR* 10 (1895), 712–31; H. Sauer, ‘The Transmission and Structure of Archbishop Wulfstan’s “Commonplace Book”’, *Old English Prose, Basic Readings*, ed. P. Szarmach (New York, 2000), pp. 339–93, esp. 377; *Wulfstan’s Canon Law Collection*, ed. J. E. Cross and A. Hamer (Woodbridge, 1999), pp. 41–8; Helmut Gneuss, *Handlist of Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts: a List of Manuscripts and Manuscript Fragments Written or Owned in England up to 1100*, *Med. and Renaissance Texts and Stud.* 241 (Tempe AZ, 2001), 35 (item 73).

more recently M. Budny describes it as a ‘diagrammatic map of the world, incomplete’ (pl. I).² The map’s unassuming and unfinished nature likely explains why it never has been identified, or placed within the context of early English mapmaking to which it belongs; after all, what is the point of studying a map that is barely there in the first place?³ As J. B. Harley remarks in reference to more modern cartography, though, the silences of a map often have as much to say as the explicitly known or the obviously represented.⁴

The map in CCCC 265 in all probability dates from 1065–95, with a likely date closer to 1090, and stands as a nearly exact and earlier analogue of two twelfth-century English maps of the world, Oxford, St John’s College 17 (Thorney, *c.* 1110), 6r (pl. II), and London, British Library, Harley 3667 (Peterborough, *c.* 1120), 8v (pl. III).⁵ Given their shared attributes (discussed below), these maps will be referred to together as ‘Mission T-O’ maps. The earlier date of the CCCC 265 map, taken together with an overview of the content of the other Mission T-O maps at Peterborough and Thorney, point to a unique, late Anglo-Saxon tradition of *mappae mundi* thus far unrecognized.

DESCRIPTION OF THE CCCC 265 MAP

The map occurs on p. 210 (old pagination), on the verso of the first folio of the fourteenth quire, the folio that also begins the second section of the man-

² James, *A Descriptive Catalogue* II, 20, also provides a rough transcription of the map; Budny, *Insular Anglo-Saxon* I, 606–7 and 608, contains a brief description of the map’s design and text. M. Destombes, *Mappemondes, A.D. 1200–1500, Catalogue préparé par la Commission des Cartes Anciennes de l’Union Géographique Internationale* (Amsterdam, 1964), p. 33, also list this map, but with a twelfth-century date.

³ As I was writing this article, it came to my attention that Loredana Teresi had begun work on this map at the same time as the work presented here, albeit in the larger context of a general survey of extant Anglo-Saxon *mappae mundi*. See her ‘Graphic and Conceptual Representations of the Earth in Anglo-Saxon and Early Norman England: Mappaemundi and their Contexts’, *Mediaevalia Groningana*, ed. R. Bremmer and C. Dekker (Leuven, forthcoming).

⁴ J. B. Harley, ‘Silences and Secrecy: the Hidden Agenda of Cartography in Early Modern Europe’, in his *The New Nature of Maps: Essays in the History of Cartography*, ed. P. Laxton (Baltimore, MD, 2001), pp. 83–108.

⁵ The Harley 3667 map remains relatively obscure and undiscussed, while the JCO 17 map, because of a possible (but by no means certain) connection to Bryhtferth, has seen more discussion. For brief discussions of both maps, see F. Wallis, ‘MS Oxford St. John’s College 17, a Mediaeval Manuscript in its Context’, (unpubl. PhD dissertation, Univ. of Toronto, 1985), pp. 219–23, 243, 655, 686–7 and 801; for the map in JCO 17, see K. Miller, *Mappaemundi: die ältesten Weltkarten*, 6 vols. (Stuttgart, 1898) III, 118, *Bryhtferth’s Enchiridion*, ed. P. Baker and M. Lapidge, EETS ss 15 (London, 1995), lviii and 373; E. Edson, ‘World Maps and Easter Tables: Medieval Maps in Context’, *Imago Mundi* 48 (1996), 25–42 (at 35–7); and Edson’s *Mapping Time and Space: How Medieval Mapmakers Viewed Their World* (London, 1997), pp. 86–95. Curiously, the *summa*-like *History of Cartography in Prehistoric, Ancient, and Medieval Europe and the Mediterranean*, ed. J. B. Harley and D. Woodward (Chicago, 1987), does not discuss or list either of these maps.

uscript.⁶ Pages 209–10 of this quire were originally left blank. A contemporary (late-eleventh-century) insertion to the formula for excommunication found on p. 211 now fills the top of p. 209, the page before the map, while the bottom of this page contains a twelfth-century insertion for the absolution formula on p. 215. Both insertions contain congruent *signes-de-renvoi* to indicate the point of insertion. There is nothing else on p. 210 other than the map.

Though it has little inked content, the map contains drypointing that suggests a much grander design. Drypointing reveals a plan of one central circle, bordered by three bands, and two upper rimmed roundels, which intersect the top right and left of the central circle, respectively.⁷ All circular figures have been drypointed by compass, while other lines and figures have been drawn freehand. While the inscriptions generally sit on, or levelly between, the original ruling of the page, and follow the drawing of basic lines and figures,⁸ the awkward management of textual layout implies that this map was a hasty and/or casual copy of an exemplar.⁹

The CCC 265 map has true orientation, that is, with the east at the top. Four rows of text, or approximately the top quarter of the central map, has been completed, and the script is a mixture of Rustic capitals and late Anglo-Caroline minuscule. The first row of text, *ASIA MAIOR*, uses Rustic capitals; the second line below, *Quod sunt septuaginta duae gentes ortae*, minuscule. Next to this line, a double-lined bracket frames the inscription *Achaia sc̄s Andreas*. The

⁶ Budny, *Insular Anglo-Saxon* I, p. 601.

⁷ The central circle has an inner diameter of 113 mm. The inner band measures 3 mm in width, the central band, 6 mm, and the outer band, 3 mm, for an outer diameter of 137 mm. The upper roundels have an inner diameter of 27 mm, with the bordering rims measuring 2 mm, for an outer diameter of 31 mm. The circumferences of the top roundels are inconsistently done. The left one appears correct in execution, with the inner circle running flush with the outer circle of the main map. The right medallion appears off its alignment, with both inner and outer circles running into the outer band of the map circle.

⁸ Cf. Harley and Woodward, *History of Cartography*, p. 325.

⁹ As an unfinished work, the map also provides a window into the process of its composition, and reveals an inconsistent and likely hurried execution. The scribe started his drafting by compass drypointing the major outlines of the map. He then began his writing at the top, adding *Asia Maior* in Rustic capital display script, following the original ruling, and circling the inscription, roughly matching the arc of the dry line. Working downwards section by section, the scribe then drew lines and figures before inscriptions. For example, he first draws the bracket for St Andreas, and then two inscriptions on the line, and, as the inscription to the left was poorly spaced out, *-es ortae* then had to be squeezed in above the main line. The scribe also appears to first drypoint some of his figures, but then not follow his own work closely, as the offset boxes for *Cili-* and *Casaria* . . . indicate. The rubbed out letter in the inscription for *Cilicia* appears to be an 'a', where a 'c' should follow – the scribe here probably jumped ahead to the final 'ia' of the word. Intriguingly, the same inscription in Harley 3667 is also spelled differently, but instead as *Cilicia*. As the mistake in CCC 265 is erased but not corrected, it is quite conceivable that this is the last action the scribe took on this map.

third line contains more display script: *DE SEM GENTES ·XXVII·*, and the fourth line contains in minuscule an incomplete and misspelled place-name, partly erased (*Cilicia*), the inscription *Caesaria-hic Petrus predicavit*, and an unfinished representation of Noah's ark (with no inscription). A drypointed rectangle below the ark indicates a space for another inscription, likely *Babilonia*.¹⁰

The missing content of the rest of the map may be easily surmised by comparison to the close (and in the case of Harley 3667, nearly exact) parallels of its later analogues. However, neither Harley 3667 nor JCO 17 contains the upper roundels outlined in drypoint in CCCC 265. As the CCCC 265 map does not appear to have been a carefully executed or especially innovative project,¹¹ the rimmed roundels here probably point instead to a more elaborate exemplar than previously known, and also to a layout unique in medieval cartography.¹²

CONTENT AND SOURCES OF MISSION T-O MAPS

The existence of complete and nearly exact analogues to the scheme of the CCCC 265 map permits a fuller discussion of possible sources for the earlier work. In both content and cartographic design, the maps in CCCC 265, JCO 17 and Harley 3667 comprise a tradition unattested anywhere else in medieval mapmaking. These maps adopt a modified T-O and 'list' form, with broad, diagrammatic bars to represent the Mediterranean, Don and Nile, but shift the titles for Asia, Africa and Europe from their traditional placement – most notably, in the complete maps, the text *EUROPA* runs across the bar of the Mediterranean.¹³ While no sure source or map tradition has been yet identified

¹⁰ Attested in JCO 17 and Harley 3667 analogues.

¹¹ See above. In contrast to the JCO 17 version, which exhibits substantial stylistic differences from the other two analogues, and to Harley 3667, which was written in polychrome, the text and layout of CCCC 265 is simple in adornment and monochromatic.

¹² The intended content of the rimmed roundels remains a mystery; thus far, I have been able to find no example of a *mappa mundi*, from any period, that has similar roundels. Many early medieval maps integrate roundels or *rotae* into a main circular design (e.g. *rotae* for the twelve winds or computistical and/or tidal data, roundels for islands, cardinal points or the four evangelists, or simply empty figures symmetrically dispersed throughout the design), but none even remotely parallel the two-roundel design of CCCC 265, or clearly suggest the projected content. Possibilities for content range widely, from the sun and the moon in a computistical mode to any of a number of Old and New Testament figures in a scriptural mode. For comparison, see Edson, *Mapping Time and Space*, figs. 1.3, 3.2, 4.2, 4.4 and 5.5, and Harley and Woodward, *History of Cartography*, figs. 18.26, 18.33, 18.38, 18.47, 18.53, 18.61 and 18.74.

¹³ The T-O design ultimately derives from an early version of an Isidorean map. Influenced by, and perhaps originally designed to illustrate geographical sections of Isidore of Seville's early-seventh-century *Etymologiae* and *De natura rerum*, such maps (which continue to be reproduced in their early formats well into the fifteenth century) generally display a geometric layout of the world, surrounded by a ring of ocean, with Asia occupying the top, eastern half, Europe and Africa splitting the bottom, western half, and the waters of the Don river, Nile river and

for the specific layout of this type of map,¹⁴ the form does bear a distant resemblance to T-O maps of the Sallust family.¹⁵ Some of the geography in these maps appears quite jumbled; Carthage Magna, for instance, appears in north-west Europe, while another Carthage (New Carthage?) occurs in the Middle East, next to Palestine and Jericho. Armenia occurs in the extreme southeast of Asia, while England and Ireland are located outside the northeast quadrant, in what would be northern Eurasia.¹⁶ In the Harley 3667 and JCO 17 versions, Greek and Latin inscriptions run along the outer circumference, marking the cardinal directions, and an inscription for Jerusalem fills the centre bar.¹⁷

Mappae mundi often serve as anthologies of both time and space, collapsing diachronic representations of geography and history into a single synchronic plane, and this map model is no exception.¹⁸ Along with some vestiges of an earlier Roman tradition (for example, the inclusion of *Tiber flumen*, *mons Ethna* and *Tuscia*), these maps contain some other standard medieval cartographic fare: Noah's sons and ark, tribes of Israel, the crucifixion of Christ, and major biblical cities, sites and rivers.¹⁹ More strikingly, though, they also possess a block of thematic content unattested elsewhere, in four inscriptions which identify the preaching zones of specific saints: Andrew in Achaia, Peter in Caesaria, Paul in Athens and John in Ephesus.

The earliest T-O maps, from Isidore's *Etymologiae*, also related the biblical divisions of peoples as descended from Noah's three sons, Shem (Asia),

the Mediterranean dividing the land masses. List maps have a similar form, but include quasi-geographical lists of place-names derived from various literary sources, including the Bible, patristic commentaries, and classical geographies such as Sallust, Lucan and Orosius. For overviews of this cartographic type, see Edson, *Mapping Time and Space*, pp. 2–6, and Harley and Woodward, *History of Cartography*, pp. 343–53.

¹⁴ Previously suggested analogues, such as Edson's consideration (pp. 92–4) of the Arnstein Bible (London, British Library, Harley 2799 (Germany, s. xii), 241v) and Baker and Lapidge's reference (*Bryhtferth's Enchiridion*, p. 373) to the map of Jerusalem in London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius E. IV (Winchcombe, s. xii), 143r, should not be considered as closely related to this map in any way.

¹⁵ For discussion and examples of maps included in medieval manuscripts of Sallust's *De bello Jugurthino*, see Edson, *Mapping Time and Space*, pp. 18–21, Harley and Woodward, *History of Cartography*, figs. 18.37, 18.44, 18.46, 18.47 and 18.50, and L. Chekin, *Northern Eurasia in Medieval Cartography* (Turnhout, 2006), pp. 35–57.

¹⁶ The earlier Anglo-Saxon Cotton *mappa mundi* (London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius B. V (s. xi²), 56v) similarly contains doubled inscriptions of Carthage, though both are labelled *Cartago Magna*.

¹⁷ The first letter of each of the Greek names for the cardinal directions, when given in the order of the sign of the cross, spell *ADAM* (*Anatbole, Disis, Arcton and Mesembria*). Such a formula follows Honorius Augustodunensis's *Imago mundi*, sec. 93, *De plagis: plage Grece dicuntur Anathole Disis Arcton Mesembria de quibus nomen ADAM qui est minor mundus componitur*. See also Wallis, p. 221, for connections to Augustine's *Tractatus in Johannem*.

¹⁸ See M. Foy, 'The Virtual Reality of the Anglo-Saxon *Mappamundi?*, *Literature Compass* 1 (2004): ME 016, 1–14; Edson, *Mapping Time and Space*, pp. 132–44.

¹⁹ In this traditional content, the map may also be connected to the mode of English *mappa mundi* to which the earlier Cotton map, and the later Hereford map belong.

Japheth (Europe) and Ham (Africa).²⁰ The particular text of the Mission T-O maps, however, suggests a more active and perhaps contemporary consultation with Isidorean writings, perhaps in an effort to align the map and the textual tradition out of which it arises. The inscription *Quod sunt septuaginta duae gentes ortae*, which in all maps occurs under *Asia Maior* but should probably be considered the rubric inscription for the whole of the map, derives from Isidore, but not from his *Etymologiae*. Instead the phrase matches almost precisely text both from Isidore's *Chronicon* and his *Quaestiones in Veterum Testamentum*; in both sources Isidore concisely summarizes Augustine's reckoning of seventy-two nations descending from Noah's offspring.²¹

No such ready source explains the inclusion of SS John, Peter, Paul and Andrew, and their 'mission fields' – the regions where they were known to preach; a s. xi^{ex}–xii^{inc} map of French provenance does contain a similar formulae for four apostles, including Andreas, but with no exact parallels.²² Conceivably, the inclusion of these four saints may be inspired by the layout of the Beatus family of maps, maps designed to illustrate the late-eighth-century author's commentary on the Apocalypse, fourteen of which survive today;²³ but scant evidence exists for this kind of map having been known in Anglo-Saxon England,²⁴ and the assignation of saints to territories here substantially differs from the Beatus maps.²⁵ It is possible, given the Greek locations of all

²⁰ See Gen. X. Simple T–O maps commonly occur as illustrations for Isidore's *De natura rerum*. For examples of Isidorean maps, see Harley and Woodward, *History of Cartography*, pp. 301–4 and figs. 18.11, 18.12, 18.13, 18.14 and 18.43.

²¹ *Chronicon*: PL 83 1021A 6. [2242]: 'Fuerunt autem Noe filii tres, ex quibus septuaginta duae gentes sunt ortae, id est, quindecim de Jepheth, triginta de Cham, viginti septem de Sem.' Cf. *Quaestiones in Veterum Testamentum*: PL 83 237B.14: 'Benedictis igitur duobus filiis Noe, atque uno eorum medio maledicto, deinceps generationes eorum texuntur, ex quibus septuaginta duae gentes sunt ortae, id est, quindecim de Japheth, triginta de Cham, viginti septem de Sem'; this argument ultimately derives from Augustine's discussion of the calculation of nations descended from Noah's sons, in bk XVI of *De civitate Dei*.

²² Phrase is Edson's, *Mapping Time*, p. 153. The Sallust map in Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Reg. Lat 571-V, 71v (France, s.xi^{ex}–xii^{inc}) has little in common with the English maps in form or content, beyond four saints' inscriptions using the 'predicavit' formula for Andreas (no region indicated, but placed in northeast Asia), Bartholomew (India), Thomas (India, also) and Jacob (no region indicated, but placed in western Europe, near Spain). See Chekin, *Northern Eurasia*, pp. 44–5 and pl. II.5.

²³ J. Williams, 'Isidore, Orosius, and the Beatus Map', *Imago Mundi* 49 (1997), 7–32; see also Edson, *Mapping Time*, 149–59; and Harley and Woodward, *History of Cartography*, pp. 303–4.

²⁴ The only Beatus map with an English provenance is Manchester, John Rylands University Library, Lat. 8, 43v–44 (Destombes), which dates to the close of the twelfth century.

²⁵ In his commentary on saint's missionary areas, Beatus works from Isidore's *De ortu et obitu partum*; see PL: Caput LXXXI, section 141: 'Petrus namque Romam accepit, Andreas Achaiam, Jacobus Hispaniam, Joannes Asiam, Thomas Indianam, Matthaues Macedoniam, Philippus Galliam, Bartholomaeus Lycaoniam, Simon Zelotes Aegyptum, Mathias Judaeam, Jacobus frater Domini Jerosolymam, Judas frater Jacobi Mesopotamiam.' Cf. Williams, 'Isidore', pp. 7–8.

four saints (and the Greek text on the later redactions of the map), that this map also then derives from an eastern family of maps, a derivation that might also explain the geographic confusion of some of the layout.²⁶ On the basis of the maps' basic schema, their four mission regions, and use of Isidore, all that may be concluded with certainty at present is that the makers of these maps' exemplar selectively modified the standard Isidorean model of T-O maps, and integrated into this revised structure an as yet unidentified apostolic discourse. Medieval cartography has been a representational form generally viewed as unencumbered by the excitement of innovation and change;²⁷ these Mission T-O maps stand in sharp contrast to this view, and in their form point to a high degree of experimentation and adaptation.

PROVENANCE AND DATING

We have no reason to doubt that the map in CCCC 265 was drawn at Worcester, as the manuscript has a sure Worcester provenance throughout its history,²⁸ and as the hand of the map formally relates to other hands in the manuscript. Dating the map, however, is a far more complicated issue. The map's location on an originally blank folio at the beginning of a new quire and new section of the manuscript suggest, at the very least, that the map was not part of the original plan of the manuscript, an idea supported by the fact that the map displays no explicit or discernable connection to the texts surrounding it, or indeed to any material in any part of the manuscript.²⁹ Further, the sections following the map (sections 2–5, pp. 209–442) were written in stages, with section 5 (pp. 368–442) perhaps written as late as S. xiii;³⁰ as evidenced by

²⁶ Cf. A. von den Brinken, 'Gyrus und Spera: Relikte griechische Geographie im Weltbild der Frühscholastik', *Sudhoff's Archiv* 73 (1989), 129–44 (at 143), who analyses the JCO 17 map and discusses the possibility that the map derives from a Greek source with a northern orientation, and that a later shift to true orientation could account for the muddled geography. However, see also below, n. 51.

²⁷ See, for instance, Harley and Woodward, *History of Cartography*, who write that the maps of the Beatus tradition 'provide perhaps the only spark of innovation' in the history of medieval mapmaking (p. 303).

²⁸ CCCC 265 remained at Worcester until the sixteenth century, when it was obtained by Matthew Parker and annotated by John Joscelyn. Joscelyn's annotations match references to a Worcester manuscript in Parker's *Testimonie of Antiquity*; see Ker, *Catalogue*, p. 94.

²⁹ Before the map, at the end of the previous section, the manuscript contains *ordines* for baptism and mass (pp. 180–98) and then miscellaneous extracts from Church Fathers (pp. 199–208). After the map, the second section of the manuscript contains formulae for baptism, absolution and excommunication (pp. 211–15, with two insertions on p. 209), and then a version of the Laws of King Edgar (pp. 216–27), an *ordo* for the consecration of chrism (pp. 228–31), followed by five blank pages (pp. 232–6). No material here or elsewhere in the manuscript suggests a clear thematic or utilitarian reason for the inclusion of the map.

³⁰ Ker, *Catalogue*, p. 94; Budny, *Insular Anglo-Saxon* I, 602.

the Proto-Gothic formula insertion before the map on p. 209, the second section of the manuscript continued to be annotated well into the middle of the twelfth century. On the basis of structural evidence, therefore, the map could have been added at any point after its section (pp. 209–36) was begun, either in the late eleventh century, or even into the twelfth century.

At first glance, the script of the map does little to help resolve the issue. While both the display and minuscule script should be regarded as closer in form to the Anglo-Caroline styles employed throughout the first part of this manuscript than to the Proto-Gothic added to the bottom of p. 209 and elsewhere, the *ductus* of the minuscule is rather compressed, and possibly compromises or obscures the specific style of the hand.³¹ The long ‘d’ in *Andreas* further complicates matters, as such characters could indicate a distinctively twelfth-century date, or, at the very least, a late transitional hand past 1100. Budny suggests, without discussion, that the map could be the work of the scribe who wrote the excommunication formula on the facing page, but such identification remains tentative.³²

Fortunately, the relatively small sample available within the text of the map does contain enough distinguishing evidence to suggest a pre-1100 date. Because of the limited amount of existing text, and the compressed *ductus* of the map hand, secure identification with any of the other hands in the manuscript remains impossible. But the script does share many of the basic attributes of the mid- to late-eleventh-century Style IV minuscule that was the standard at most major English scriptoria, including footed minims, clubbed ascenders, inward turning h’s and pierced t’s.³³ As such, the hand compares generally to most of the other eleventh-century hands in the manuscript. Further, with regards to specific style and conventions of abbreviation in CCCC 265, the map script compares most favourably to the hand of the main scribe of section four of the manuscript, who writes most if not all, of pp. 269–95.

In *duae*, *ortae* and *Caesaria*, the map scribe employs a looped e-caudata (e) to abbreviate *ae*, a style prevalent within mid-eleventh-century Worcester manu-

³¹ On this matter and others regarding the dating of this script, I am grateful for the consultation and advice of both Peter Stokes and Tessa Weber.

³² Budny, *Insular Anglo-Saxon* I, 608.

³³ For a discussion and description of Anglo-Caroline Minuscule Style IV, see D. Dumville, *English Caroline Script and Monastic History: Studies in Benedictinism, A.D. 950–1030* (Woodbridge, 1993), pp. 128–38; Dumville notes (pp. 136–7) the ‘rather heavy and monumental grade’ of this script in liturgical and paraliturgical texts such as CCCC 265 at Worcester in the late eleventh century. See also T. A. M. Bishop, *English Caroline Minuscule* (Oxford, 1971), pp. xxiii–xxiv and items 24–8. For an example of late, transitional Anglo-Caroline minuscule, see M. Brown, *A Guide to Western Historical Scripts from Antiquity to 1600* (London, 1990), p. 70 and pl. 24; for a discussion and examples of Proto-Gothic script, see Brown, *ibid.*, pp. 72–9.

scripts that sharply contrasts with the more common spurred and hooked forms elsewhere, and appears in the late eleventh century to have been relatively rare outside Worcester.³⁴ In CCC 265, a looped e-caudata is used throughout in the earliest section (pp. 3–208), though hooked or spurred forms do occur more often in later sections, especially at the beginning of words.³⁵ However, the first consistent uses of spurred e-caudata happen in the sections immediately following the map (p. 211), and in the first eleventh-century addition/insertion at the top of p. 209. Later, the main hand of section four (pp. 269–363) applies a mixture of looped and hooked caudata throughout.³⁶

Within Worcester manuscripts, the use of looped e-caudata can be dated almost exclusively in the last quarter of the eleventh century; the form is found in later sections of Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 391 ('Wulfstan's Portiforium', Worcester, s. xi² (1064 × 1069), with later additions), in the Worcester additions to Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 146 ('The Samson Pontifical', Winchester, s. xiⁱⁿ, and Worcester, s. xi² and xi^{ex}), the Alveston Charter (Worcester, 1089) and London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius A. XIII ('Hemming's Cartulary' (pt II), Worcester, c. 1094–6), to cite just a few examples.³⁷ Notably, all of the above manuscripts have been shown to share scribal and stylistic connections with each other, and with CCC 265.³⁸ A

³⁴ The e-caudata came into prominence in England in the tenth century, but by the mid-twelfth century, is replaced by the simple *e*; see B. Bischoff, *Latin Paleography: Antiquity and the Middle Ages*, trans. D. Ó Cróinín and D. Ganz (Cambridge, 1990), p. 122. Based on initial investigations, outside of Worcester, the use of the looped e-caudata appears to have been relatively rare in s. xi² Anglo-Caroline minuscule. E-caudata in the later JCO 17 and Harley 3667 analogues are hooked, or, in some cases, reduced to the simple *e*, suggesting a later stage in the evolution of the inscription.

³⁵ For examples of both forms in CCC 265, see pp. 23 and 158 of the manuscript, respectively.

³⁶ Cf. p. 270, where the scribe uses the looped e-caudata exclusively, and p. 280, where he mixes the form with the more conventional spurred form.

³⁷ In CCC 391, looped e-caudata appears only in a few late sections (e.g. fols. 592–5); in CCC 146, see the later additions on pp. 1–60; the Alveston Charter uses the looped form throughout; pt II of Hemming's Cartulary uses looped forms at times, but with a predominance of spurred forms. For CCC 391, see Budny, *Insular Anglo-Saxon I*, 629–34, and *The Portiforium of Saint Wulfstan*, ed. Dom A. Hughes, 2 vols. (London, 1958–60); for CCC 146, see Budny, *Insular Anglo-Saxon I*, 495–9; for the Alveston Charter, see *Hemingi Chertularium ecclesiae Wigorniensis*, ed. T. Hearne, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1723) II, 418–21, N. R. Ker, 'Hemming's Cartulary: a Description of the Two Worcester Cartularies in Cotton Tiberius A. xiii', in his *Books, Collectors and Libraries: Studies in the Medieval Heritage*, ed. A. G. Watson (London, 1985), pp. 31–59 (at 41). For Hemming's Cartulary, see Ker, 'Hemming's Cartulary', and F. Tinti, 'From Episcopal Conception to Monastic Compilation: Hemming's Cartulary in Context', *EME* 11 (2002), 233–61. Most recently, R. Gameson has assigned pt II of Hemming's Cartulary a date of c. 1096; see his *The Manuscripts of Early Norman England (c.1066–1130)* (Oxford, 1999), p. 102.

³⁸ For CCC entries, see Budny's summaries; for Tiberius A. xiii, see Ker, 'Hemming's Cartulary', p. 41.

scribal connection to Worcester charter writing might also explain the anomalous long *d* in Andreas. Such an Old English form was frequently employed in signature names in eleventh-century charters – albeit more prevalent in early- and mid-eleventh texts, but with some continuation into the last quarter of the century as well.³⁹

The CCCC 265 map contains two other features of note: a curled *us* abbreviation in *Petrus*, and a clean, straight suspension line in *sanctus* and *predicavit*. Though the curled *us* abbreviation becomes much more prevalent in twelfth-century script, it makes appearances in late-eleventh-century Worcester manuscripts and charters as well, and appears frequently in the hand of the main scribe of the fourth section of CCCC 265.⁴⁰ The use of the straight suspension in the map script, while relatively common in late-eleventh-century Worcester hands, is very rare in twelfth-century hands, where the style tends towards bowed, checked and rising suspensions. Again, a number of s.xi^{med} –s.xi² Worcester manuscripts share straight suspensions, including other parts of CCCC 265, Hatton 113 and 114, CCCC 146, CCCC 391 and Tiberius A. xiii.

Scant and compromised though it is, when taken in concert, the palaeographic evidence of the CCCC 265 map indicates a date contemporary to that of the composition of the first part of the manuscript, that is s.xi². Further, the close relation of the hand to that of the main scribe of section four of the manuscript suggests that the map was added while this subsequent section was produced, that is slightly later in the period; the stylistic connections to late charters at Worcester such as Alveston and Hemming's Cartulary suggest a more probable date range of 1085–95. Such dating means that this map would then pre-date the 1110 and 1120 analogues at Thorney and Peterborough, and push back the time that such a map may have been known and circulated in England by two or more decades.

PRELIMINARY CONCLUSIONS

Without the Worcester analogue of CCCC 265, the Peterborough and Thorney versions were understood to be a relatively local cartographic phenomenon; both were made within ten years and only a few miles of each other; and while one map was not copied from the other, evidence in both JCO 17 and Harley 3667 points to a single exemplar from Ramsey for both maps.⁴¹ Given these

³⁹ In Tiberius A. xiii, for example, long *d*'s are found in both pts I and II – see, for instance, for the early hand in 13v 24, *ego Berehtred*, and the late-eleventh-century hand throughout fol. 134. Alternatively, as the long *d* is attested in all three Mission T-O analogues, the *d* here could be a slavish copy of an older Old English exemplar, though this is a matter of pure conjecture.

⁴⁰ See, for example, Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 113 (Worcester, s. xi^{3/4}), pt II of Hemming's Cartulary, and the Alveston Charter.

⁴¹ See Wallis, 'MS Oxford', pp. 692–702, and C. R. Hart, 'The Ramsey *Computus*', *EHR* 85 (1970), 29–44.

two later manuscripts' connection to Bryhtferthian material, some commentators have assumed these maps likewise derived from Bryhtferth's early-eleventh-century computistical materials, though such assumptions should be treated with a high degree of caution.⁴²

An earlier attestation of this map at Worcester does not, of course, disprove the possibility of a Bryhtferthian association; through Bryhtferth, Abbo of Fleury, Bishop Oswald and Bishop Wulfstan II, the eleventh-century locales of Ramsey, Worcester, Peterborough and Thorney stood in a tight network of associations relevant to the production of such a map.⁴³ However, the road between Worcester and Ramsey ran both ways, and, as F. Wallis has noted in regards to the transmission of some scientific materials, at the end of the eleventh century the flow of written materials also ran from western monastic centres *through* Worcester to Ramsey.⁴⁴ Conceivably, a late-eleventh-century attestation of an exemplar of the Mission T-O map at Worcester could illustrate the movement of the exemplar through to Ramsey via Worcester, where one or more copies of an exemplar more ornate than extant ones were made.

This scenario is conjectural, but the notion of the map being at Worcester before Ramsey, and moving eastwards through England, as opposed to westwards, might help explain the one key discrepancy between the JCO 17 map and its analogues. Like the CCCC 265 version, the 1120 Peterborough map in Harley 3667 is relatively unambitious, and likely another hasty copy, quickly executed as part of an initiative to replace materials destroyed in the

⁴² See, for instance, Baker and Lapidge, pp. lviii and 373, who include the Thorney and Peterborough versions of the map among items associated with Bryhtferth's computus; cf. Wallis, 'MS Oxford', pp. 780–802, who considers the map to be thematically connected to Bryhtferth's diagram. Bryhtferth commonly calls attention to figures and charts he has included in his work, but no reference to a map of the world occurs in the surviving text of his *Enchiridion*, nor in the materials thought to have comprised his computus.

⁴³ Bryhtferth studied with Abbo of Fleury at Ramsey in the 980s, and likely learned most of what he knew about computation from him. He also wrote the *vita* of Oswald, bishop of Worcester (961–92) and later concurrently archbishop of York, a figure who himself studied at Fleury before residing at Worcester, and who had founded Ramsey. Bishop Wulfstan II (1062–95) started a lifelong love of manuscripts while a youth at Peterborough. Subsequently, during Wulfstan's primacy, Peterborough and Worcester are known to have trafficked in manuscripts. See R. Gameson, 'Book Production and Decoration at Worcester in the Tenth and Eleventh Centuries', *St Oswald of Worcester: Life and Influence*, ed. N. Brooks and C. Cubitt (Leicester, 1996), pp. 194–243 (at 218, 232–3). In the same volume, see M. Lapidge, 'Bryhtferth and Oswald', pp. 64–83; J. Nightingale 'Oswald, Fleury and Continental Reform', 23–45; and J. Barrow, 'The Community at Worcester, 961–c.1100', pp. 85–99.

⁴⁴ Wallis, 'MS Oxford', p. 693: 'the centre of English abacus studies at the end of the eleventh century was the Severn–Wye valley; thus, if we find the *Ratio regularum abaci* at Worcester, Peterborough and at Thorney, it probably came to Ramsey from Worcester via the same lines of communication as provided, in the reverse direction, Abbonian materials [from Ramsey] for Worcester.'

Peterborough fire of 1117.⁴⁵ In contrast, the 1110 Thorney map in JCO 17 appears much more elaborate in execution, more carefully drawn, with more decorative flourishes and script, and at times perhaps to have been revised.⁴⁶ JCO 17 also contains one major addition that the other two analogues lack: after the inscription *De Sem Gentes . xxvii .*, the Thorney scribe adds *De jafeth*. Until now, the inclusion of Noah's son Japheth away from his traditional cartographic association with Europe has been puzzling, especially as both complete maps represent Cham in his usual location in Africa.⁴⁷ Wallis, however, considers the inclusion of Japheth in the Thorney map as integral to connecting the map to surrounding Bryhtferthian thematic in the manuscript, as the three sons of Noah carried specific symbolic weight in the writings of Bryhtferth.⁴⁸ But the fact that the earlier CCCC 265 does not have the Japheth inscription (along with the later, but utilitarian Harley 3667 version) indicates that the JCO 17 scribe likely added *De jafeth* to make the map better fit the Bryhtferthian and computistical contexts of the manuscript. If this is the case, Japheth in the Thorney redaction should not be considered as evidence for a Bryhtferthian source for the map, but instead as evidence of a revision to the Mission T-O model to make it *more* Bryhtferthian.

While the surviving form of the Mission T-O maps may have had distant roots in Greek and Roman models, the possibility that in its more immediate English context this map may have moved not westward (from Ramsey, and further back, the Continent and even Greece), but eastward from Worcester prompts us to consider the English character of this map family. As we have seen, the scribe of the Thorney redaction may have made the Mission T-O map more English as he connects the map to Bryhtferth's computistical materials. In the two complete maps, the placement of *Britannia*, *Hibernia* and *Thule* reveals another distinctively English revision. Anglo-Saxon and early English maps often show a struggle with the past classical literary and cartographic representations of England⁴⁹ – views which, as Solinus describes it, construct Britain as an *orbis alterius*, a world outside the world.⁵⁰ In the Mission T-O maps, *Hibernia* and *Thule* are placed outside the outer border of

⁴⁵ Wallis, 'MS Oxford', p. 689.

⁴⁶ A thorough analysis of the stemmatic relationship of these three analogues, and the differences between them, is the subject of a forthcoming study.

⁴⁷ Edson, *Mapping Time and Space*, p. 89, conjectures that such placement might reflect Gen. IX.7: 'May God make space for Japheth, and let him live in the tents of Shem.' Given the overwhelming cartographic tradition of locating Japheth in Europe, this arrangement in JCO 17 remains an odd one. ⁴⁸ Wallis, 'MS Oxford', pp. 800–1 and n. 255.

⁴⁹ For a similar representation and resistance in the Anglo-Saxon Cotton *mapa mundi*, see M. Foy, 'The Virtual Reality of the Anglo-Saxon *Mappa mundi*', esp. pp. 6–11.

⁵⁰ M. Bridges, 'Of Myths and Maps: the Anglo-Saxon Cosmographer's Europe', *Writing and Culture*, ed. B. Engler (Tübingen, 1992), pp. 68–84.

the world, but *Britannia* lives just inside the outer border, moving closer towards the 'known' world, and reclaimed, somewhat, from its received colonial representation.

Finally, considering the function of this map within the culture of late-eleventh-century Worcester might reveal one more, regional aspect of this map. Undeniably, the manuscript context for the later redactions of this map at Thorney and Peterborough firmly set the map within a scientific, computational framework, but in its liturgical content, CCCC 265 lacks anything of the sort. The absence of a computational basis for the map's earliest surviving context invites us to reconsider the spiritual, rather than scientific side of these maps – and returns us to their four, mysterious preaching saints, Peter, Paul, John and Andreas. Whatever their source, these saints highlight an apostolic side of these maps that bears closer scrutiny.⁵¹ At Worcester, the apostolic function of the map may connect to the ideological shift at Worcester that occurred under Wulfstan II (1065–95). While Wulfstan was bishop, the number of monks

⁵¹ Much more work on the inclusion, and even identity, of these saints in the Mission T–O maps remains to be done. It is quite possible that these four saints provide proof for an early eastern origin for the map, as all of their preaching zones (Athens, Ephesus, Achaia and Caesaria) are in Greece. Scriptures associate Peter (Acts X and Acts XII.20) and Paul (Acts XVII.16–21) with their assigned territories, while Andrew and John the Apostle possess apocryphal connections with Achaia and Ephesus, respectively. Alternatively, the John of the Mission T–O maps could be John the Baptist; Acts XIX.1 reports that John the Baptist originally converted the Jews of Ephesus to Christianity.

These saints, however, may also derive from English traditions or inclinations. Though the Old English 'Fates of the Apostles' locates Peter and Paul in their more traditional territory of Rome, the poem does place Andrew in Achaia, and John in Ephesus. In contrast to the standard canonical order of the apostles (Peter, Paul, Andrew, Jacob and then John, etc.), the poem lists these four saints first in the poem, putting John before Jacob (lines 11–33). Likewise, Ælfric's First Series homilies on Andrew (38.170–1), John (4.39) and Peter (26.3–5) all connect these apostles with their Mission T–O territories, while his *In Ascensione Domini* (21.234–9; cf. the Second Series *In natale unius confessoris* (38.182–5)), like the 'Fates of the Apostles' lists figures apostles in order first, albeit with different locations. See Ælfric's *Catholic Homilies. The First Series*, ed. P. Clemoes, EETS ss 17 (Oxford, 1997); Ælfric's *Catholic Homilies. The Second Series*, ed. M. Godden, EETS ss 5 (London, 1979); and Godden's commentary for each in Ælfric's *Catholic Homilies. Introduction, Commentary and Glossary*. EETS ss 18 (Oxford, 2000).

Intriguingly, a collect from another Worcester manuscript, CCCC 391, in a hand close (and with looped e-caudata) to the main hands of CCCC 265, records a set of prayers that descend hierarchically through a spiritual order, beginning with prayers to God, the Trinity and Christ, then to the Archangels Gabriel and Michael, then to the patriarchs and prophets, and then to a descending order of saints, from biblical to the local English favourites. The prayers following the patriarchs and prophets are, in order, to Peter, to John the Baptist, to Paul, and then to Andrew, who has two extended prayers. A general prayer to the twelve apostles frames the prayers to these four figures, and then the prayers to many other individual, lesser and local saints follow. See CCCC 265, pp. 594–7, and Hughes, *Portiforium* II, 9–11.

quadrupled, and manuscript production increased accordingly.⁵² Wulfstan's concern for pastoral care was well known, and during his episcopacy Worcester appears to have produced relatively few canonical works of patristic authors in Latin.⁵³ Rather, well past 1066, and in spite of having a Norman prior, the manuscripts produced at Worcester heavily emphasize the preservation and transmission of homiletic Old English texts, and, as others have argued, highlight Worcester's post-Conquest commitment to works 'especially suitable for preaching to lay people'.⁵⁴ The Worcester map, as well as the original motivation to copy it, needs also be evaluated within this pastoral, vernacular context – conceivably, the unknown content of the planned upper roundels of the Worcester map may also have augmented its spiritual dimensions.

At Peterborough, Thorney and likely at Ramsey, the Mission T-O maps embedded the spiritual within a framework of science, of knowing the world through calculation and logic. At Worcester, this map hints at a prior, alternative function. In CCCC 265, the map does not describe the world, but inscribes faith onto the world, in the same way that both early apostles and Anglo-Saxon missionaries endeavoured to rewrite the cultures of the peoples they encountered.⁵⁵ Further, the Mission T-O map family also works to 'map Britannia'. The struggle of Anglo-Saxon England to establish both a religious and geographic place for itself in the 'big picture' of the world leads to a last, inevitable context for the map in CCCC 265: the cultural and linguistic collapse of Anglo-Saxon England. There is something poignant in the silence of this incomplete map, given that it was started, and then abandoned, at Worcester, a monastic centre determined to carry on writing in the Anglo-Saxon vernacular for decades after the Conquest. The Anglo-Saxon world, of course, had to end; the unfinished, late-eleventh-century Anglo-Saxon map at Worcester, in its own way, bears a muted, almost absent, testimony to this end.⁵⁶

⁵² R. Gameson, 'Book Production and Decoration at Worcester in the Tenth and Eleventh Centuries', pp. 217–19. ⁵³ *Ibid.*

⁵⁴ E. McIntyre, cited in J. Barrow, 'Community of Worcester', p. 92.

⁵⁵ Cf. N. Howe, 'Conversion and Return: from Island to Continent', in his *Migration and Mythmaking in Anglo-Saxon England* (New Haven, CT, 1989), pp. 108–42.

⁵⁶ This essay originated from the 2004 NEH Summer Institute on Anglo-Saxon England, directed by Paul Szarmach. In the process of its research and writing, I have benefited greatly from discussions with Paul Szarmach, Tessa Weber, Peter Stokes, Joyce Hill, Faith Wallis, Loredana Teresi and Patrick Conner. I am especially grateful to Gill Cannell at the Parker Library, Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, and to Catherine Hilliard at the Library of St John's College, Oxford, for all of their patience and gracious hospitality. I am also grateful to the Department of English at Johns Hopkins University for providing research privileges that greatly assisted in the completion of this work, and to the National Endowment for the Humanities and Hood College's Board of Associates for funding travel for this research.