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ABSTRACT

The thesis is in two parts, 'Manuscript' and 'Text'. The first part considers the post-Anglo-Saxon history of the manuscript, Junius 85 and 86, and then considers the Anglo-Saxon manuscript from the point of view of the activity involved in its production. In Chapter One are noted some of the manuscript's fundamental physical characteristics, its size in relation to other homily collections, the collation of its leaves and the quality of the membrane. Chapter Two deals with the question of the manuscript's provenance, and is ordered in sections each of which considers a particular piece of evidence. A final section summarizes the significance of all the evidence. Aside from a titled transcript made by Junius of part of one of the homilies, all the evidence of the manuscript's history before Junius donated it to the Bodleian Library is that which has accrued to the manuscript over the centuries. The title of Junius's transcript provides evidence that Isaac Vossius possessed the manuscript before Junius, and a key question is that of Vossius's acquisition. It is circumstantially likely that Vossius did not acquire the manuscript in England, and press-marks entered in each volume suggest that the manuscript may have been collected in France by a French bibliophile, Paul Petau, part of whose collection had come into Vossius's possession before the latter moved to England. The evidence of the two volume binding, which seems certainly to pre-date Junius's ownership, does not contradict this, on the face of it, unlikely provenance for an Old English homily collection. Evidence of the manuscript's survival through medieval times resides in a title entered on the first membrane leaf, which is all that survives of a medieval binding, and in a series of jottings. A detailed examination of the writing shows that the title and the jottings are comparable palaeographically, and that both were probably added some time in the late twelfth or early thirteenth century, either in France or England. It seems probable that the jottings, some of whose content gives support to the possibility that the manuscript was in France, were entered while the manuscript was bound, as the title indicates, with a Greek psalter. The manuscript may owe its survival to this binding.

Chapter Three turns to the Anglo-Saxon manuscript itself, and it is established that it was written by three main hands. In the absence of any study of eleventh-century insular scripts, a comparative study of the palaeography has not been possible, but by way of contribution to the
subject I have tried to characterize the script of the manuscript, as well as giving detailed
description of letter forms and their variety in the course of identifying the hands. Chapter Three
ends with description of decorative features, particularly of ornamental brackets which are a
feature peculiar to Junius 85 and 86. Chapter Four considers the compilation of the manuscript,
and it is shown in a separate section how the use of ornamental brackets arose when one scribe
made regular use of a feature which another scribe had introduced for practical reasons. The
main section (section 4) of Chapter Four draws on the physical and palaeographical evidence
already described and discussed and relates it to the texts to show how the manuscript was
compiled in at least two stages, with the bulk of the manuscript belonging to a final stage and the
rest being remains of a previous stage, though no great space of time separates the two stages.
One particular point concerns the status of a translated extract from the apocryphon Visio Pauli,
and it is argued that the text was copied, and possibly translated, specifically to expand Homily 1,
there having been doubt hitherto on this point. Chapter Five considers some spelling features
which are characteristic of Junius 85 and 86, and constitutes a suggestion of an alternative to
traditional language descriptions, based on historical phonology, which are of limited value for
late Old English manuscripts.

The second part of the thesis is the edition of the texts. The editorial aim is to enable
consideration of whether the manuscript could have been used for preaching. Each homily is
followed by a Commentary whose principal function is to address all difficult readings, and
assess how often a failure of sense occurs. When other copies of homilies are thus closely
examined it should eventually become possible to assess how much textual difficulty a copy of a
homily could bear and still be delivered from the page as a preached sermon. How far the Old
English Homiletic manuscripts are representative of an active preaching tradition is yet a matter
for much debate. Notes describing the condition of the text in the manuscript accompany the
texts, and previous editions are corrected where necessary. A novel form of printing Old English
prose has been adopted, whereby sentences are spatially distinguished.
# CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviations</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PART ONE. MANUSCRIPT</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chapter One. Introductory</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Dimensions</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Collation</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Membrane</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chapter Two. Preservation History</strong></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. MS Junius 45</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Junius's Note on Fol.1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The Press-marks 'C.29.' and 'F.29.'</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The Present Binding</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Foliation and Modern Additions</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The Medieval Binding-leaves</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The Title 'pars psalterii greci'</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. A Series of Jottings</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Other Jottings or Pen Trials</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Conclusion</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chapter Three. Palaeography</strong></td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. The Hands</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Script</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Decoration</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter Four. Compilation</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Pricking and Ruling</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Written Lines</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The Use of Brackets</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Compilation</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter Five. Spelling</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PART TWO. TEXT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fragment</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homily 1</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commentary</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charms</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homily 2</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commentary</td>
<td>131a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homily 3</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commentary</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homily 4</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commentary</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homily 5</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commentary</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliography</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASE</td>
<td>Anglo-Saxon England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BL</td>
<td>British Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCCC</td>
<td>Cambridge, Corpus Christi College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUL</td>
<td>Cambridge, University Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNB</td>
<td><em>Dictionary of National Biography</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOE</td>
<td><em>Dictionary of Old English</em>, facsimiles published for the Dictionary of Old English Project, Centre for Medieval Studies, University of Toronto, by the Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EEMF</td>
<td>Early English Manuscripts in Facsimile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EETS</td>
<td>Early English Text Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LWS</td>
<td>Late West Saxon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OE</td>
<td>Old English</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Summary Catalogue**  

**Wanley, Catalogus**  
Humphredi Wanleii Librorum Veterum Septentrionalium ... *Catalogus*, volume 2 of George Hickes, ed., *Linguarum Veterum Septentrionalium Thesaurus* (Oxford, 1705)
PART ONE. MANUSCRIPT

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTORY

Junius 85 and 86 contains one Ælfrician homily (Homily 2), four anonymous homilies and a fragment of a fifth, and the manuscript is thus most importantly a witness to the anonymous element within the OE homiletic tradition. I have accordingly adopted the sigel C from Scragg's list of manuscripts containing anonymous homilies and saints' lives.1

I have found no reason to question Ker's dating of C to 's.xi med.'2 nor have I found evidence to suggest a more exact dating.

The question of where C was written I have left open. The textual relationship of the Ælfrician homily with copies in Bodley 340 and 342, CCC 198 and CCCC 162, manuscripts of the early eleventh century with Canterbury and Rochester connections,3 is a doubtful indication of south-eastern origin, since exemplars in that textual tradition could have travelled far by the time of the writing of C. Moreover, the influence of a Canterbury tradition may depend as much upon particular relationships of Canterbury with other centres as upon geographical vicinity.

This observation could apply as much to spelling traditions as to textual traditions.

My study of C begins with consideration of some basic physical characteristics.

1D.G. Scragg, 'The Corpus of Vernacular Homilies and Saints' Lives before Ælfric', ASE, 8 (1979), 223-77.
2Ker, Catalogue, p.409.
1. Dimensions

What is at first remarkable about C is its smallness. The dimensions given by Ker, height first, are 160 x 115mm (MS 85) and 155 x 100mm. (MS 86). There is some variety in the size of the leaves, and to give overall maximum dimensions 5mm. may be added to the height of MS 85 and to the width of MS 86.

In the introduction to his catalogue, in a section dealing with the preparation of sheets for writing, Ker comments that a 'common size' of the folded sheets in Old English homiliaries is about 250 x 160mm. A few manuscripts do conform nearly to these dimensions, but Ker's figures should rather be seen as giving about an average size, since a survey of the dimensions of homily collections reveals a range from about 300 x 200mm. down to about 200 x 130mm. Most markedly outside the upper limit of this range are the two volume homiliary, Bodley 340 and 342 (Ker no. 309, s.xi in., 315 x 220 and 315 x 210mm.) and the Royal manuscript of the First Series of Ælfric's Catholic Homilies (BL, Royal 7 c. xii, Ker no.257, s.x ex., 310 x 205mm.). The former, a mixed collection of Ælfrician and anonymous pieces, was probably written at Canterbury or Rochester. The latter was probably written at Ælfric's scriptorium, since there is agreement among scholars that a marginal note on fol.64r is in Ælfric's hand. Outside the approximate lower limit are Lambeth Palace Library, 489 (Ker no. 283, s.xi third quarter, 184 x 125 mm.) and BL, Cotton Cleopatra B. xiii (Ker no.144, s.xi third quarter, 184 x 125 mm.), which probably are two parts of the same manuscript and BL, Cotton Vespasian D. xiv (Ker no. 209, s.xii med., c.191 x 122 mm.). The relatively late Vespasian D. xiv, written probably at either Canterbury or Rochester, differs in character from C in that it seems to have

4Ker, Catalogue, p.411.
5Ibid., p.xxiii.
6CUL, Li. 4. 6, Ker no.21, s.xi med., c.261 x 150mm.; CCCC 302, Ker no.56, s.xi/xii, c.253 x 168mm.; Cambridge, Trinity college, B. 15. 34, Ker no.86, s.xi med., c.248 x 161mm; Bodleian Library, Hatton 113 and 114, Ker no.331, s.xi third quarter, 255 x 158mm. Rudolph Willard, The Blickling Homilies, EEMF, 10 (Copenhagen, 1960), p.19, cites Ker's comment when he gives probable original dimensions of the Blickling manuscript as 250 x 160mm., now c.200 x 145mm. Manuscript dimensions are given from Ker, Catalogue.
7The lists in Scragg, 'Corpus of Vernacular Homilies' and Godden, Ælfric's Catholic Homilies. Second Series, pp.xiii-xiv, between them cover all extant witnesses to the homiletic tradition. They include fragments and manuscripts which cannot be described as homily collections: the dimensions of most of these fall within the range indicated.
8For references on this point, see Norman Eliason and Peter Clemoes, eds, Ælfric's First Series of Catholic Homilies. British Museum Royal 7 c. xii, EEMF, 13 (Copenhagen, 1966), p.28.
9See Ker, Catalogue, pp.184 and 345.
been used for teaching. It contains, for example, the English translation of the *Disticha Catonis*, and much of the homily material consists of extracts. Lambeth 489 and Cleopatra B. xiii, probably written at Exeter, are the remains of what seems to have been a more strictly homiletic collection than Vespasian D. xiv, drawing on Ælfrician, Wulfstanian and anonymous material. The collection, which is written by several hands, seems not have been ordered according to the church year. The Wulfstanian manuscript, BL, Cotton Nero A. i, fols 70-173 (Ker no.164, s.xi in., c.165 x 105mm.) is of comparable size to C and contains a few homilies and homiletic pieces, but the contents are mainly legal and regulatory texts.

We may safely say of C that the dimensions of its leaves show it to be the smallest manuscript containing a homily collection in Old English to have survived.

2. Collation

In order to facilitate future reference, the following diagram shows the collation of C in relation to the texts. The eighty leaves of the Anglo-Saxon manuscript have been foliated 2-81. Fol.1 is a later binding-leaf.

---


11The only homily collection actually smaller than C is BL, Cotton Vitellius D.xvii (Ker no.222, s.xi med.). Ker, *Catalogue*, p.298, notes that it has been 'much shrunken by fire' and that Wanley described it before the fire as 'in quarto'. Wanley, *Catalogus*, p.44, describes C as 'in octavo (ut loquuntur) minori'.

12The diagram agrees with the collation given by Antonette DiPaolo Healey, *The Old English Vision of St Paul* (Cambridge, Mass., 1978), pp.6-7, who corrects and supplements that given by Ker, *Catalogue*, p.411, except that she omits to note that fols 54 and 59 are singletons, as Ker notes.
Binding-leaf, fol.1;
Fragment, fol.2r; Homily 1, fols 2v-17r, line 5; Charms, fol.17r, line 5-17v

Homily 2, fols 18-24

Homily 3, fols 25r-40r; Homily 4, fols 40v-61
Fols 25-32 are four bifolia

Homily 5, fols 62-81r
Fols 62-71 are five bifolia.
3. Membrane

The membrane varies in quality but all is more or less thick and stiff.

Fols 3-11 and 18-24 are conspicuously of a different quality from the rest.\(^\text{13}\) In these two gatherings the membrane is of a greyish colour with a matt surface on both sides. The membrane is further distinguished in having white spots (as if bleached) throughout the two gatherings. Similar white spots appear in the gathering, fols 25-32, especially fol.25r, but they are not a regular feature. Fol.24 has a large hole.

Fols 2 and 12-16 are the least thick and stiff, especially fol.16, which has a tear across its width. The tear has been repaired with fine white thread in criss-cross stitching, which is probably to be associated with later binding. Judging by the curved edge depriving the leaf of its lower outside corner, it was from the edge of a skin. Fol.17 is among the thickest of the leaves of the manuscript. It appears to be palimpsest, showing traces of erased writing on both sides and roughening, especially on the verso. Fol.2 is much worn and brittle. It might well be thought that fol.2 had once been conjoint with either fols 16 or 17, but this seems not to have been the case. Fol.17 is certainly too thick ever to have been conjoint with fol.2 The cut inner edge of fol.16 is clearly visible before fol.12, as is the cut edge of fol.2 before fol.1, and neither fol.2 nor fol.16 is narrower than the other leaves, as would be the case if they had been a bifolium which broke at the fold, the two leaves then being trimmed and refolded for binding as singletons.

Fols 25-32 are stiff, generally smooth and shiny, but some sides are roughish. Fol.30 has no outside corner.

Of the three singletons, fols 33-35, fol.34 is slightly thicker than the other two, though perhaps not so thick as fols 17 and 42-81; it has a large hole and lacks a lower outside corner. Fol.33 is comparable in thickness to fols 36-41, which are slightly stiffer than fols 12-16 but not so stiff as fols 25-32.

Fols 42-81 are generally thicker than any other leaves and often have shiny surfaces. Fol.81 lacks a lower outside corner. The collation of fols 42-81 is readily ascertaintable, unlike the collation of the leaves in MS 85. This contrast may partly be due to a need, incurred,

\(^{13}\text{As noted by Healey, OE Vision of St Paul, p.4, and Ker, Catalogue, p.411, where the membrane is described as being 'softer and whiter than the rest'.}\)
perhaps, by the number of singletons, to bind MS 85 more tightly, but also to the quality of the membrane of fols 42-81, whose number and hardness would resist tight binding.

With regard to fols 42-81, we may further note that they appear to show a preference in principle for a gathering of five bifolia. In C as a whole, the frequency of singletons, sometimes in vulnerable positions on the outside of a gathering, seems remarkable.

The quality of the membrane of fols 3-11 and 18-24 may be regarded as the more typical of membrane prepared in the insular manner, that is, 'roughened on both sides with pumice stone, with the result that hair- and flesh-sides became indistinguishable from one another', and giving a 'suede-like finish'.

---

14 Ker, *Catalogue*, p.xxiii, states that the normal gathering in England from the eighth to the twelfth centuries was one of four bifolia; Bernhard Bischoff, *Latin Palaeography. Antiquity and the Middle Ages*, translated Dáibhí Ó Cróinín and David Ganz (Cambridge, 1990), p.20, gives a different view, that 'the gatherings in most Irish and Anglo-Saxon manuscripts consist of five double leaves ('quinio', Old Irish 'cin', Anglo-Saxon 'cine'). That Bischoff's view may be influenced by consideration of mainly early Anglo-Saxon manuscripts is suggested by T. Julian Brown's comment on the insular gathering, 'usually eight to the quire; but Irish and older Anglo-Saxon mss. may have 10 leaves' ('The Distribution and Significance of Membrane Prepared in the Insular Manner', in *La Paléographie Hébraïque Médievale*, Colloques Internationaux du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 547 (Paris, 1974), pp.127-35 (p.29)). The dictionary entries in *BT* s.v. 'cine' leave some uncertainty whether the word applies to any folded sheet or to a quaternion; *DOE* gives 'single sheet of parchment or vellum folded twice'. In Ælfric's glossary 'cine' glosses 'quaternio' (Julius Zupitza, ed., Ælfric's *Grammatik und Glossar. Text und Varianten* (Berlin, 1880; rept. with a preface by Helmut Gneuss, Berlin, 1966), p.304, lines 6-7), and given the seemingly strong likelihood that 'cine' derives from 'quinio', as Bischoff suggests, it may be that Ælfric's gloss reflects a change in England from an Irish to a continental model of collation. Of course, the term may yet have been used for folded sheets and gatherings generally.

15 The use of singletons allows the exclusion from consideration of the possibility that the method known as 'imposition' was employed in the making of C. This method, particularly suitable for small format, whereby pages were copied on to a sheet before it was finally folded and cut, must result in gatherings of conjoint leaves. See Bischoff, *Latin Palaeography*, p.21, fn.9, for a bibliography on 'imposition'.


17 Brown, 'The Distribution and Significance', p.128. Anna Di Majo, Carlo Frederici, Marco Palma, 'Indagine sulla Pergamena Insolare (secoli VII-XVI)', *Scriptorium*, 42 (1988), 131-9 (p.137), discuss the technique and describe the resulting membrane as having a suede- or chamois-like quality ('pelle scamosciata'). They regard the technique as characteristic also of central northern Europe throughout the Middle Ages, but this view is not supported by Brown's survey of insular style membrane on the continent (The Distribution and Significance*, pp.129-32).
CHAPTER TWO

PRESERVATION HISTORY

Two facts in the history of the preservation of C are known. One is that C was among manuscripts bequeathed by Junius to the Bodleian Library in 1678. The classification of C as a Junius manuscript may satisfy us on that point. The other fact, evidence of which provides a starting-point for investigation of C’s pre-Bodleian history, is that C had been in the possession of Isaac Vossius, Junius’s nephew, before it came to Junius.

1. MS Junius 45

The evidence for Vossius’s possession of C is provided by the heading with which Junius introduces a transcription he made of part of Homily 3. The transcription, now fols 10r-11v of the Bodleian manuscript, Junius 45, begins at the top of C, fol. 29v (Homily 3, line 93, ‘soplice...’), omits the text of C, fols 33r-35r, line 4 (Homily 3, lines 162-206, the 'Three Utterances' passage and the passage in the style of a prayer which follows it) and ends with the last word on C, fol. 35v (Homily 3, line 230, ‘...mansworan’). The heading is as follows:

OFFICIUM CHRISTIANI HOMINIS.ex per antiquo
codice MSo propinquui mei Isaaci Vossii.

The end of Junius’s transcription coincides with the end of the first bound volume of C (MS 85), where the last word, 'mansworan', is in the midst of a list of sinners (Homily 3, lines 227-34). It seems unlikely that Junius would have ended his transcription thus abruptly if he had

2Noted in Summary Catalogue, II.2, pp.974 and 983. Wanley, Catalogus, p.44, notes that C was a gift to Junius from Vossius, but does not give the source of his information. It may be supposed that Wanley had come across Junius's transcription and noted the significance of the heading, but whether he had other grounds for his note cannot be known.
had before him the continuation of the list on fol. 36r, the first leaf of MS 86. Moreover, Junius ended his transcription with a row of dots after 'mansworan', and under the row of dots he wrote 'Pauca desunt'. He uses a row of dots and the words 'Reliqua desunt' at the end of another transcription preserved in Junius 45 (fols 1-8), where he transcribed up to the imperfect end of BL, Cotton Julius A. ii, and it may be thought that he would have used the form 'Reliqua desunt' if he had believed that C ended imperfectly with fol. 35. However, it seems likely that he transcribed from fol. 35 in order to include the list of sinners, and that 'Pauca' refers to the apparent lack of a few words from the list. The list of sinners, giving a negative view of Christian duty, is the only part of the text on fol. 35, the rest of which is a description of hell, that is appropriate to Junius's heading 'Officium Christiani Hominis'. Whatever Junius may have meant, exactly, by 'Pauca desunt', the fact that he recorded the imperfect end of text on fol. 35 indicates that the whole of C was not available to him at the time he made his transcription.

Junius's heading describes that part of C from which he made his transcription as a codex ('cogice antiquo'). This suggests that the leaves were in a bound volume at the time, but the suggestion is not supported by the description 'antiquis membranis' in what must be an earlier version of the heading, which is written at the top of fol. 9r of Junius 45 and which is the only item on that leaf. This heading includes a cancelled passage which I give in square brackets, and is as follows:

Officium hominis Christiani, [item officium Regum, principum, sacerdotum,
abbatum, monachorum, monialum, laicorum, etc.] descriptum
ex per antiquis membranis propinqui mei Isaaci Vossii et distinctum in V capita.

The cancelled passage possibly refers to text in CCCC 201. Thus on fols 12-14 of Junius 45 is a transcription headed 'In eodem codice collegii Scti Benedicti statim sequitur pag. 31,
Ælfrici epistola' and titled 'TO GEHADEDUM MANNUM'. Ælfric's letter to Wulfstan begins thus titled on page 31 of CCCC 201. The items of the cancelled passage correspond to CCCC 201, Ker's art. 42 (i) Be cinince (vi) Be eorlum (vii) Be sacerdum (ix) Be abbodum (x) Be

---

3Ker, Catalogue, no. 159.
4See Ker, Catalogue, p. 84. This source of the transcription is noted in Summary Catalogue, II. 2, p. 974. I do not know what Junius meant by 'collegii Scti Benedicti'.
munecum (xi) Be minecenan (xii) Be læwendum mannum. The same text occurs also in the Bodleian manuscript, Junius 121, but the sections are ordered differently. In BL, Cotton Nero A.1, the same text occurs with the sections in the same order as in CCCC 201, but since the existing transcription is from CCCC 201, it is likely that the cancelled passage refers to other transcriptions from that manuscript. Junius's phrase 'in eodem codice', referring to CCCC 201, indicates that other transcriptions were indeed made, but the phrase cannot be taken to indicate directly the sections referred to in the cancelled passage, because the heading goes on to say that Āelfric's letter immediately follows (unless 'statim sequitur' can mean 'begins on') and the sections occur after Āelfric's letter. However, it certainly appears that Junius at first thought to include the transcription from C with a transcription of the sections found in CCCC 201 under one heading, but, while writing the heading, it seems he decided to use separate headings for each of the transcriptions, cancelled the reference to one and carried on to specify the other to be from C by mention of Vossius's ownership. Then, it seems, he decided to begin afresh and write the neater heading that now accompanies the transcription. That the existing transcription from C is a fair copy is suggested by the fact that it is divided into five sections, as stated by Junius in the draught heading, and he must have already applied the sections to a working draught otherwise he would not have known how many there would be.

The evidence of the draught heading suggests that Junius was organizing and copying up material he had gathered from different libraries, and it seems reasonable to take his description of C as 'propinqui mei Isaaci Vossii' to indicate that C was still in Vossius's possession at the time. Although the differing descriptions of C in the phrases 'antiquis membranis' and 'antiquo codice MS0' may therefore be drawn from memory, they nevertheless suggest that Junius had seen a number of leaves in some sort of binding.

Although the evidence of it is somewhat tenuous, the association of the transcription from C with CCCC 201 suggests that Junius saw C in England. This cannot have been during the period, 1621-51, when Junius was in the service of the Earl of Arundel, because Vossius was not SKer, Catalogue, pp.86-87.
6Ibid., pp.412-413.
7Ibid., p.212.
8CCCC 201 seems never to have left England. Ker, Catalogue, p.90, states that the manuscript was at Corpus Christi by 1600.
resident in England, with his library, until 1670. There is the possibility that Junius made the transcription before 1670, during the period following 1651 when he was living at Amsterdam and the Hague with his sister, Vossius's mother, and later brought it together with transcriptions from CCC 201, but it seems more likely that the transcription was made at the time when, to quote Wood's *Athenae Oxoniensis*, 'in 1674 our author Junius returned into England to the end that he might peruse such English-Saxon books, which he had not yet perused, especially in the Cottonian library and elsewhere'. It was after he had retired to Oxford in 1676 that Junius made a deed of gift of his manuscripts to the Bodleian Library, by which time the whole of C must have come into his possession. Thus Vossius had probably already given C to his uncle, and the manuscript was in Oxford, when Junius went, in August 1677, to stay at Vossius's house near Windsor, where, in November 1677, Junius died aged eighty-eight.

2. Junius's Note on Fol. 1

Another piece of evidence, besides the transcription, of Junius's perusal of C is a note written in a column over to the right of the recto of fol.1, the medieval binding-leaf that is preserved with C. Wanley, who printed the note, identified it as Junius's work, and having compared the hand of the note with that of the headings in Junius 45, I find no cause to question the identification. The note is as follows:

Imperitia possessorum inscriptus fuit huius libelli titulus Pars psalterii rectius enim
Homiliarum quam Psalterii partem dixeris. Accensendus etiam est alter sequens eiusdem
forma e libellus, similiter in charta membranacea conscriptus et materiam tractans
poenitentialem. Talis est Dominica illa in quadragesima, quae occurrit huius opusculi
pagina decima octava.

Junius substituted 'Homiliarum' for some other word which he so cancelled as to make it
illegible: 'Homi' is added at the end of a line, 'liarum' is added above the cancelled word. The
note is not neatly written, this being partly due, perhaps, to the difficulty of the worn surface of
fol.1r, and it looks as if Junius might have spelt 'Home-' rather than 'Homiliarium'.

The first sentence of the note is most obviously intended to correct the medieval title,14
'pars psalterii greci', in the top left corner of the recto of fol.1, but at the tops of the rectos of folis
2 and 36 the words 'Pars psalterii saxonici' have been inscribed in a hand which Ker dates to
's.xvii', and, since the inscriptions would hardly have been entered after Junius had written the
note, Junius must have been aware at least of the first of them. Whether or not these inscriptions
were entered while C was in Vossius's possession or before is a point to which we will return
(below, pp.36-7), but first the note itself, being one of the few scraps of evidence concerning the
preservation of C, merits close attention.

I say above that Junius must have seen 'at least' the inscription on fol.2r, because it is
likely that the note was written on that occasion when Junius made his transcription and when he
seems not to have been aware of the continuation, on fol.36, of the text he was transcribing. The
second person singular 'dixeris' in the first sentence of the note supports this view since it implies
that Junius intended his information for someone in particular, which person may reasonably be
supposed to have been Vossius, the owner of the manuscript. At first sight, the second sentence
of the note seems to imply that Junius had seen the two volumes of C,15 but closer consideration
of the wording suggests otherwise. Junius describes the 'alter sequens...libellus' as being
'similiter in charta membranacea conscriptus'. The wording of the phrase does not make it clear

14Ker,Catalogue, p.411. For the medieval title, see below, pp.25ff.
15Healey, OE Vision of St Paul, p.16, assumed this was the case: '[Junius] wrote on fol.1 that
this book (Junius 85) and the one following (Junius 86) form a collecton of homilies "materiam
tractans poenitentialem".'
whether writing or membrane is being compared, but if Junius were merely indicating a similarity in writing ('similiter...conscriptus'), he would hardly need to specify that the writing is on membrane leaf, and he is probably, therefore, referring, perhaps rather too concisely, to both writing and membrane. In neither particular, however, is this phrase appropriate to a description of the second volume of C in relation to the first. We have seen (above, pp.7-8) that the membrane of fols 42-81, that is of all but six of the leaves of the second volume, is distinguishable from that of all other leaves of C, and it will be seen (below, pp.43-4) that the writing on fols 42-81 is attributable to one hand, but that this hand is not readily to be identified as that responsible for any of the rest of the writing in C. The phrase does, however, suggest an alternative identification of the 'libellus'. We have seen (above, p.7 and fn.13) that the gatherings, fols 3-11 and 18-24, are of strikingly similar membrane, unlike that of any of the other leaves, and that these gatherings are apt to prompt comment. Moreover, it will be seen (below, pp.42-3) that the Anglo-Saxon writing on each of these two gatherings is as closely comparable and as distinctive as the quality of their membrane.16 I think that the phrase, 'similiter in charta membranacea conscriptus', is meant to draw attention to both particulars, writing and membrane, of the similarity between the gatherings, fols 3-11 and 18-24. The phrase may be taken to be complementary to the preceding one, 'eiusdem formae'. The gathering, fols 12-17, intervenes between the two gatherings, and the gathering, fols 18-24, would then be indeed 'alter sequens', the 'second one following' the gathering, fols 3-11. The last phrase of the second sentence of the note describes the content of the 'libellus' as 'materiam tractans poenitentialem'. The gathering, fols 18-24, contains the whole of Homily 2, and, while it would not be an easy task to detect a passage in the texts of C that might seem to reflect a chapter or chapters of a Penitential, an impression of penitential material might at once be gained from the treatment of Lenten fasting in the opening of Homily 2, and from the mention of

16 It will emerge in the discussion of the hands of C that the hand of these two gatherings can be identified, with a good degree of confidence, with the hand of fols 42-81. But the contrast in the quality of membrane, between fols 3-11 on the one hand and fols 42-81 on the other, is matched by a contrast in the appearance of the writing, and the point does not disturb the present argument.
confession in the first sentence of the homily, thus even from a look through the content of fol.18.

In the third sentence of the note Homily 2 is clearly identified. Not only does Junius cite the title (Homily 2 is the only homily in C to be provided with a title), but he also notes that it (i.e. 'Dominica illa in quadragesima', 'that Sunday in Lent') occurs 'pagina decima octaua', that is, on the first leaf of the gathering, fols 18-24. The opening of the third sentence, 'Talis est...', is a difficulty in the reading of the note so far, because it seems to be selecting an example of, rather than supplying further identification of what has been described in the second sentence. But this is a minor difficulty, and one that diminishes if the note is regarded as being spontaneously written, perhaps while opening, to check detail, and closing, to write on fol.1, the leaves of the manuscript. Thus, in the second and third sentences of the note we may observe Junius selecting evidence which would readily provide support for the correction he offers in the first sentence, and which would be quickly appreciated by someone who was not, as Vossius was not, an Anglo-Saxonist.

In the first sentence there are two further difficulties with my reading of the note. The first is that, if I am right and the gathering, fols 18-24, is the 'libellus' of the second sentence, the gathering, fols 3-11, must be the 'libellus' referred to in the first sentence, but Junius regarded the 'titulus Pars psalterii', which appears on fols 1 and 2, as belonging to this 'libellus' and therefore must have regarded at least fol.2 as being part of it as well. The second difficulty concerns the word 'Homiliarum', which appears to be genitive plural of 'homilia', but which would read more easily if it meant 'homiliary', properly 'homiliarium', in which case there would be the suggestion that the 'libellus' of the first sentence is identical with the whole of the first volume of C. The reading as it stands, 'Homiliarum...partem', 'part of homilies' rather than 'parts of homilies', is an infelicitous reading, but it could describe fols 2-11, since the recto and verso of fol.2 contain respectively the end and beginning of homilies. Thus the two difficulties lock together and I propose that we allow the inaccuracy that fol.2 cannot be described along with fols 3-11 and 18-24 as 'similiter in charta membranacea conscriptus'. It is inappropriate to be too exacting in the

17'...urum gasticum scriftum geandenan', Homily 2, line.
18The title is in fact 'Dominica I in quadragesima'. Wanley, Catalogus, p.44, also omits 'I'.

interpretation of a note whose purpose is to indicate the nature of the content of C, not to give an accurate description of the manuscript. Nevertheless, although there is no way of clinching the argument, I believe it is safe to assume that Junius wrote the note when C was still in Vossius’s possession, and that he saw only the first volume.

I believe it is scarcely less safe to assume that the note was written on the same occasion as the transcription was made, that is, some time between Junius's return to England in 1674 and his retirement in 1676, not a long period considering that Junius, by then an old man, was working in at least two libraries (the Cottonian and the Parker libraries: witness the two other transcriptions in Junius 45) with large holdings of Anglo-Saxon manuscripts. It is even reasonable to suppose, since to identify the nature of the first volume of C would have been the first thing Junius would have had to do, that on that occasion he wrote the note before he decided, having examined the content more closely, to make a transcription.

The alternative descriptions in the headings of the transcription, that the latter was taken from 'membranis' and from a 'codice', reflect the description to be inferred from the note, that the first volume of C is a coherent work, an 'opusculus' (see the last sentence of the note), but one that seems to be made up of 'libelli'. Translating the term 'libellus' as 'booklet', it is interesting to note that a modern scholar has perceived C as being made up of 'booklets'.

3. The Press-marks 'C.29.' and 'F.29.'

The press-mark 'C.29.' is on fol.1, the medieval binding-leaf at the front of the first volume of C, and 'F.29' is on the first of two paper leaves at the front of the second volume.

The evidence provided by Junius 45 and Junius's note on fol.1 of C suggests that the two volumes of C were not together in Vossius's library after it had been moved to England. If, as Ker believed, the press-marks are Vossius's, the appearance that they are not consecutive would seem to support the suggestion. Thus it might be thought that the letters refer to different shelves, and that it is coincidence that the numbers are the same. But it may be that the non-consecutive press-marks are not connected with Junius's having seen only the first volume of C.

20Ker, Catalogue, p.411.
It may be that Vossius's extensive library, which is said to have been 'the finest private library in the whole world', had not yet been organized after its removal to England in 1670, or after Vossius's subsequent move to Windsor in 1673. Thus, when the library had been sorted and the two volumes had been brought together again, Vossius gave Junius the whole of C. Some such account, disassociating the press-marks from the separation of the two volumes in Vossius's library, is required because of the possibility, of which I have been recently made aware, that the press-marks belong not to Vossius but to Paul Petau (1568-1614), a French collector of manuscripts who used marks of the same form as those in C. To research the possibility that Petau played a part in the preservation of C would be no small task, and I can only here note briefly the circumstances of the possibility and offer some information that may or may not be pertinent.

In 1650, while in the employ of Queen Christina of Sweden, Vossius bought on the queen's behalf the greater part of Petau's library from Alexandre Petau, Paul's son. In 1654 Queen Christina's library was transported to Antwerp, where Vossius, with assistants, 'libros Petavianos a "non-Petavianos" separavit. Labore finito codices Romam misit; multos tamen ex eorum numero sibi adrogavit - utrum Christina ignara neene incertum est'. After his death in 1689, Vossius's library was bought by Leiden university. De Meyeier's catalogue of the Leiden Vossiani includes an index of the Petau manuscripts showing Petau's marks. From this index and a list of Petau's marks in classical Latin manuscripts at the Vatican, it is apparent that Petau's system of marking employed all letters of the alphabet except I, U and W. The highest number is '79', with the next highest '59'. I cannot suggest what actual system the marks represent, but it is notable that the two '29's, 'B.29.' and 'E.29', in the lists are of very small size, smaller than C. Of eleven '28's in the lists, all are under 200mm. in height. There are five '30's,

---

21See the Vossius entry in DNB, p.395.
22The possibility was pointed out to me by Dr. Bruce Barker-Benfield of the department of Western Manuscripts at the Bodleian Library.
25Ibid.
26Ibid, IV, pp.60-63: this list does not show a point after the number, only after the capital letter, but the list in De Meyier, Paul en Alexandre Petau, pp.126-7, prints the marks with both points.
from 'B.30' at 190 x 140mm. to 'T.30' at 320 x 215mm. and 'Z.30' at 310 x 225. It may be that the numbers relate in some way to the size of the manuscripts.

C, a humble collection of homilies in Old English, looks out of place among the Latin manuscripts in the lists I have referred to, and, moreover, one wonders how Petau could have acquired C, when he seems, according to the entry in Biographie Universelle, never to have been in England. Paul Petau was cousin to a fellow bibliophile, Jacques Bongars (1546-1612), a diplomat, who, according to the entry in Dictionnaire de Biographie Francaise, was twice in England on political missions. The Petau entry in La Grande Encyclopedie notes that Petau 'avait partage avec Bongars les epaves de la bibliotheque de l'abbaye de Saint-Benoit-sur-Loire': They bought the Fleury library from Pierre Daniel.28

It should be noted that the glossed psalter, Junius 27, given to Junius by Vossius by, according to Ker, 1655, bears a press-mark 'B.19'.29 This mark is thus in the manner of Petau's, and it is not among those in the lists I have consulted. It has been noted above that Vossius was sorting out Petau manuscripts in 1654. Apart from the occurrence of comparable press-marks in C and Junius 27, I know of no support for Ker's statement that the press-marks in C are Vossius's.

As for the appearance of the press-marks in C, the figures '9' are formed differently, the 'F' is a curious form, with the vertical faint and looped at both ends and with two bold horizontals which the vertical bisects, and there is a faint horizontal mark in the middle of the otherwise bold letter 'C', giving a very slight suggestion that the letter has been altered to 'E'.

4. The Present Binding

The first volume of C (MS 85) has two paper leaves, one at the beginning and one at the end. The second volume (MS 86) has two paper leaves at the beginning and one at the end. All except the first of MS 86 are blank.

28Cp. M.B.Parkes, 'The manuscript of the Leiden Riddle', ASE, 1 (1972), 207-17 (pp.212-13, p.213, fn.1): Parkes notes the probable provenance of this Vossius manuscript from Fleury via Daniel from De Meyier, Paul en Alexandre Petau, p. 64.
29Ker, Catalogue, p.409; cp. above, p.12, fn.10.
The first paper leaf at the front of MS 86 has been pasted along its inner edge, which is ragged, on to the second, and is therefore not an integral part of the present binding. It is this first paper leaf that bears the press-mark 'F.29'. That this leaf belonged to an earlier stage of the binding is shown by the fact that its verso bears an off-set of writing from the recto of the first Anglo-Saxon leaf of MS 86, and of course the second paper leaf now intervenes.

The front board of MS 85 is loose, attached to the spine covering but revealing the whole of the inner spine, and the paper leaf at the front of MS 85, glued into the spine, cannot be said to be an integral part of the present binding.

The paper leaf at the front of MS 85 and that bearing the press-mark 'F.29.' seem to be of different manufacture from the other paper leaves. In the latter, chain lines are from about 25mm. to about 28mm. apart, while the chain lines in the other two are about 30 or 31mm. apart. Thus recorded the difference seems not great, but in practice the difference is conspicuous. The detail does not serve to suggest how much earlier the first paper leaves in each volume are, but it does support the evidence of the off-set from fol.36r that the present binding includes remains of an earlier binding. Another feature is similarly suggestive. Because the paper paste-downs on the insides of the boards cannot be held so that light shines through, chain lines are not visible, but the paper paste-down on the back board of MS 85 and that on the front board of MS 86 both have clearly visible watermarks of the same form, a two-fluked anchor in a circle. A great number of examples of anchor watermarks have been collected and illustrated by Vladimir Mosin. The watermark is associated mainly with Venice, though it may have been used by other paper makers around the Adriatic. It has many variant forms, the most notable variations being in the top of the anchor and in additions on top of the circle. Unfortunately the watermarks in C's binding are so placed that the top of anchor and circle are lacking. However, the form of

---

30Healey, *OE Vision of St. Paul*, p.8, observed 'some faint lettering' but did not identify it as being, as it certainly is, off-set from fol.36r.
31Too much weight cannot be given to the evidence of the chain lines. Thus E.G.Loeber, *Paper mould and Mouldmaker* (Amsterdam, 1982), p.22, comments that 'as a rule...chain wires were spaced at the same distance [within a mould], usually 24 to 26 millimetres, though exceptions to this rule were not infrequent'. But *cp. ibid.*, p.43: 'Although in the earliest European papers the - hardly visible - chain lines seem to be spaced from 40 to 50 millimetres, their distance normalizes in the course of the years to about one inch, or roughly 25 millimetres'.

---
the flukes places the watermarks of C's binding among examples most of which are dated to the middle decades of the sixteenth century. Some are as early as the later fifteenth century, but only one (and that not closely comparable to those in C's binding) is dated later than 1580.\textsuperscript{33}

Thus it is possible that not only two of the paper leaves of the binding but also the boards belong to an earlier binding. Moreover, although all the boards are covered with the same dicoloured, greyish skin, both spines are covered with a different, finer, much whiter skin. In \textit{Summary Catalogue}, C's binding is described as seventeenth century English work.\textsuperscript{34} Of course, I am no expert to pronounce on these matters, but it does seem that this work is really repair work. What seems to me most remarkable is that the putative repairer troubled to preserve the paper leaf bearing the press-mark 'F.29.'

With further regard to the paper leaves, it is disturbing that the description in Ker, \textit{Catalogue} (p.411) does not correspond to the reality. For MS 86 Ker noted two, not three, paper leaves, one at the beginning and one at the end. Since he noted the press-mark 'F.29.', and since the other two leaves are secured under strips of skin that edge the boards, it must be assumed that Ker saw MS 86 as it now is and the the discrepancy is a mistake, though it is odd, too, that he recorded the final paper leaf as being included in the foliation of the whole manuscript as fol.82, and I see no trace of a number '82' on the leaf. For MS 85 Ker recorded only one paper leaf at the beginning. The paper leaf at the end of MS 85 is not attached to the board, but is pasted on to the inner edge of fol.35v, thereby obscuring some letters at the ends of lines. Junius transcribed complete lines from fol.35v and I am inclined to think that fol.35 was free of paper leaf when he made the transcription in Junius 45, though as an experienced Anglo-Saxonist he could probably have supplied obscured letters without difficulty. The obscured letters are indicated in my edition of Homily 3. It is a little curious that the obscured letters are not indicated as such in Fadda's edition of the Homily,\textsuperscript{35} but is not believable that the paper leaf was stuck to the Anglo-Saxon leaf in recent years.

\textsuperscript{33}The late example is \textit{ibid.}, no. 1248, dated 1657. The other comparators are nos 346-1256, especially those with the better formed flukes among nos 346-434.
\textsuperscript{34}\textit{Summary Catalogue}, II.2, p.982.
Two more details of the binding are to be noted. The spine of MS 85 has three raised bands, that of MS 86 has none. The Greek letters 'a' and 'b' are inscribed on the front covers of MSS 85 and 86 respectively, as Wanley noted.36

5. Foliation and Modern Additions

Incomplete foliation in MS.85 is perhaps associated with a stage of the modern binding. In the top right hand corners of the rectos of fols 2-4 the numbers 1-3 are inscribed in ink, but they seem to belong to the series of folio numbers, 4-25, pencilled in the same position on fols 5-24. The pencilled numbers are very faint and are not visible on all folios. The absence of some numbers in the series is perhaps due to their having faded completely, or it may be that some numbers were never entered. The latter possibility is likely if fols 2ff. were foliated to ensure that the order in which they were found was preserved. The inking of the numbers 1-3 may have been for a similar reason, that is to ensure that fol.2 was retained in initial position. This fits in with my belief, noted in the previous section, that an earlier modern binding was repaired. Thus the pencilled numbers could belong to the earlier binding and the inked numbers 1-3 to the repair. This would not contradict a possibility that Junius was responsible for both the repair and the main foliation, since the inking can be assumed to have been done by Junius's binder, not by Junius himself.

The main foliation, entered in the lower right hand corners of rectos, I would attribute to Junius, who had included the medieval binding-leaf, fol.1, in his count of leaves when he wrote the note on fol.1. Thus Junius, when the whole manuscript came to him, could have made the foliation agree with the note, which counts Homily 2 as beginning 'pagina decima octaua'. The frequent retouching of writing throughout C I would also attribute to Junius. The retouching is carefully done and is usually accurate, so that rarely does it give cause for comment in the notes to my edition. That Junius was an accomplished writer of Anglo-Saxon script is clear from his transcriptions in Junius 45. He used his own version of Anglo-Saxon script, which he would tend to impose when retouching, and of course retouched writing has largely to be excluded from

36Wanley, Catalogus, p.44.
37Noted Healey, OE Vision of St Paul, p.4.
consideration of the palaeography of C. But from the purely textual point of view the retouching
is no great obstacle. To attribute the foliation and retouching of C to Junius's presumable study
of the manuscript once it had come into his possession is, of course, merely to state a most likely
possibility.

Other traces of modern study of C cannot so naturally be attributed to Junius, though some
appear to be in the same black ink of the retouching. When the ink of what I take to be modern
additions is not black it is greyish. The black ink of Junius's note on fol.1 has faded in places to
grey, and Anglo-Saxon inks in C fade to brown, never to grey. The modern additions are as
follows.

Hyphens are frequently added when a word is interrupted at the end of a line.

Some superscript letters are marked by means of a small inverted 'v', which is comparable
to the form of insertion marker used by Junius in his transcription from C in Junius 45. The
Anglo-Saxon insertion marker for superscript letters, when used, is a comma-like stroke. It is
not certain in every case that the superscript letter and the inverted 'v' marker were added at
once, but it is safer to assume that both letter and marker are modern. These superscripts are
remarked in the notes to the text of my edition. They occur as follows: Homily 1, line 294;
Homily 2, lines 58, 72, 168; Homily 3, lines 26, 70, 233; Homily 4, lines 189, 253, 266;
Homily 5, line 224.

In Homily 5, faint vertical lines have been added before some proper names to indicate
word division. These occur before 'pannania' and 'arrea', line 5; before 'constantines' and
'iuianii', line 13; before 'ambinensus', line 48; before 'turna', line 148.

In Homily 2, at the beginning of some sentences, small Arabic numbers have been added
superscript, presumably to mark off sections. The numbers occur as follows: '2' before 'wutod',
line 8; '3' before 'Stunlice', line 22; '4' before 'Beoð', line 34; '5' before 'Of', line 49; '6' before
'God forgifð', line 64; '7' before 'Du hiwast', line 85; '8' before 'Efnæ', line 102; '9' before 'Gif',
line 114; '10' before 'We', line 131; '11' before 'Donne', line 164.
Little can be said about the original content of the binding-leaf, fol.1. It can scarcely be ascertained that there was any writing on the recto. Enough writing on the verso is legible to identify the script as Caroline. Ker describes the content as 'part of a closely written early twelfth century liturgical text in Latin'. The text has been identified as belonging to 'Masses for kings and abbots' and listed as 'Missal (?) (Fragment)' by S.J.P. Van Dijk, who gives the date with a double query. Since the script is Caroline, Van Dijk probably had in mind the possibility of a date earlier rather than later than the twelfth century. Because of the condition of the writing, the lack of positive identification of the text and the fact that the outer margins are cut (as Van Dijk notes), the original size of the leaf would be difficult to judge. Its present height as fol.1 was originally part of its width, with the writing running from bottom to top on the verso. It appears that the leaf had been ruled with a point rather too sharp, since the horizontal ruling can be seen either to have scored or later to have resulted in breaking of the surface of the membrane on the present verso.

We owe our knowledge of the existence of the second medieval binding-leaf to A.S. Napier, who, in 1886, transcribed its content, which he had recognized to be part of a copy of the Old English translation of Boethius's 'De Consolatione Philosophiae'. By the time Sedgefield came to assemble material for his edition of the Old English Boethius, which was published in 1899, the leaf was lost. In the introduction to his edition, Sedgefield wrote that 'some years ago [the leaf] was taken out and bound separately, but it has since been mislaid, so that the present editor has not been able to see it'. Ker states that the leaf 'is not now to be found'.

38Ker, Catalogue, p.411.
40N.R. Ker, English Manuscripts in the Century after the Norman Conquest. The Lyell Lectures 1952-3 (Oxford, 1960), p.2, comments that 'about 1170...English writing and illumination cease to be essentially Caroline and Romanesque and become essentially Gothic'. The manuscript from which fol.1 was taken was not necessarily of English origin, of course.
41A.S. Napier, 'Bruchstück einer altenglischen Boetiushandschrift', Zeitschrift für deutsche Alterthum und deutsche Litteratur, 31 (1887), 52-4. The binding-leaf is Ker, Catalogue, no.337, p.411, the entry being based on Napier's article.
43Ker, Catalogue, p.411.
In a paragraph introducing his printed transcription, Napier gives his opinion that the text was written by a hand of the first half of the tenth century.\textsuperscript{44} He notes that the leaf was the last of MS 86. From the lacuna in the text between recto and verso it is clear that the leaf had been cut from one larger, whose size Napier gives as 'klein folio'.\textsuperscript{45} He estimated that there were originally c.38 written lines on each side, and marks off sixteen lines in the printed transcription of the original verso. Judging by the length of the written lines, which were evidently complete, the lost leaf, like fol.1, was placed sideways in the binding of C. On the condition of the lost leaf, Napier remarked that the writing was much faded ('verblasst') and that the membrane was perforated ('durchlochert') in places, with the holes causing loss of letters.

On the placing of the lost leaf Napier wrote: 'dieses blatt, welches augenscheinlich früher als einband gedient hat, ist erst vom buchbinder an die jetzige stelle gebracht worden'. The evidence for the use of the leaf 'als einband' is presumably that it had been cut to fit C, and we may reasonably assume (with Sedgefield, who translates Napier: 'This leaf, which evidently has been used previously in the binding...') that Napier did not intend to question the likelihood that the leaf belonged with C before the manuscript was bound into two volumes. I can only think that Napier remarked that the leaf was first placed in its present position by the binder because it was, in fact, the last membrane leaf of MS 85, not of MS 86 as Napier recorded. This would explain how the last paper leaf of MS 85 came to be stuck to fol.35. There is no sign of the removal of the lost leaf at the end of MS 86, but that is to be expected, perhaps, since the paper leaf would possibly have been re-stuck to fol.81 after the removal. However, I do not think there is cause to doubt that the lost leaf belonged, with fol.1, to a medieval binding of C. An indication that it followed fol.81 is that fol.81 has small holes in it, and these may correspond to the perforations noted by Napier. The holes are too small to cause loss of letters on fol.81, but on the lost leaf the letters may have been smaller and the holes bigger.

The correspondence of some brown stains on fols 35v and 36r shows that the tops of the leaves of MS 86, which are slightly smaller than those of MS 85, were aligned with the tops of the leaves of MS 85 when C was in its medieval binding.

\textsuperscript{44}Napier, 'Bruchstück', p.52.
\textsuperscript{45}Ibid.
\textsuperscript{46}Sedgefield, \textit{King Alfred's Old English Version of Boethius}, p.xvi.
7. The Title 'pars psalterii greci'

In the top left hand corner of fol.1, extending about half way across the page, the title 'pars psalterii greci' is boldly written in a formal script. The writing is only a little faded in places. The title includes no capital letters; '-cr-' of 'psalterii' and '-re-' of 'greci' are represented by abbreviation marks. In order the better to assess the significance of the title, I attempt to gain a more positive notion of its date than that afforded by Ker's dating, 's.xiii'.

It has been noted above (p.23) that the Caroline script of the original content of fol.1 was written probably no later than the early twelfth century date given by Ker. The title, therefore, was probably written some time during the twelfth century or later. The palaeographical indications of the title are that Ker did not have a possible fourteenth-century date in mind, but rather that he could not rule out a date earlier than the thirteenth century. Simply, the script of the title is not of a fully developed Gothic style, but rather exhibits two of the four features identified by Ker as being characteristic of the English transition from the Caroline to the Gothic style. These features will be noted in the course of the following assessment of the script of the title.

---

47Ker, Catalogue, p.411. The section in ibid., pp.xx-xxi, where Ker sets out his method of dating, does not cover the use of the question mark. It is, of course, to be appreciated that it would be rash to date so small a sample of script as the title provides to within the half-century limits outside which Ker hoped his dating method would not err. I must admit to a slight suspicion that the title is a forgery, intended by some post-Reformation dealer to fool a naive collector, but my examination of the letter forms tends to dispel the suspicion, and I treat the title as genuine.


49As well as Ker, English Manuscripts, principal works consulted are S. Harrison Thomson, Latin Bookhands of the Later Middle Ages, 1100-1500 (Cambridge, 1969), Andrew G. Watson, Catalogue of Dated and Datable Manuscripts, c.700-1600, in the Department of Manuscripts, the British Library, 2 vols (London,1979) and P.R. Robinson, Catalogue of Dated and Datable Manuscripts, c. 737-1600, in Cambridge Libraries (Cambridge, 1988). Examples from Robinson's catalogue, and one from Thomson's, are referred to in the text by author's name along with plate number, and place and date are noted as given in the catalogue.
**pars psalterii greci**

p The descenders of both examples begin at an angle of forty-five degrees; that of the first ends with a horizontal foot to the right. The bow is a single curved stroke, rather high in ‘pars’, completed on the line by an horizontal stroke, which the descender bisects. This horizontal stroke does not figure in any of Ker’s examples in *English Manuscripts*, but a horizontal stroke crosses the descender in Robinson, plate 40, an early twelfth-century manuscript written in Canterbury by Eadmer. The projection of the stroke to the left of the descender may be an attempt to impart a monumental air to the title. I find no comparably exaggerated example in letters p that are not *littera notabilior*. The feature may be considered a Gothic one, since it facilitates the combination of opposing curves (see Thomson, plate 91, ‘written probably at Ely, 1247’), although this propensity is not always exploited (see Robinson, plate 107, St. Albans, mid-thirteenth century). The foot which terminates the descender is comparable to the ‘horizontal or slightly sloping angular foot’, used to finish ‘a vertical stroke’, which is noted by Ker to be a feature of the mid-twelfth-century English script.\(^{50}\) s of ‘psalterii’ has a similarly formed foot terminating the ascender on the line, and this feature will be looked at again under that letter.

a The head of the second a is cramped beneath the head of preceding s; the first a is fully formed and clear and is of the ‘trailing-headed’ kind which Ker identifies as a feature of change in formal scripts of the twelfth century.\(^{51}\) Here the a is erect, with the bow somewhat flattened. The curving head stroke encloses an area about equal in size to the total area of the bow, with its ‘trailing’ end begun just above the level of the juncture of the top of the bow with the back of the letter.

According to Ker, the trailing-headed a developed from the high a ‘very commonly’ used initially in eleventh-century script, and was emerging as a new form by the time of the *Rouleau Mortuaire*, which contains *tituli* written in France and England in the year 1122.\(^{52}\) Of a total of two hundred and forty-eight entries in the *Rouleau*, seventy-three of which are from England, I

---

\(^{50}\)Ker, *English Manuscripts*, p.37.

\(^{51}\)Ibid., p.36.

\(^{52}\)Ibid. For the *Rouleau Mortuaire*, see ibid., pp.16 and 34: the manuscript is available in facsimile edition, Léopold Delisle, ed., *Rouleau Mortuaire du B. Vital, Abbé de Savigni* (Paris, 1909).
count eighteen from England that exhibit the feature. Though few, these entries are widely
distributed throughout England. There are two French entries that exhibit the feature (nos 49
and 178). The example from the Rouleau given by Ker (English Manuscripts, plate 15a) is from
Ely, and the feature may be observed in a later manuscript from there, dated 'after 1147'
(Robinson, plate 62), and in English manuscripts throughout the remainder of the twelfth century
(Robinson, plate 63, Canterbury, 1145 x 1170, to plate 99, 'London?, before 1201?'). The
trailing-headed a is yet to be observed in three St. Albans manuscripts of the middle of the
thirteenth century (Robinson, plates 106-108). In one of these (plate 107), the tendency for the
trailing head to close on the bow may be seen to be well advanced. Trailing-headed a seems to
have been used in French writing of the latter part of the twelfth century (Robinson, plates 69-
79).

s Medial s in 'psalterii' is unusual in that the ascender is a simple stroke, lacking the fin-
like projection which otherwise seems to be obligatory at all periods for high s in formal
scripts. The head is a simple broad stroke at forty-five degrees to the top of the ascender,
which is short, causing cramping of the head of following a. The foot is a bold, horn-shaped
projection to the right of the ascender on the line, better formed than that which is appended to
the right of the descender of p. This feature Ker thought may have been an archaism in the
Rouleau Mortuaire of 1122, but is to be observed again in manuscripts of the later twelfth
century (e.g. Robinson, plate 98, 'Englnad, before 1199'). The feature is also to be observed in
French manuscripts (e.g. Robinson, plate 69, 'Paris?', 1164 x 1170).

Final s of 'pars' is round, with the top two strokes making a circle that is interrupted by the
bellying first stroke of the bottom half, which is completed by a horizontal tilde-like stroke.

I The shortness of the ascender of s in 'psalterii' is matched in the ascender of l, which
barely rises above the top of the preceding a. The shortness of the ascenders may be considered a
Gothic feature, inasmuch as it indicates a move away from a four-line script.

53But see Thomson, plate 92, where a 'broken-backed' s used at St. Albans by Matthew Paris is
sometimes written with a plain straight ascender by one of his assistants. The bottom of the
descender is turned to the right. The date of the manuscript is given as 1259.
54Ker, English Manuscripts, p.37.
The tail seems distinctive, being a horizontal tide-like stroke, extending for about one third of its length beyond the round head. No hair-stoke is visible connecting the end of the tail back to the head. This style of tail should probably be considered a Gothic feature (e.g. Robinson, plate 125, Peterborough, 1295x1299), but a similar horizontal tail may be observed in earlier manuscripts (Robinson, plate 67, Canterbury, c.1155 and plate 95, Winchester, 1192 x 1198).

Other letters are unremarkable, except that final i of 'psalterii' is extended below the line and curves away to the left, while i in 'greci' has been provided with a foot like those of p and s noted above. The two abbreviation marks are horizontal stokes, with hair strokes at either end. This mark Ker describes as an 'innovation' (taking the place of 'a wavy or cup-shaped stroke') in a Canterbury episcopal profession of 1174.55

Generally the script of the title is curved, with no positive sign of Gothic fracture, the only angularity being in the feet of p and s.

The palaeographical evidence thus indicates, most particularly because of the trailing-headed a, that the title was written some time during the lengthy period of the development towards the Gothic style. Recalling that the abbreviation marks indicate a date not much earlier than the last quarter of the twelfth century, and giving full weight to Ker's impression of a possible thirteenth-century date (an impression probably due to such Gothic characteristics as the shortness of the ascenders), I suggest a date for the writing of the title before the middle of the thirteenth century, perhaps as early as the latter part of the twelfth century.

The script of the title appears to have been executed by an inexperienced scribe. The cramped a in 'psalterii' is one indicator of inexperience. Another is the contrast between the care with which 'pars' seems to have been written and the failure to maintain an even line for the rest of the lettering. Further, on the execution of trailing-headed a, Ker remarks that 'in practice the new form was difficult to make without raising the a above the general level of the letters: to do this successfully is the mark of a skilled scribe'.56 The a of 'pars' rises above the level of the bow of p (though the top of r is on a level with that of the a) and a of 'psalterii' rises higher than any

55Ibid. Ker, ibid., p.39, lists the straight abbreviation mark as one of the 'principal developments of the formal book-hand' at the end of the twelfth century.
56Ibid., p.36.
other letter in the word that is not an ascender. It may be noted, in the same connection, that the horizontal abbreviation marks in fact slope slightly down to the right.

8. A series of Jottings

For those of the following jottings which he cites, namely 'gaude prole...exultet' on fol. 20v and the names on fols 20v and 43v, Ker gives the date 's.xii/s.xiii'.

At the foot of fols 20v and 21r, but written the opposite way to the main text, that is, with the Anglo-Saxon manuscript upside down, is the following:

fol. 21r 'depronite', to the left of centre of the inverted page;
'depronite domino sede [?a]', in the right hand corner of the inverted page;
fol. 20v 'gaude prole grecias glorietur gal[lia] patre dyonisio exultet', in one line across the top of the inverted page. 'gaude...exultet' has been identified by Ker as the incipit of a hymn for St. Denis.

Written along the inner edge of the page, with the manuscript turned sideways, and the writing descending to above the middle of the page:
fol. 20v 'odo de moteroil', followed by a cross-shaped mark; below this, a little further out from the gutter, is a smudged, illegible jotting;
fol. 21r 'decid[..::l' is written in the inner margin, about centre page, with the manuscript the right way up;
'd[?icit] dominus', immediately below the preceding; 'dns' lacks its abbreviation mark.

Fol. 24v of the Anglo-Saxon manuscript is blank. To the right of the hole in the top half of the leaf, the following is written in one line:
fol. 24v 'Domine ne in furore tuo arg[u]' Capital 'D' is ornamented with surrounding wavy lines and two single curls, top and bottom, within the bow; 'f' in 'furore' has been altered from 't'; only the first minim of 'u' at the end of the line seems to have been written, though there is at least one letter space between preceding 'g' and the present gutter. 'Domine...arguas me' is the incipit of the sixth Psalm.

---

57 Ker, Catalogue, pp. 410 and 411.
58 Expanded abbreviations in the jottings are indicated by underlining.
59 Ibid., p. 410.
'decidit' is written at the foot of the page, much smaller than the preceding, and with the manuscript upside down.

Fol.30r 'Scritor sum talis' is written, with the manuscript turned sideways and more neatly than other jottings, along the inner edge of the page, the writing running from top to bottom.

Fol.36v 'gaudia monda' is written at the very top of the page;

'am' and two 'a's are scribbled between the lines of the OE text.60

Fol.43v 'teobaldus ade de richebor', followed by a cross-shaped mark, is written in two lines in the top right hand corner of the page; a few of the letters are partly off-set on fol.44r.

Fol.44v 'decid. omnia vincit amor et nos cedamus amori' is written in one line across the top of the page, with the following written smaller below: 'om on omnia' and 'omnia [four minims with abbreviation mark]cit'. 'Omnia...amori' is line 69 of the tenth Eclogue of Virgil's Bucolicon;

'decidit' is written near the the top of the left hand margin, with the following below, in descending order:

'decidit interdum' in two lines, with 'dum' repeated below;

'dum dominus deus', with 'deus' twice below;

's.p. amor uincit omnia et nos cedamus amori' in four lines, the first three of which intrude between two lines of the OE text;

'sermo convinio deorum no[?]'. '...nuin...' is written as four minims with abbreviation mark over the last one; letters after 'no' are a mere scrawl.

Fol.45r 'amor' and 'amo' are written in the left-hand margin.

Fol.61r 'decidit' is written in the top margin, with some off-set on fol.60v.

None of these jottings can be said to relate in any way to the OE text.

The jottings have been described in the heading of the present section as a series chiefly because they all appear certainly to have been written by the same hand. Palaeographically the hand is difficult, because it writes casually. It may reasonably be described as a personal hand (considering that the jottings can hardly have been intended to be read by anyone else) based on a

60Padda, Nuove omelie, p.25, in her edition of Homily 3, notes the scribbled 'am', but reads it as 'don'.
formal script rather than on a cursive script, although it exhibits at least one cursive feature, namely the continuation below the line and curve to the left of high s. Minims are usually sharply pointed at the top, with a long leading stroke, but less pointed or rounded at the bottom; minims are sometimes not turned on the line at all; in 'conuincio' on fol.44v the minims are written currently, that is, the pen is not lifted between strokes. Tops of ascenders are sometimes treated similarly to the tops of minims, but are sometimes plain. The hand employs round d, of varying length, and without the reverse curve of cursive scripts. Some letter forms exhibit features which make the hand comparable to the script of the title on fol.1. It should be stated at once that it cannot be said that the same scribe wrote both title and jottings. First there are the practical difficulties of having in the title only a small sample of script and of comparing samples executed in different manners. Then there is the point that, while the hand of the title appears to be that of an inexperienced scribe, what I have described as a personal band may be assumed to belong to a scribe with considerable writing experience, a point underlined by the fact that the writing of the jottings is for the most part readily legible, even though it is written small, with minim height never exceeding 2mm. However, this does not exclude the possibility that the same scribe wrote both the jottings and the title, since the latter could have been written earlier in the scribe's life than the former. Ker's datings are not necessarily an obstacle here, since a late twelfth-century date cannot be ruled out for the script of the title, and Ker's date for the jottings is 's.xii/xiii. Whatever the case, the palaeographical features which the jottings and the title have in common must be noted, and it is convenient to select for description here those letters whose forms in the title have already been described and discussed in the preceding section. The letter forms of the jottings are taken in the same order as those of the title.

As in the title, the descender is begun at an angle of forty-five degrees, and, more significantly, the bow is completed on the line by a horizontal stroke which crosses the

61 For this and other features of the cursive style as it had developed by the middle of the thirteenth century, see M.B. Parkes, English Cursive Book-hand, 1250-1500 (Oxford, 1969), pp.xiv-xv, and cp. Bischoff, Latin Palaeography, pp.137-8. Curved long s is a feature of most of the twelfth-century examples of the developing cursive style in T.A.M. Bishop, Scriptores Regis. Facsimiles to identify and illustrate the hands of royal scribes in original charters of Henry I, Stephen and Henry II (Oxford, 1961).
descender. This feature is clearest in the first 'prole' on fol.20v. In the first 'depronite' on fol.21r, the stroke is angled down to the right.

   a The shaft is usually written at an angle, but is occasionally erect. The head is pointed, not curved as in the title, but the leading stroke usually overhangs the bow, giving the letter the 'trailing-headed' appearance which is a feature of the script of the title. In 'amor' and 'amo' on fol.45v, a is written with an ascender and a long leading stroke which extends well beyond the bow.

   s The curved long s, reminescent of the cursive form of the letter, has already been noted, but in 'dominus' on fol.44v the ascender is a plain straight stroke, turned up at an angle of forty-five degrees on the line, and the form is thus comparable to the s of 'psalterii' in the title.

   l Ascenders are rather long, not conspicuously short as in the title.

   g Perhaps the most marked feature of the hand is the tail of g. This is a plain horizontal stroke which extends well beyond the head of the letter, and is thus comparable to the form in the title.

The usual abbreviation mark is a single straight stroke, but is wavy for 'Domine' on fol.24v and is cup-shaped for the first 'cedamus' on fol.45v.62 For 'um' of deorum' on fol.45v, the foot of 2-shaped r is crossed. For 'us' of 'teobaldus' on fol.43v, the mark like an open, round figure '9' is used.

The palaeographical features common to the title and the jottings, then, are the horizontal stroke in p, the trailing-headed a, and the extended horizontal tail of g. Little weight can be given to the single example in the jottings of a high s with a plain ascender.

The incipit of the hymn for St.Denis on fol.20v varies from printed texts, which have 'Graecia' for 'grecias' and 'Gallia' for 'gaullia'.63 'Exultet' is the first word of the second sentence of the hymn.64 The hymn was composed by Adam of St.Victor. Adam's dates, according to the

---

62 For the continued use at the end of the twelfth century of the wavy and cupped abbreviation marks beside the straight one, see Ker, English Manuscripts, pp.38-9.

63 Ulysse Chevalier, Repertorium Hymnologicum, 6 vols (Louvain, 1892-1921), 1,423, gives the incipit as far as 'Dionysio'. Full texts are in Migne, Patrologia Latina, vol. 196, cols 1521-3, Joseph Kehrein, Lateinische Sequenzen des Mittelalters aus Handschriften und Drucken (Mainz, 1873), pp.374-5 and Léon Gautier, Oeuvres Poétiques d'Adam de Saint-Victor. Texte Critique (Paris, 1894).

64 'exultet' is spelt 'exsultet' in Migne and Gautier.
New Catholic Encyclopaedia, are c.1110-1180, and we may be quite sure, therefore, that the jottings were not written at any time early in the twelfth century. One may note the coincidence that the jotting refers to the people of Greece while the title on fol.1 refers to a Greek psalter: there is the slightest of suggestions here that the writer of the jottings was working with the putative Greek psalter when the hymn occurred to him. That the jotting on fol.24v is the incipit of a psalm scarcely supports the suggestion.

The line from Virgil on fol.44v is the source of the motto on the prioress's brooch in the General Prologue to Chaucer's Canterbury Tales.\(^5\) The word order is changed in the motto, which appears in Chaucer as 'Amor vincit omnia'. In the fact that the writer of the jottings quotes the whole line, not simply the motto, and quotes it correctly, is a slight suggestion that he may have been at least somewhat a scholar.

A concordance search shows that those jottings for which no source has been noted above seem not to be Biblical. To re-cap, these are as follows: on fol.21r, 'depronite domino sede'; the repeated 'decidit' seems to belong to a clause which, when re-assembled from jottings on fol.44v, seems to read 'decidit interdum dominus deus'; on fol.44v, 'sermo conuincio deorum'. In the last, 'conuincio' does not seem to be a genuine Latin verb and I can offer no conjecture for the scrawled word, beginning 'no...', which follows 'deorum'.

The names on fols 20v and 43v are of interest especially because they include place-names. The second, 'teobaldus ade de richebor', prompted the comment in Summary Catalogue (where the place-name is given as 'Richeborg') that the place indicated is 'no doubt' Richborough in Kent. Healey likewise considers that the place-name is an indication of Kentish provenance for C.\(^6\) However, 'Richborough' is a late form of the place-name. In 1197, about the time of the jottings, the name is recorded as 'Ratteburg', and the name seems to have persisted in similar forms through the fourteenth century ('Retesbrough') and at least until the mid-fifteenth century ('Rath(o)urgh').\(^7\) A search through the volumes of the English Place-Name Society reveals no

---


\(^7\)J.K. Wallenberg, The Place-names of Kent (Uppsala, 1934), pp.531-2; Wallenberg's earliest instance of the form with the element 'Rich' is from the year 1509. See also Eilert Ekwall, The Concise Oxford Dictionary of English Place-Names, fourth edition (Oxford, 1960), and
name that is similar to 'richebor', although both 'riche' and 'bor' are to be found as English place-name elements. 'ade' appears to be a form of the surname 'Adam', which is found in [Domesday Book and is] common thereafter. The name on fol.20v is 'odo de moteroil', and again there is no similar place-name in the volumes of the English Place-Name Society, although the elements, if 'roil' is taken to be a form of 'roial', are to be found in English place-names. The first element, 'mote', could be the same as the OE element 'mot' (meaning either an 'assembly' or a 'river-confluence'), but, in conjunction with the Old French element 'roil', is more likely to be the Old French or Middle English element 'mote' (meaning 'embankment' and 'moat' respectively). I think there must be doubt as to whether either of the place-names, 'richebor' and 'moteroil', are in fact English. The second especially could as well be French. It may not be too fanciful to suggest that the thoughts of the writer of the jottings had turned to France when he remembered (or perhaps he was working with) the hymn for St. Denis, the French patron saint. Assuming, that is, that C was still in England.

9. Other Jottings or Pen Trials

On fol.24r, 'legem', begun hard up to the present gutter, is written in the next blank line below the end of Homily 2. The 'l' is like a long, thin Roman numeral 'I'. The 'e's and the round-headed Caroline 'g' are not well formed; for example, in the latter the tail stroke misses the stroke connecting tail and head. The minims of 'm' are better formed, and get progressively thicker. The appearance of the writing, from the spidery 'l' through to the final bold minim, suggests that the word was written as a pen trial. Despite its position relative to the OE text, the fact that there


68 See A.H. Smith, English Place-Name Elements, English Place-Name Society, 25 and 26 (Cambridge, 1956), under 'ric' and possibly 'risc', and under 'bor'.


70 Smith, English Place-Name Elements, under 'mot' and 'roial'.

71 Ibid.

72 However, David Hugh Farmer, The Oxford Dictionary of Saints (Oxford, 1978), p.106, remarks that 'the cult of Denys, bishop of Paris ... resulted in England in the dedication of no fewer than 41 ancient churches in his honour. Four Benedictine abbeys kept his translation feast, including Wilton.' The dedications are discussed in Florence Arnold Forster, Studies in Church Dedications or England's Patron Saints, 3 vols (London, 1899), II, 474-483, and listed ibid., III, 351.
is only one word makes it unlikely that a text had begun to be copied and then abandoned. Palaeographically there is nothing to suggest that the word was not written roughly contemporarily with the main texts. However, the letter ‘g’ is unlike Caroline g found in the main texts, where the first stroke of the head and the connecting stroke appear to be written at once (e.g. ‘ignem’, fol.23v, line 5). Between lines at the end of Homily 2, a few neum-like marks are drawn in the same brown ink as that of ‘legem’, and are therefore likely to be part of the same pen trial. Their position relative to the OE text is noted in the commentary to Homily 2, lines 182-3.

On fol.24v ‘anima’ is written in the top left-hand corner of the page, in darker ink than that of ‘legem’. Minims are rounded; the ‘a’s are too damaged for comment.

In three lines in the top half of fol.81v, the incipit of the first Psalm is written. Where the writing is illegible, due to fading or damage, and where the text varies from the Vulgate, Vulgate readings are supplied in square brackets: ‘Beatus uir qui non ha[Vulgate ‘abiit’] in consilio impio[rum] et in uia peccarum [Vulgate ‘peccatorum’] non stetit et [in] cath[edra]’. The script is a Caroline miniscule.

Below the preceding, in a single line, are written the letters of the alphabet, through to ‘stux’. The letters are rather faded and damage has caused the loss of ‘hikl’. The script may be described as Caroline miniscule, except that the ‘d’ is round (round d is short). Below the alphabet are two capitals ‘B’s, of the same form as that in ‘Beatus’ above, that is erect, with a small upper and a bellying lower bow.

10. Conclusion

One piece of evidence relating to the preservation history of C, the twin inscriptions ‘Pars psalterii saxonici’ on the rectos of fol.2 and 36, has not yet been considered. The inscriptions are identical in appearance and there need be no doubt that they were written by the same hand, and, with almost equal certainty, on the same occasion. Ker dates the hand to ‘s.xvii’.73 The inscription on fol.36r has been cancelled by means of a single line, perhaps by Junius or perhaps by Vossius when the latter had read Junius’s note on fol.1r. The note, which is likely to have

73Ker, Catalogue, p.411.
been written on Junius's first acquaintance with C (as I conclude in section 2, above, p.16), proves that Junius was not responsible for the inscriptions; but that an Anglo-Saxonist could have made the error could hardly have been entertained as a possibility anyway. When in the note, which I have taken to have been intended for Vossius's attention (above, pp.13 and 15), Junius says 'rectius enim Homiliarum quam Psalterii partem dixeris', there is the suggestion that Junius thought Vossius might have written the inscriptions. However, if this is the implication, Junius may have been unjust to attribute such an error to the renowned scholar Vossius. A comparison with known examples of Vossius's hand might resolve the point.\textsuperscript{74} However, even if, on the one hand, it could be shown that Vossius himself did not write the inscriptions, there would still be the possibility that he was responsible for them through the agency of an assistant, and if, on the other hand, it could be shown that Vossius did write the inscriptions, he could have done so at any time while C was in his possession, and it could not then be said that they indicate that Vossius was responsible for the division of C. All that can be said here is that the inscriptions could have been entered at any time between the occasions of C's binding into two volumes and of Junius's writing his note.

The question to which one seeks an answer is, of course, how did Vossius acquire C? Had he come by the manuscript after his move to England in 1670, or when, before his employment with Queen Christina of Sweden, 'he is said ... even to have crossed over into England in his quest of manuscripts'?\textsuperscript{75} But the only evidence providing a possible answer to the question, the press-marks considered in section 3 of this chapter, suggests that Vossius did not acquire C in England at all, but rather that he acquired the manuscript, via Queen Christina's library, from the collection of Paul Petau.

In section 4 of the present chapter, we saw that one of the press-marks is on a paper leaf that, judging by its off-set from fol.36r and by the fact that it has been pasted on to another paper leaf, seems to have been preserved from an earlier stage of the binding. That the paper of this leaf, and of the first leaf in MS 85, is of a different manufacture from that of other paper leaves in the binding is a further indication that the present binding is a repair of an earlier one. The full

\textsuperscript{74}Letters and notes in the Bodleian, written by Vossius, may be located by means of the Vossius entry in the index volume of Summary Catalogue (vol.VII).

\textsuperscript{75}DNB (Vossius entry, p.393).
extent of the repair I cannot say, though it might be ascertained by an expert. Unfortunately, the
evidence of manufacture of the paper leaves, the spacing of chain lines, cannot be observed in the
paper lining the boards, and it cannot be said that the earlier paper leaves belong to the same
stage of binding as the boards, that is, to probably the earliest stage of the present binding. The
boards themselves at least might be expected to be retained from the binding undergoing repair,
and even if their covering had been replaced, paper pasted on their inside would not be easily
removed. On two of the boards, the paper bears probably Venetian anchor watermarks, which
appear to be of a style that was not used after about 1580, and the two boards may, therefore,
belong to C's earliest post-medieval binding. Since one of the two boards belongs to MS 85 and
the other to MS 86, and the two volumes are of different size, it is likely that the binding to
which the boards with the watermarks belong was also the binding into two volumes. It seems
reasonable to postulate that the binding underwent only one repair, and consequently that the
ever paper leaves (including that with the off-set from fol.36r) belong with the paper lining the
boards. Since the spine coverings are of different skin from the board coverings, which are of
uniform appearance, it is likely that the board coverings, too, are pre-repair and contemporary
with the watermarks. My view of the binding has to be set against the Summary Catalogue entry,
where the bindings are described as English work of the seventeenth century.76

The date of the watermarks would suggest a date of the binding perhaps a little earlier
than the time when Paul Petau, who lived from 1568 to 1614, was collecting manuscripts, but the
possible connection with Petau depends on the press-marks, not on the binding, and of course the
press-marks could have been entered at any time between the occasions of the two-volume
binding and of the repair of that binding.

With the possibility that Petau had owned C comes the possibility, not only that the
manuscript was in France at about the end of the sixteenth century, but also, since Petau is more
likely to have acquired C in France than in England, that the manuscript had been in France in
medieval times. Since they cannot be shown to be English, the place-names 'richebor' and
'moteroil', which occur among the jottings considered in section 8 of the present chapter, do not
contradict such a possibility. That the jottings might be French is also suggested by the fact that

76Summary Catalogue, II.2, p.982.
they include the incipit of a hymn for the French Saint, St. Denis. Ker dates the jottings to 's.xii/xiii'. My scrutiny of the letter forms of the title, 'pars psalterii greci', on fol.1 suggests a similar date for the writing of the title (above, p.28), and the fact that the title and the jottings have palaeographical features in common suggests that they could have been written at the same place (above, p.32). When I was working on the palaeography, I was not aware of the possible Petau connection, and my palaeographical investigations in section 7 of the present chapter have an English bias, but I did note that two important features, the trailing-headed a and the foot used to finish vertical strokes, are found in French as well as English manuscripts.

The evidence provided by the jottings could hardly be more tenuous, but the possibility that C had been in France becomes a little more attractive when Parkes's comments on the manuscript of the 'Leiden Riddle' are noted. The riddle is in the Leiden manuscript, Vossius Lat.Q.106, which bears Petau's mark, 'R.37', and is probably from Fleury. Parkes comments: 'numerous pen trials and in particular pen trials of neums are a characteristic feature of manuscripts which, according to the evidence of ex libris inscriptions, were at Fleury in the ninth and tenth centuries ... Not only the neums but also the series of small letters bed and names ... are characteristic additions in Fleury manuscripts'. One cannot help but be put in mind of what appear to be neums which accompany the pen trial 'legem' on C, fol.24r, noted with other pen trials in section 9 of this chapter, and even of the names among the series of jottings. Parkes was assembling evidence to indicate that the Riddle was copied at Fleury in the tenth century, and does not discuss additions to Fleury manuscripts generally, but he does incidentally refer to 'neums added to manuscripts whose main contents were copied at the end of the tenth century or in the eleventh'.

An hypothesis that most readily suggests itself to explain the presence of a book in Old English at Fleury is that it could have been left there accidentally by an English pilgrim to the resting-place of St. Benedict's remains. One is reminded of another English book containing Old English homilies, the Vercelli Book, whose presence in Vercelli may be explained by its having

---

77Ker, Catalogue, pp.410 and 411.
78De Meyier, Codices Vossiani Latini, II, pp.235-7; De Meyier gives the date 'saec. ix/x (f.1: saec. xi)'; the Petau mark is noted ibid., p.61.
79Parkes, 'Manuscript of the Leiden Riddle', p.213.
80Ibid., p.215.
been left there by an English pilgrim to Rome in the eleventh century. However, whether C was acquired by Paul Petau, perhaps among manuscripts that had belonged to Fleury library, must here remain an open question.

Turning to the medieval binding-Leaves described in section 6, one point should be emphasized, that it is unlikely that fol.1 was introduced as part of the present binding. The present arrangement, with fol.1 pasted into the fold of fol.2 (see diagram, above p.6), which suggests that fol.1 was not used as an integral part of the present binding, may be due to the original modern binding or to the later repair, but wear round the outside edges of fol.1 shows that the leaf was not cut to be used in the present binding. Moreover, like fol.2, fol.1 is particularly fragile at its bottom outside corner, and there is the appearance that the two leaves lay long together, before they came to be protected by the present binding. If it could be shown that I am right to connect the script of the title on fol.1 with that of the jottings within C, there would be less difficulty in accepting that fol.1 belonged to a medieval binding of C. But the title itself is a difficulty here.

It is hardly credible that C could have been mistaken for part of a Greek psalter, however strange eleventh-century insular script may have looked to whoever was responsible, probably in the late twelfth or early thirteenth century, for writing the title on fol.1, and the possibility must be considered that the title genuinely indicates that C was once bound with part of a Greek psalter. Indeed the only other possibility that I can think of is that fol.1 was taken from the binding of a Greek psalter and re-used to bind C. This would have had to have been done earlier enough to account for the comparably damaged condition of fols 1 and 2, but the possibility

---


82However, Wanley, *Catalogus*, p.44, did think that the title had been entered by one who was 'Saxonismi imperitus'. In his note Junius is less specific when he says 'imperitia possessorum inscriptus fuit huius libelli titulus Pars psalterii', and he might, unless he believed Vossus was responsible for them, have been also referring to the first of the inscriptions identifying C as part of a Saxon psalter.
cannot be ruled out on that count since about four hundred years may separate the writing of the title and the modern binding. However, I think the condition of fols 1 and 2 can be more exactly accounted for if it is postulated that C was at one time bound with part of a Greek psalter, which was removed at a later time, thereby leaving a gap, which need not have been large, between the board, probably with fol.1 attached, and fol.2. I think this could fit both with the fact of the wear around the outer edges of fols 1 and 2, and with the fact that the title itself, on the inside half of the page, is little worn. If I am right about the repair to the modern binding, it might be thought that the repair was necessitated by the removal of the Greek psalter fragment from the modern binding, but I think fols 1 and 2 are too worn for this to be likely.\(^8\)

We may note that small format Greek psalters are not unknown. When Healey was prompted by the title on fol.1 to search English library catalogues for Greek psalters 'which are no later than the thirteenth century', she found three examples, one of which, CCCC 468, is about the same size as C, while another, CCCC 480, is smaller.\(^4\) The dimensions are given in the catalogue in inches, and so for comparison I give C's dimensions in inches from Summary Catalogue:\(^5\) C, 6.7" x 4.5" and 6.4" x 4.1"; CCCC 468, 6.1" x 4.5" (thirteenth century);\(^6\) CCCC 480, 4.8" x 3.8" (twelfth century).\(^7\) An earlier example, of unusual format, is the Bodleian manuscript, E.D.Clarke 15, 4.375" x 5.375" (c.1078).\(^8\) An example dated to 961 because accompanying Easter tables are calculated from that date, is Milan, Bibl. Ambrosiana, MS.F.12.Sup., at 6.25" x 5".\(^9\) I have not undertaken a search for imperfect Greek psalters, but it seems that small format examples could be multiplied.\(^10\)

\(^8\)There are no small Greek psalters, or fragments of such, among Vossius's Greek manuscripts at Leiden, catalogued by K.A. De Meyier, Codices Vossiani Graeci et Miscellanei, Codices Manuscripti, VI (Leiden, 1955).
\(^4\)Healey, OE Vision of St. Paul, p.17, fn.76.
\(^5\)Summary Catalogue, II.2, p.982.
\(^6\)M.R. James, A Descriptive Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Library of Corpus Christi Cambridge, 3 vols (Cambridge, 1912), II, p.403.
\(^7\)Summary Catalogue, IV, no.18377, p.302.
\(^9\)I have noted four examples in the Vatican catalogue, Bibliothecae Apostolicæ Vaticanæ Codices Manu Scripti Recensiti: Cyrus Gianelli, ed., Codices Vaticani Graeci. Codices 1485-1683 (Vatican, 1950), no.1541 (s.xii, 118 x 93mm.) and no.1542 (s.x, 120 x 95mm.); Paulus Canart, ed., Codices Vaticani Graeci. Codices 1745-1962. Tomus I. Codicum Enarrationes (Vatican, 1970), no.1873 (1010-11, 163 x 145mm.) and no.1874 (s.xi-xii, 165 x 145mm.). A list of a selection of Greek psalters, including imperfect examples up to 1100, is given by James
CHAPTER THREE

PALAEOGRAPHY

Ker dates the style of insular script used in C to 's.xi med.', that is possibly to within the twenty-five years and more certainly to within the fifty years centred around 1050.\(^1\) Ker notes that the writing 'varies in appearance',\(^2\) and, as we shall see, the manuscript seems certainly to have been written by more than one scribe. However, there is some conformity of style throughout C. Although a 'lateral compression so characteristic of eleventh-century English vernacular script'\(^3\) is not clearly evinced in the script of C, there is a certain perpendicularity in the style which is perhaps akin to the characteristic noted by Dumville. However, this impression of perpendicularity depends largely, I think, on the marked tendency throughout C to write the back of the usual round or slightly flattened a nearly or quite as erect as minims: an erect a would have the effect of lateral compression only when viewed in relation to a script using a sloping-backed a, and Dumville's impression of lateral compression is derived from a contrast with the proportions of 'English square miniscule' (an essentially tenth-century style), in which the typical a is erect.\(^4\)

1. The Hands

Some emphasis has been placed in preceding chapters (see above pp.7 and 13) on the similarity, in contrast to all other gatherings, of the membrane used for gatherings fols 3-11 and 18-24. Once the eye adjusts to the different page format (fols 3-11 with sixteen or fifteen lines,

\(^1\)Ker, *Catalogue*, p.409. See *ibid.*, pp.xx-xxi, for Ker's system of dating.
\(^2\)Ibid., p.411.
\(^3\)David N. Dumville, 'Beowulf Come Lately: Some Notes on the palaeography of the Nowell Codex', *Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen und Literaturen*, 225 (1988), 49-63 (p.54).
\(^4\)See *ibid.*, p.53; for square minuscule, see Dumville, 'English Square Miniscule Script: the Background and the Earliest Phases', *ASE*, 16 (1987), 147-79, and *ibid.*, pp.153 and 172 and plates VI and VII for the typical square a.
fols 18-24 with nineteen or twenty lines), the writing in these gatherings is no less strikingly similar than the appearance of the membrane. The even, matt black of the ink is the same in both gatherings, and the fineness of the pen strokes is also marked, in contrast to the writing in the rest of the gatherings in C. These characteristics are, probably, largely due to the comparatively good quality of the membrane, but there is also close agreement in the formation of the letters. The following comments, then apply to both gatherings.

The form of f is distinctive with its lower stroke fine, horizontal, on or just below the line and, most distinctively, crossing the descender, often so that the descender bisects it into roughly equal halves. Descenders of all letters are wedge-shaped at the top. Sometimes the top of the wedge is slightly angled but there is a very marked tendency to write descenders with a long, horizontal leading (or 'attacking') stroke, which sometimes all but replaces the wedge. This tendency extends to the formation of the tops of ascenders, but is there much less marked. In h the ascender is often with either an angled or horizontal wedge, and in h and l the ascender is often with either an angled or split wedge, but this distinction is by no means rigorously observed. Round d is very short or short. g has a fine head stroke; the down stroke is begun at or slightly to the left of the middle of the head stroke, and is, sometimes very gently, curved, though in the gathering fols 18-24 there is a slight tendency for the down stroke to be angular. The tail of g is amply open and is typically formed with a fine stroke which seems to continue without break from the down stroke, but sometimes, especially in gathering fols 18-24, the open tail is a thicker stroke, in which cases it is occasionally apparent that the stroke is drawn back (from left to right) to meet the tail. Cross strokes of d and the abbreviation for 'pat' are typically not steeply angled and are turned at both ends (up at the left, down at the right). There need be no doubt that the writing in gatherings fols 3-11 and 18-24 is attributable to one scribe, who, for the sake of consistency with Healey's analysis of the hands of C, will be called 'Hand B'.

The quality of the membrane of the four gatherings, fols 42-81, is no less uniform than, but quite different from, that of the two gatherings, fols 3-11 and 18-24. Significantly for the

---

5Horizontal tops of descenders, especially when in the vicinity of f and g, impart to the script a general aspect of horizontality which combines with the perpendicularity of aspect to give an overall impression of squareness.

writing, while the latter membrane is matt, the former is smooth and shiny. The ink is black on all these leaves, but in fols 42-81 it often shows brown, especially on the shinier sides; that is, the ink inheres far less evenly than in fols 3-11 and 18-24. However, once the contrasting quality of membrane has been taken into consideration, it becomes apparent that the writing of fols 42-81 may be confidently attributed to Hand B.

Hand B begins this stint with his pen cut thick, but mid-way on fol.46r his writing becomes finer and smaller, and so it continues, but never so fine (comparatively) as on gatherings fols 3-11 and 18-24. It is perhaps the need to execute bold strokes on the smooth surface of the membrane that inhibits his use of fine, horizontal strokes for the tops of descenders. At any rate, tops of descenders are regularly more or less wedge-shaped, and angled at about forty-five degrees. The exigencies of the membrane may also be responsible for the tail of g being rarely so finely drawn as it is especially on fols 3-11. On fols 42-81 it is regularly (but not exclusively) apparent that the tail of g is drawn back to meet the down stroke. The down stroke of g has a stronger tendency than in fols 18-24 to be angular. Tops of ascenders are wedge-shaped, either angled or split. The distinctive crossed f is in totally regular use. Round d is again very short or short. Cross strokes of 6 and the abbreviation for 'pæt' are as they appear in fols 3-11 and 18-24.

Fol.34 (the middle leaf of a gathering of three singletons) is of much the same quality as fols 42-81, and again the writing on this folio may be attributed to Hand B, although it is not possible with a rather small sample to be quite so confident in the attribution as hitherto. Moreover, much of the recto of fol.34 has been subject to the attentions of the probably seventeenth-century retoucher. A particular point against the attribution is the form of the cross stroke of 6 and the abbreviation for 'pæt'. On the recto this is sometimes steeply angled and, instead of being turned at both ends, is in the form of an inverse tick (much in the manner of the accents). However, Hand B's form of the cross stroke is present on the recto and almost totally regular on the verso. It may be that Hand B was trying to adapt his usual form to match the form habitually used by the scribe of the preceding folios. The presence of two rather long round d's (one retouched) is another occasion for hesitation, but the evidence for the attribution outweighs that against, and the writing generally appears very much as that on fols 42-81. In particular, the

7The retoucher is likely to have been Junius: see above, pp.21-2.
tendency of the down stroke of g to be angular is the same, and the variable form of this letter
generally is exactly comparable. There are several instances of f, all crossed. Moreover, a
drawing of a bird is used to enclose a final part line on the verso of fol.34, and a smaller,
rougher, but comparable drawing of a bird is used to enclose the final word of fol.77r. It may be
noted in the present connection that fol.34 has fifteen written lines (plus the part line on the
verso), whereas fol.25-33 and fol.35 have nineteen lines. In fols 42-81 Hand B writes a page of
from thirteen to fifteen lines (sometimes with a part line at the bottom). Fols 36-41 have sixteen
lines, plus a part line.

Fols 3-11, 18-24, 34 and 42-81 may safely be attributed to Hand B.

It is convenient to preface the next stage of our investigation of the hands of C with Ker's
comment that 'ff.2v, 12-16v, 25-33v, and f.34 [recte fol.35], ii.1-4, appear to be in a different
hand from the rest, by a scribe who often uses a caroline form of r, which descends below the
line: in Latin by this scribe the r is not a descender'.8 Fols 2v and 35r, lines 1-4, are problematic
and must await later consideration. Neither is the identification of the hand of fols 12-16 with
that of fols 25-33 quite straightforward. However, each of these two stints is definitely to be
distinguished from those of Hand B, and in ways which tend to identify one with the other. Thus
in fols 12-16 and 25-33 the writing has an angular aspect, largely due to the angular down stroke
of g, but also detectable in minim strokes, which makes Hand B's writing look curvacious by
comparison. When, at fols 13v and 14r, a curving down stroke is used in g, it is unlike Hand B's,
having an ungainly appearance due to the curve being executed below the line. The angular
aspect is complemented by a spikiness due to the sharply angled wedges (which often show
splitting) at the tops of ascenders. This treatment of ascenders, which is mirrored (apart from the
splitting) in the treatment of descenders, in turn contributes to a perpendicularity of aspect which
is further enhanced in fols 12-16 and 25-33 by a round d which is generally both longer and
more erect than that executed by Hand B.

8Ker, Catalogue., p.411. Healey, OE Vision of St. Paul, p.8, does not correct the error in Ker's
comment. Caroline r with descender was used by Wulfstan: see N.R.Ker, 'The Handwriting of
Archbishop Wulfstan', in England before the Conquest. Studies in Primary Sources presented to
Dorothy Whitelock, ed. P.Clemoes and K.Hughes (Cambridge, 1971), pp.315-31 (p.317). I have
not come across any other examples.
Only once does a crossed \( f \) appear in fols 12-16 and 25-33, and that in the marginal addition of 'for' to the word 'loren' on fol.26r. In fols 12-16 the lower stroke of \( f \) is slightly angled up, and turned down at its right-hand end, but there are a few instances where the stroke is not turned down. In fols 25-33 there is a reversal of practice, with a straight, nearly horizontal lower stroke being usual, along with a few examples of turned strokes; also in fols 25-33 there are a few instances of a stroke mid-way between the two types.

The usual form for the cross stroke of \( \delta \) and the abbreviation for '\( \varphi \)et' is an accent-like stroke, but there are instances in fols 12-16 of the stroke being turned at both ends, especially on \( \delta \) at the beginning of lines, where \( \delta \) is extended into the margins.\(^9\) The stroke is then steeply angled, and not so deliberately turned as is the case with Hand B.

Fols 12-16 and 25-33, then, were certainly not written by Hand B, and the overall, similarity between the two sections is sufficiently close that we need no longer hesitate in agreeing with Ker's judgement that they were written by one scribe, who will be called (with Healey) 'Hand A'.

Let us examine the point which caught Ker's attention, namely Hand A's use of a caroline form of \( r \) with descender, which I will call 'long open \( r \)'. This form appears first on fol.12v, though a short open (caroline) \( r \) is used for a superscript correction on fol.12r. On fol.12v there are four instances of long open \( r \) beside nineteen of insular \( r \), and this ratio does not significantly increase during the section fols 12-16, with some pages having insular \( r \) exclusively. In fols 25-33 long open \( r \) does not appear until two thirds of the way down fol.29r, after which it is almost entirely regular, superceding the insular form.

The situation is somewhat the same with Hand A's choice of forms of the letter \( s \). Thus in fols 12-16 insular \( s \) (descender with head stroke within the line) is usual, but there is a scattering (not on every page) of the long form of \( s \) (descender with head stroke curving up well above the line). In fols 25-33, long \( s \) appears with total regularity, except for the \( s \)'s in 'clænnesse' (fol.25r, line 3) and 'pis' (retouched, fol.27v, line 1).

\(^9\)Strictly, it cannot be claimed, as Healey does (\textit{OE Vision of St.Paul}, p.9), that 'the general rule for the eleventh century that \( \varphi \) should be written at the beginning of a word, and \( \delta \) medially and finally' is observed in fols 12-16 and 25-33, though it is true, as she implies, that Hand B uses \( \delta \) rather than \( \varphi \) comparatively frequently. Note that preference for \( \varphi \) over \( \delta \) contributes to perpendicularity.
Another feature, with comparable distribution, of Hand A's writing is his use in English of st ligature (descender with a vertical extension, to the top of which is joined the extended shaft of t). In fols 12-16 the form appears once medially and three times terminally in a total of thirty-six instances of 'st'. In fols 25-33 the form is much more frequent, appearing twenty-eight times medially and sixteen times terminally, in a total of fifty-four instances of 'st'. The only occurrence of 'st' in initial position in either section ('staefne', fol.33r, line6) is not a ligature.

Thus, in contrast with Hand B, who uses standard insular forms consistently for writing English, Hand A seems to be experimenting with letter forms, and the seemingly introduced forms (long open r, long s and st ligature) are more frequent in fols 25-33 than in fols 12-16.

The writing on fol.35\(^1\) (leaving aside for now the problematic first four lines of the recto) is more like Hand A's than Hand B's writing, except that the lower, straight stroke of f tends to transect the descender, but rarely so that the descender bisects it into two equal parts as is often the case with Hand B. Although Hand A seems to have been in the process of changing his form of f so that its lower stroke is usually straight in fols 25-33, never does the lower stroke cross the descender. g on fol.35 is angular (like Hand A's g) but the tail is generally markedly less open than it is in the work of either Hand A or Hand B. Round d and ð are of exaggerated length, except when ð is inhibited by preceding l. r and s are insular in every instance, whereas Hand A uses long open r and long s regularly by the end of his stint, fols 25-33 (it will be remembered that fols 33-35 are one gathering). However, st ligature of the same form as that employed by Hand A appears twice in medial position on fol.35r (other instances of 'st' on fol.35 are in initial position), but on balance, and on grounds of general aspect, it is fairly safe to attribute the writing of fol.35 to a third scribe, Hand C.

The writing in the gathering, fols 36-41, contrasts at first sight with that on fol.35, but this is largely due to the change of page format, with nineteen lines to the page on fol.35 and sixteen lines and a bracketed part line on each page of fols 36-41. The detail is identical, with the same maximally extended d and ð being dominant, the same closing tail of g and the same strong tendency to write crossed f. r and s are insular with two exceptions: long open r appears

\(^{1}\)The verso of fol.35 is much retouched, but enough original writing is visible to identify it with the main hand of the recto.
at the end of the fifth line on fol.37r, and a long s is the final letter on fol.38v. Occurrence of st ligature is limited to fols 38-40, where seven out of twenty instances of 'st' are so formed, six in medial, one in terminal position: there are a few instances of initial 'st', none of which is a ligature.

Thus so far it can confidently be stated that Hand A wrote fols 12-16 and 25-33, Hand B wrote fols 3-11, 18-24, 34 and 42-81, and Hand C wrote fols 35-41.

It is impossible to be confident in the attribution of the writing of fol.35, lines 1-4, but all six instances of r are of the long open form used by Hand A, and the one instance of f, with a turned lower stroke that does not cross the descender, is in the manner of Hand A. The hand is sprawling and untidy, and contrasts sharply with Hand C's writing on fol.35. Hand B's bracketing of a part line on fol.34v suggests that his stint within the gathering, fols 33-35, is confined to fol.34. It may be that Hand A wrote fol.35, lines 1-4, and that the untidiness of the writing is due to his having tried to match his hand to the larger writing of Hand B, as Hand B may have tried to adjust the appearance of his writing to match Hand A's writing on fol.33 by varying his usual cross stroke for δ and the abbreviation for 'pæt'.

The palaeography of fols 2 and 17 and of additions on fols 2v-6r is still to be considered.

Although fol.2 is in very poor condition, it is evident that the recto is in a different hand from the verso. The small sample of fourteen lines of writing on the recto is made smaller by extreme fading, especially of the top three lines and down the right-hand side of the page. The fact that some of the faded writing has been retouched is a further difficulty, but the retouched writing (here and on the verso) need not be discounted altogether, since the retoucher, though he makes mistakes, seems generally to have taken pains to trace the letters accurately.

Of the hands so far distinguished, the writing on fol.2r is most like that of Hand B, in overall aspect and in detail. There is a good example ('soðfæstan', line 4) of a crossed f exactly in the manner of Hand B, and two retouched instances of the letter are both crossed. The cross stroke of δ is the same as Hand B's. The only point that can be brought against attribution to Hand B is that of six occurrences of d (excluding the two instances in the repeated word 'woruld': round d is necessarily short in the combination 'ld') three are written long, while in the bulk of Hand B's work d is dominantly short. However, like fol.2r, fol.81r contains the completed
ending of a homily and has instances of long d: it may be that Hand B was inclined to write d long when approaching the end of a text. The last word before 'Amen' in both texts is 'ande' and on fol. 81r d in this word is only a little shorter than it is on fol. 2r. The 'Amen' itself is in closely comparable uncial capitals (except that 'E' on fol. 2r has been retouched to look like a revised figure three) and the word is finished in each case with a very similar decorative flourish. Fol. 2r, then, was written by neither Hand A nor Hand C, but could have been written by Hand B.

The text of Hand A's stint, fols 12-16, begins on fol. 2v. The last two and a half lines of fol. 2v have been erased and the reviser who made additions to the text of fols 3-11 (on fols 3-6r) added three lines of text, the last word of which overruns on to fol. 3r, to link the text of fol. 2v with that of fols 3-11. Ker would attribute the writing of the original text on fol. 2v to Hand A, because of the occurrence of long open r. This form appears five times on fol. 2v alongside thirteen instances of insular r, a ratio not too different from that in Hand A's stint, fols 12-16 (e.g. six long open r's beside eighteen insular r's on fol. 14r). Nearly all the writing on fol. 2v has been retraced by the retoucher, but one long open r, in 'rerest' (line 5), has not been retouched. Although the retoucher seems to have retraced r accurately, there is confusion over f, some instances of which are crossed, a form not used by Hand A. However, there are also examples of uncrossed f, where the lower stroke is turned and is therefore the same as Hand A's usual form in fols 12-16. The crossing with a straight stroke may be due to the retoucher: I believe I detect a turned stroke under the crossing stroke in 'leofestan' (line 1), and we may recall that the retoucher will already have encountered crossed f on fol. 2r. Apart from this doubt about f, there is nothing against the attribution of the original writing on fol. 2v to Hand A.

Healey would identify the reviser with Hand A, but there is palaeographical evidence against the identification. The only evidence for the identification is the reviser's use of long s as well as insular s. Against the identification are two instances of crossed f in the additions on fols 3-6r, and the reviser's use of a nearly horizontal cross stroke turned at both ends for δ and the abbreviation for 'pat'. Also the reviser's g, though variable, is never angular, as it is in the work of Hand A. All these points are also against identification with Hand C, and the reviser's use of long s is against identification with Hand B. However, the work of the reviser is either retouched...

or faded, and on palaeographical evidence alone it cannot be averred that the reviser is not to be identified with any of the three hands which have been safely distinguished. There will be occasion in the next chapter to deliberate the identity of the reviser (below, pp. 69-70).

Most of the text on fol. 17 is in Latin, approximately in the proportion one and a half lines of Latin to one line of English. The distinction, caroline script for Latin, insular script for English, is observed with total regularity, except for insular s in 'miles' (line 8 of the verso); caroline r is once written with a descender ('peperit', recto, line 7); s in Latin is the long form. Insular f, of which there are five instances, is crossed, and this point suggests strongly that fol. 17 was not written by Hand A. In the rest of C, when, of course, the text is mostly English, none of the hands observes the script distinction strictly, but Hand B is most lax on this point. For identification with Hand B and against identification with Hand C (who uses crossed f) is that the cross strokes of δ and the abbreviation for 'pæt' are turned at both ends, while against Hand B and for Hand C is angular insular g. Insular d is short, a point in favour of Hand B, but all instances except one ('mid', recto, line 3) are inhibited by a preceding ascender or descender from the line above. The angular g also tells against attribution to the reviser of fol. 2v-6r. I find no safe palaeographical grounds for attributing the writing of fol. 17 to any other hand in C.

2. Script

A feature of the style of script in C which unites all hands is a strong tendency to join the head strokes of g and t and the tongue of e to following letters. e joins with following a, i, u, (and sometimes other minims), o, y, d, δ and descenders. g and t generally join less regularly with these following letters.

e is usually round, but the straight-backed form is used in combination with preceding g and sometimes, especially in the work of Hand B, with preceding t. The ge combination seems to be fairly common in tenth- and eleventh-century manuscripts and may perhaps be regarded as a genuine (albeit modest) calligraphic ligature, as may be the case with an ege combination which occurs in C, where the tongue of the first e forms the head stroke of g. The ge combination is most regular in the work of Hand A. In the work of Hands B and C g joins also with following
round e, in much the same way as all hands tend to join horizontal strokes with any following bow.

a, erect backed with a usually fairly well rounded bow, sometimes occurs in a form resembling a caroline a. The form is made by beginning the bow part way down the back, instead of at the top, and occurs most commonly following g and t, the head strokes of which then tend to join with the top of the back of a. ga and ta combinations of this kind are regular in the work of Hand C, who employs the caroline-like a occasionally in other positions, twice joining with the tongue of preceding e, but also where there is no combination. In the rest of C the ga combination is most regular in Hand B's stint, fols 41-81, while the ta combination is never regular. However, it may be that ga and ta combinations were a genuine calligraphic feature of a script familiar to all hands of C (including the reviser of fols 2v -6r). It is important to bear in mind that C is a humble production in which a high standard of calligraphy seems not to have been required: it seems likely that it is due to this circumstance that the tendency to join letters is so marked in C. Not having to lift the pen between horizontal strokes and following bows is perhaps a particularly expedient technique, which would work against the use of special ga and ta ligatures, as well as against the regular use of ge (and te) ligature, where usual round e often takes the place of the straight-backed form.

Note on Combination. Ker, Catalogue, p.xxviii, notes that a 'form of a resembling caroline a is used in 106 (s.x) after g and t'. Ker's no.106 is edited in facsimile by T.J.Brown, The Durham Ritual. A Southern English Collector of the Tenth Century with Northumbrian Additions. Durham Cathedral Library A.IV, EEMF, 16 (Copenhagen, 1969). However, I have not been able to find any examples of this feature, and it is not noted in Brown's very detailed palaeographical description.

Combination of letters can be observed in manuscript where a high standard of calligraphy may be supposed to have been required in C.R. Dodwell and Peter Clemoes, eds, The Old English Illustrated Hexateuch. British Museum Cotton Claudius B.IV, EEMF, 18 (Copenhagen, 1974), especially in the work of the main scribe, who is responsible for the main text on all except fols 21r-56v. This scribe regularly employs the ge combination (his e is always straight-backed) and a gy combination looks deliberate; te combination is also regular, and t has a very strong tendency to join with following letters, especially descendents and minimis (the latter combination may particularly be due to the influence of caroline miniscule: for ti combination see the plates in T.A.M. Bishop, English Caroline Miniscule (Oxford, 1971), passim, where a variety of combinations may also be observed). The same scribe also uses the tongue of e freely in combination; note, too, his regular use of crossed f. On the origin of the manuscript, the editors conclude, on the grounds of the stylistic evidence of the illustrations, that it was 'made at St. Augustine's, Canterbury, in the second quarter of the eleventh century' (p.16).

ga and ta combination occurs in Old English in the manuscript known as 'Textus Roffensis' (Peter Sawyer, ed., Textus Roffensis. Rochester Cathedral Library Manuscript A.3.5,
2 vols, EEMF, 7 and 11 (Copenhagen, 1957 and 1962). This is an early twelfth-century manuscript, nearly all of which is written by one scribe in a script style which is conspicuously later than the eleventh-century style in C, especially in the well advanced stage of its development towards a two-line script: the scribe nevertheless retains insular letter forms, though the a is always a caroline form of the letter. The ga combination is frequent, but not entirely regular. Thus on fol.3v 'agan' in line 2 does not have the combination, but deliberate combinations can be seen in lines 7 and 15. Deliberate ta combinations are on fol.5r, lines 15 and 16, and on this page it may be observed how g and t are combined with following minims, descenders and other letters, and also how the horizontal lower stroke of high f is used in combinations. The preceding examples are from EEMF, 7; in EEMF, 11, ga and ta combinations may be conveniently observed in several instances on fols 162v-163v. The scribe of 'Textus Roffensis' distinguishes between Latin and OE in his use of script. Combination of letters is perhaps equally free in his version of insular script as it is in his caroline script. Combination of caroline g with following a can be seen, e.g., on fol.60v (EEMF,7) lines 15 and 23; ta combinations in Latin, never far to seek, may also be seen on fol.60v.

For combination in a manuscript earlier than C, see Rudolph Willard, The Blickling Homilies, pp.29 and 35, where Willard notes the use of head strokes of t and g 'as ties' in the work of both hands of the manuscript.

3. Decoration

Each of the five homilies in C is begun with a large, more or less ornamental initial, two or three lines in height and extending into upper and left-hand margins. Uncia M on fol.2v is the most elaborate. Though the letter is too discoloured to be sure, it appears to have been written in the same brown ink that was used for the text of fols 2v and 12-16. The plain uncial M on fol.18r is in red-brown ink, with the following text in black ink. Initial G on fol.25r appears to be in the same ink as the text, a darker ink than that of fols12-16, but fol.25r is darkly discoloured and it is not possible to be sure. The letter is the form with no post, and is unadorned, except for a round clasp at the lower end of the bow, before the inward scroll. Initial G on fol.40v is the form with a post, which has a flourish from its lower end. There is a round clasp in the middle of the bow and a flourish from its upper end. The letter is in different ink from that of the text. The ink appears brownish, but at the top of the letter shows an orange tinge, which is the same as the colour used to fill the following capitals ('EHERADNU'). Initial H on fol.62r is a large h with a tail which has a round clasp and ends in a flourish. The letter is coloured an orangey-pink, which has faded from the ascender.

Capitals and '7' are filled on all but fols2-11 and 70v-81r. Of the three instances of '7' on fol.2v (there are no capitals), one is added and hardly has room for filling; no trace of filling is to be seen in the other two, but it must be remembered that the writing on fol.2v was much worn
before being retouched. In the gathering, fols 18-24, the filling is all very faded. The colour in a few filled letters shows greyish, but most appear pale brown. This colour seems to be different from that used in the filled letters on fols 12-17 and 25-70r, where the filling is a dark, sometimes shiny, grey which occasionally shows pink beneath. It looks as though an ingredient of the ink has separated from the pigment, which inheres more effectively in the membrane than does the grey substance. The uniform appearance of the filling in fols 12-16 and 25-70r suggests that it was added at one time, independently of the copying stints. Fol.17 cannot confidently be included in this run of filling, because in the only letter in which the dark grey has faded (‘W’ of ‘Writ’, in the second line of the verso), the colour shows brownish rather than pink. On fol.62r, the three ’7’s and the ’s’s of sanctus’ have filling of an orangey-pink colour like the colour of the initial H on this page, and the filling and the initial may therefore have been executed at one time, independently of the main run of filling.

Ornamental brackets enclose part lines at the bottom of fols 36-52 and 77v-79r. The brackets are all of the same form, consisting of two parallel lines which enclose the written line on its left and continue below it, curving up around its right-hand end to finish with a round clasp and a flourish. They seem to have been drawn, apparently in the same ink as that used for the text, by the copyists of the folios on which they occur. Those that occur in Hand C’s stint, fols 36-41, are distinguishable from the rest, all of which occur in Hand B’s stint, fols 42-81. Thus each of the horizontal pair of lines of the brackets on fols 36-41 is broken by zigzags in three places, with the zigzags one above the other. The bracket on fol.42r is much more loosely drawn and the zigzags are not paired. The zigzags do start to be paired from fol.43r (the bracket on fol.42v is shorter than the rest), but then there are usually four, or even five, pairs. The brackets on fols 42-52 and 77v-79r are never so neat as those on fols 36-41, and always end in a small pendant flourish, quite different from the terminal flourishes of the brackets on fols 36-41.

All the brackets have been filled with colour except those on fols 77v-79r. No colour is visible in the brackets on fol.42, but it may have faded quite away. As with the main run of filled letters, the filling of the brackets on fols 36-41 is dark grey with pink beneath, though the filling of the brackets shows more pink and less grey than that of the letters. The filling of the brackets
on fols 43-52 does not show grey, and the orangey-pink colour is like the colour in the initial \( \text{H} \) and filled letters on fol. 62r.

As Ker notes, the brackets are unusual, and certainly I know of no other manuscript where brackets are used as ornament.\(^{12}\) The use of brackets in C is not restricted to those described so far, but other instances are either merely utilitarian or only incidentally ornamental. These will be considered in section 3 of the next chapter.

\(^{12}\)Ker, *Catalogue*, p. 411: 'unusual ornamental brackets mark runovers on ff. 11v, 34v, 35v-52v, 77-79'. Ker's reason for including fols 11v, 34v, 35v and 77r will become apparent in section 3 of the next chapter.
CHAPTER FOUR

COMPILATION

1. Pricking and Ruling

Pricking is visible on fols 12-16, most clearly on the central bifolium, fols 14 and 15, where some of the punctures appear as vertical slits. They are not in a straight line. Fol.17, the last leaf of the gathering fols 12-17, also shows pricking, but here the punctures, a little larger than those on fols 14-15, appear as horizontal slits and are in a curving line that seems to follow the edge of the leaf; the pricking does not correspond closely to the written lines and since fol.17 is palimpsest, the pricking could belong to the original writing. The only other leaves to show pricking are the singletons fols 33 and 35. The punctures on both these leaves are very small and do not appear as slits. Those on fol.33 are in a straighter line than those on fol.35.

Ruling by dry point is more or less visible on most leaves. The usual practice of ruling double vertical lines in the inner and outer margins of pages appears to have been adhered to, though occasionally only a single line is visible, and often the lines in the inner margins must be assumed to be out of sight in the binding.

On fols 2-35, where the verticals are clear enough to allow measurement, the distance between the double lines is about 7mm. In the gathering, fols 36-41, the vertical pairs are noticeably narrower, though there is, in fact, only about 2mm. difference from those of fols 2-35. on fols 42-81, 5mm. is the widest spacing (fol.45), and 3mm. is about average.

The number of horizontal lines varies within as well as between gatherings. Occasionally the scribe concerned appears to ignore the horizontal ruling. This is noticeable particularly on fol.11, where it can be seen that the writing does not follow the horizontal ruling at all closely,

---

1The procedure is described by Ker, Catalogue, p.xxviii; see also L.W. Jones, 'Pricking Manuscripts: the Instruments and their Significance', Speculum, 21 (1946), 389-403.
but is evident at other points in the manuscript where the recto of a leaf has a different number of written lines from its verso. This occurs in gatherings fols 18-24, 42-52, 62-71, 72-81, all of which were written by Hand B.

2. Written Lines

Fol. 2r fourteen.

Fol. 2v twenty: sixteen and a half plus three and a half, with last line continued on fol. 3r.

Gathering fols 3-11:

3-10 sixteen.

11r fifteen.

11v fifteen, plus part line in bracket.

Gathering fols 12-17:

12-16 nineteen.

17 seventeen.

Gathering fols 18-24:

18r twenty, including one for title.

18v-19r twenty.

19v-23v nineteen.

24r twelve, part page blank.

24v blank

Gathering fols 25-32:

25-32 nineteen.

Gathering fols 33-35:

33 nineteen.

34r fifteen.

34v fifteen, plus part line in bracket in form of a bird.

35 nineteen, plus 'sworan' in bracket at end verso.

Gathering fols 36-41:

36-41 sixteen, plus part line in ornamental bracket.
Gathering fols 42-52:
(all pages with part line in ornamental bracket)

42-48r thirteen.
48v-51r fourteen.
51v-52 thirteen.

Gathering fols 53-61:
53-61 fourteen.

Gathering fols 62-71:
62-65r fifteen.
65v-69 fourteen.
70-71 fifteen.

Gathering fols 72-81:
72-75r fifteen.
75v-77r fourteen, plus 'him' in bracket in form of a bird at end fol.77r.
77v-79r fifteen, plus part line in ornamental bracket.
79v-80v fifteen.
81r eleven, part page blank.
81v blank.

3. The Use of Brackets

The ornamental brackets on fols 36-52 and 77v-79r, described in section 3 of the preceding chapter, seem to be purely decorative, serving no practical purpose, but the idea for this unusual form of decoration may have arisen from the use of brackets for practical reasons during the compilation of C. Perhaps the most obvious reason for the use of brackets is to be seen in the gathering, fols 18-24, which had to be trimmed for inclusion with the rest of C. The trimming involved the removal of the left-hand margins of the versos. Before the leaves were cut, the ends of lines on the rectos were recopied in the left-hand margins of the rectos, the end of one line being recopied into the margin next to the line below. The recopying was done by the

\[2\] As noted Ker, Catalogue, p.410.
scribe who made the original copy, Hand B. When he came to the last line, he recopied the word or letters which were to be erased before trimming directly below the right-hand end of the line, and enclosed the rewritten letters in a bracket. Recopying from the last line was not occasioned on fol.23r, and on fol.24r the text ends mid-page with a part line. On fol.19r recopied 'ðearfan' and its bracket were nearly all removed, presumably during trimming, the word being written again, but not by Hand B, further to the left. On fols 18r, 20r and 21r the bracket consists of three lines, a vertical with a diagonal or horizontal at either end, enclosing the rewritten letters on their left. On fol.22r the lower horizontal line is longer than the lower lines of the other brackets. It is broken by zigzag and then curves up round the right-hand side of the letters, to end in a flourish. The letters thus enclosed are 'dan' of 'hæbbendan'. On fol.11v there is a longer and more elaborate version of the bracket on fol.22r.

It has already been mentioned (above, p.49) and it is a point to which we will return in section 4 of this chapter, that text was added on fols 2v-3r, in a hand which cannot be identified with Hands A, B or C, to combine the text of fol.2v with the text in the gathering, fols 3-11. The end of the text on fols 3-11 was adapted to link up again with the interrupted text on fol.12r (see below, pp.65-7), but this time the additional text was written by the copyist of fols 3-11, Hand B. Fols 3-10 all have sixteen written lines per page, but when he reached fol.11, Hand B did not have enough text to fill two sixteen line pages and wrote fifteen lines on the recto. When he had filled fifteen lines on fol.11v, Hand B still had the words 'ðæs synfullan mannes' to write. These words were not enough to fill a whole line, and he enclosed the words in a bracket. To the left of the words the three lines are similar to those of the brackets in Hand B's gathering, fols 18-24, but on fol.11v three wavy lines, or frills, connect the upper and lower lines. The lower line is continued below the words and is broken in four places by, somewhat untidy, zigzags. The line then curves up to the right of the words and ends in a pendant flourish, much like the flourish in Hand B's main run of ornamental brackets.

Fol.34, Hand B's contribution to the gathering of three singletons, fols 33-35, has fifteen written lines on each side, but at the foot of the verso the three words, 'on heofona rices', constitute an extra part line, which is bracketed by a drawing of a bird. The head of the bird is to the left of the words. It has an open beak and a protruding tongue which ends in a pendant
flourish. Head and neck are adorned with frills, reminiscent of those in the bracket on fol.11v, and dots. The line representing the back and long tail of the bird is drawn horizontally under the words, and is broken where the wing tips might be and towards the end of the tail by zigzags. The tail ends in an upward flourish.

On fol.77r Hand B drew a smaller, rough sketch of a bird to bracket the last word, 'him', below the bottom line. This seems to have encouraged Hand B to apply the short run of uncoloured ornamental brackets on fols 77v-79r. At the end of fol.67r Hand B drew lines, like those that begin the ornamental brackets, to the left of 're' detached from 'ðæere'. A comparable instance where Hand B kept a word complete at the end of a page, but where no bracket is visible is at fol.62r, where 're' is written below 'hwæðe'.

The ornamental brackets on fols 22r and 11v, and the bird brackets on fols 34v and 77r suggest that Hand B liked to draw, but the idea of using brackets regularly as decoration may not have been his. Hand C's ornamental brackets in the gathering, fols 36-41, are preceded by a smaller bracket enclosing the letters 'sworan' of the word 'mansworan' at the end of fol.35v, Hand C's contribution to the gathering, fols 33-35. The bracket is faded, and it is difficult to be sure that the lines are double, but enough is visible to see that it has the same basic form, but without the zigzagging horizontal continuation, as the ornamental brackets. Hand B's brackets in the gathering, fols 18-24, are formed differently. It may be remembered that Hand C's neat pairing of zigzags in the horizontal lines contrasts with the unpaired zigzags in Hand B's first ornamental bracket, on fol.42r, suggesting that this was Hand B's first attempt to copy Hand C's example.

Hand C's bracketing of 'sworan' on fol.35v can be explained by his wish to finish the odd gathering of three singletons, fols 33-35, with a complete word, before moving on to a new gathering, fols 36-41, whose leaves are smaller than those preceding and whose pages are formatted differently from fol.35 (see preceding section). Hand B's brackets in the gathering, fols 18-24, were necessitated by the trimming of the leaves, and his brackets on fols 11v and 34v served to fill space which had resulted from his having to attempt to fill the pages with a set amount of text (too little on fol.11, too much on fol.34). All these are practical reasons, but it is
interesting, I think, to see how they prompted the scribes to decorate their work, Hand B as occasion arose, Hand C by designing a perhaps novel form of page decoration.3

When on fols 62r and 67r Hand B adds the letters 're', left over at the end of a page, below the line, he shows himself not only to be reluctant to run over into the margins, but also to be careful not to divide words awkwardly. At other points in Hand B's work where words are interrupted by the ends of pages, the words are divided logically: fols 8v/9r, 'ge/seah'; fols 18v/19r, 'witod/lice'; fol.52r/v, 'mæsse/preost'; fol.56r/v, 'an/wealde'; fols 65v/66r, 'an/fealдре'; fol.80r/v, 'ge/seonde'. The bracketed 'him' on fol.77r is the last word of a sentence which introduces a passage of direct speech, and this suggests further that Hand B was alive at least to passing detail of the import of the text. An attractive example of this involves the use of a bracket which has not yet been noted. At the end of fol.58r Hand B wrote 'nesse' of 'oferflownesse' below the line, and drew a vertical pair of curving lines, with a dot in the lower curve, to the left of the detached suffix. Perhaps Hand B's attention was caught by the fitting coincidence that the word 'oferflownesse' was too long for the final line of a page.

I can offer only one other example of a manuscript where there is comparable, though not decorative, use of brackets, BL, Cotton Nero A. i., fols 70-177, an early eleventh-century manuscript associated with Wulfstan.4 Where the end of a text or a section of text would otherwise overrun on to the next page, words are bracketed on fols 127r, 130v and 135v; part words are bracketed where the end of a page does not coincide with the end of a section on fols 146r and 151v. The form of the bracket on fol.130v is very like the form of Hand B's plain brackets in the gathering, fols 18-24. Cotton Nero A. i. is a small manuscript (c.165x105mm),5 about the same size as C, and since the smaller the page the less room there is to adjust spacing, it may be that brackets were commonly used in small format manuscripts.

---

3G.S. Ivy, 'The Bibliography of the Manuscript-Book', in Francis Wormald and C.E. Wright, eds, The English Library before 1700, (London, 1958), pp.32-65 (p.58), mentions that catchwords were 'sometimes enclosed in elaborate scrolls'. Ivy's article is concerned mostly with manuscripts later than C, and Robinson, 'Self-Contained Units', p.232, fn.3, notes that 'the system of catchwords was not generally adopted before the twelfth century'. Hands B and C are therefore unlikely to have been influenced by having seen decoratively bracketed catchwords.


5Ker, Catalogue, p.215.
4. Compilation

The overall similarity of the style of script written by Hands A, B and C shows that all parts of the manuscript were written at about the same time, but there are indications that C is not the remains of a homily collection which had been planned and copied all at once.

Indications of this which have already been mentioned in the preceding section are that the gathering, fols 18-24, was trimmed to the size of fols 2-17 and 25-35, and that the gathering, fols 3-11, appears also to have been added. But before considering compilation up to fol. 24, it will be convenient to consider the compilation of fols 25-81.

The text of Homily 3, contained in fols 25-40r, can be analysed into four parts which roughly correspond with the collation of the leaves. Thus the first half, approximately, is composed of topics related to the theme of 'clænnes' of body and soul. The theme is stated at the very beginning of Homily 3, restated at lines 78-9 and 84-90, and concluded at lines 146-51 with a list of virtues necessary for 'ura saula clænnesse' (line 146). The list of virtues ends at the top of fol. 32v, the remainder of which contains a passage, centred on a gospel citation (Matt. 13:43, at lines 156-7) and providing a link with the 'Three Utterances' exemplum. Fols 25-32 are a single gathering (it happens to be the only regular quaternion in C). The 'Three Utterances' exemplum occupies fol. 33 and most of fol. 34r (lines 162-198). The rest of fol. 34 contains a passage in the style of a prayer, which ends in the fourth line of fol. 35 (lines 199-207). The rest of fol. 35 and most of the gathering, fols 36-41, contains what may be regarded as the fourth and final part of Homily 3 (lines 208ff.), and this part is made up of various views of heaven and hell. Fols 33-35, containing the 'Three Utterances' exemplum, the prayer and the beginning of the final part, are a gathering of three singletons. Hand A wrote fols 25-33, Hand B wrote fol. 34 and Hand C's writing is recognizable from where the final part of the homily begins in the fourth line of fol. 35.

6CCCC 198 is an example of a homily collection whose palaeography, according to Ker's analysis, shows it to have been compiled through three successive stages: Ker, Catalogue, no. 48, s.xi(1) and xi(2), pp. 76-82.

7See Rudolph Willard, Two Apocrypha in Old English Homilies, Beitrage zur Englischen Philologie, 30 (Leipzig, 1935), pp. 31ff., and Mary F. Wack and Charles D. Wright, 'A New Latin Source for the Old English "Three Utterances" Exemplum', ASE, 20 (1991), 187-202. The article by Wack and Wright is concerned with the source of the version of the exemplum found in C, and supercedes the comments on C in Willard, Two Apocrypha, pp. 118-121.
This albeit rough correspondence of textual analysis, collation and scribal stints must, I think, give rise to a suspicion that Homily 3 in its present form might be a compilation of previously distinct texts. Since no other copy of Homily 3, or of any part of Homily 3, is extant, such a suspicion cannot easily be dispelled or confirmed. However, a spelling feature which in C occurs only in Homily 3 indicates that most of the piece was copied from one exemplar. This feature consists in the ie spellings listed in the next chapter (below, p.89). In Hand A's stint, fols 25-33, ie spellings occur throughout what I have analyzed as the first part of the homily, in the passage that links the first part with the 'Three Utterances' exemplum ('gehiere', line 161) and in the exemplum itself ('siendon/-an', lines 166 and 168; 'hier', pronoun dat. fem. sg., lines 171, 183 and 187). In the first sentence of the final part of the homily, written by Hand C on fols 35-40r, is the spelling 'awiergedra' (line 208), along with 'aetiewed' (line 223) and 'hiera' (pronoun gen. pl., lines 219 and 244). The ie spellings suggest that Homily 3 was copied from one manuscript exemplar, but there is still the possibility that Homily 3 draws on more than one homily from the same exemplar, and that Hands A, B and C collaborated to make a composite piece. It is not significant that the short passage in the style of a prayer (lines 199-207) has no ie spellings (only two words, 'fynd' at line 201 and 'afyrsige' at line 204, could possibly spelt with ie), but the passage does stand out from the 'Three Utterances' and the heaven and hell parts of the homily either side of it; it is also compositionally effective, supplying aptly a pause before the declamatory final part. It is interesting that the conclusion of the passage is a version of a passage in the conclusion of Homily 1 (Homily 1, lines 325-6). The analogue (Homily 3, lines 205-7) begins at 'on heofona rices', the words Hand B enclosed in a bird bracket on fol.34v, and is completed in the first four lines of fol.35r, in a hand which cannot be identified with Hands A, B or C, but whose letter forms connect it with Hand A (see above, p.48). It is a strange coincidence that the end of a page occurs at the same point in both analogous passages.

Differences in the thickness of the membrane of each of the leaves in the gathering, fols 33-35, suggest that each scribe drew on his own supply of membrane for his contribution to the gathering (see above, pp.7-8). The similarity in the appearance of punctures in the membrane,
noted in section 1 of this chapter, suggests that pricking of fols 33 and 35 was done at the same
time, but the difference in the line of punctures suggests that the two leaves were not pricked
together.

There need be no doubt that Homilies 4 and 5 were already unitary texts when copied for
inclusion in C, because copies of both are extant among the Blickling Homilies and another copy
of Homily 5 is in the Vercelli Book. The Vercelli and Blickling manuscripts are both earlier than
C. It is evident, too, that Homilies 4 and 5 were intended to follow Homily 3, and that their
copying belongs with the copying of Homily 3 to the final stage of compilation. Thus the end of
Homily 3 and the beginning of Homily 4 are in Hand C's gathering, fols 36-41. A difficulty here
is that the leaves of the gathering, along with fols 42-81, are smaller, by about 10mm. in height
and width, than fols 2-35. The difference in the size of the leaves could be explained if it were
postulated that C was compiled around existing gatherings of different size. Of the extant
gatherings following fols 36-41, it can only be those containing the text of Homily 5 that can be
postulated to have already existed, since the text of Homily 4 is begun by Hand C in the first
smaller gathering, fols 36-41, and continued by Hand B in the gatherings, fols 42-52 and fols 53-
61, the first of which is linked to the gathering, fols 36-41, by the use of ornamental brackets (see
above,p.59). Yet ornamental brackets of the same form are used by Hand B during his copying
of Homily 5, on fols 77v-79r, a point strongly in favour of Homily 5 having been copied after
Homily 4. If fols 36-81 were made to conform to the dimensions of leaves containing a homily
that had been copied some time earlier, those leaves may be assumed to have been lost without
trace. It is simpler to suppose that fols 36-81 are smaller than fols 2-35 either because of a
mistake in measurement or because it had been convenient to use membrane which could not be
cut and folded to the exact size of fols 2-35.

The only indication of loss from C within fols 25-81 is at the end of the gathering, fols 53-
61, where Homily 4 ends imperfectly with the words 'a on ealra'. It may be that Hand B thought
it unnecessary to complete the closing formula of the homily, perhaps following the example of
Hand C, who omitted the 'Amen' from the end of Homily 3, which concludes with the words 'a in
ealra worulda woruld abuten ænde'. But it equally may be that Hand B began a new gathering

9This is the point where Ker, Catalogue, p.409, notes loss 'perhaps after quire 8'.
with the end of the concluding formula of Homily 4. The \( \Delta \) is a gap in the present binding between fols 61 and 62, and though this gap is not wide enough even for one gathering of the thickness of Hand B's other gatherings in fols 42-81, it is possible that the gap was wider before the repair of the present binding (which I propose above, p.24) and that loss occurred in modern times.

Homily 1 comprises two distinct texts, a translation from *Visio Pauli* on fols 3-11 and a homily, the first half, approximately, of which is an address of the soul to the body, on fols 2v and 12-17r, line 5. Healey has presented the case for regarding Homily 1 as a deliberate composite, rather than assuming, with Willard, that the *Visio Pauli* material was at some point misbound within the soul and body piece.\(^{10}\) Whether one can be so generous as Healey when she says that the combination of texts is 'an intelligent piece of compilation art' is partly a matter of subjective opinion.\(^{11}\) It may seem a fundamentally bad idea to interrupt the address of the soul to the body with such a lengthy digression as the *Visio Pauli* material provides, but I agree with Healey that the texts were combined deliberately. I shall attempt to expand her argument.

Because in the gathering, fols 3-11, the leaves are the same size as fols 2 and 12-17, and because the width of the margins, which is about the same as in the rest of C (except, of course, for the trimmed gathering, fols 18-24), does not suggest that the leaves have been trimmed, it is intrinsically likely that the *Visio Pauli* material was copied in order to be included in C. Willard did not question the likelihood, nor is there cause in what follows to question it.

The opening of the soul's address to the sinful body ends in the middle of the seventeenth line on fol.2v (Homily 1, line 9). Fols 12-16, with the continuation of the address on fols 12-14r, all have nineteen lines. The remaining three and a half lines on fol.2v can be seen to have been added, in that they extend into the side margins, with the last line in the lower margin of fol.3r (Homily 1, lines 10-12).\(^{12}\) Though the condition of fol.2v is too poor to allow palpable

---

\(^{10}\) Healey, *OE Vision of St. Paul*, pp.4-6; Rudolph Willard, 'The Address of the Soul to the Body', *Publications of the Modern Language Association*, 50 (1935), 957-83 (p.958), states his assumption that 'the manuscript must have come apart and been rebound, with the result that a whole quire [fols 3-11] has got misplaced'. Ker, *Catalogue*, p.410, follows Willard on this point.

\(^{11}\) Healey, *OE Vision St. Paul*, p.6. In a review article in *Speculum*, 50 (1980), 580-1, Paul E. Szarmach criticizes this judgement of Healey's on the grounds that it is not backed up by 'literary proof and discussion of the Soul and Body text'.

\(^{12}\) The writing in the left-hand and lower margins is very, in places completely, faded, and has not been retouched. For detail, see Commentary. Willard, 'The Address of the Soul', pp.958-9,
confirmation, it must be that two and a half lines of the original text have been erased to accommodate the addition. Part of the erased text may be assumed to have contained the first part of that restatement of the soul's address whose conclusion is at the beginning of fol.12r (Homily 1, line 210). None of the restatements which punctuate the address of both sinful and righteous souls is exactly like another, and it cannot be conjectured exactly how long the partly erased one was, but it certainly cannot have filled two and a half manuscript lines.\(^\text{13}\) The added text may be an expansion of what has been lost from the end of the soul's speech at Homily 1, line 9. This part of the sinful soul's address is represented in an abbreviated redaction of text from Homily 1, which makes up part of the composite homily, Assmann XIV.\(^\text{14}\) Compare Homily 1, lines 7-12, with the following: 'Hwi noldestu gelyfan ›inum drihtene þe wæs ahangen for us 7 us alysde fram helle wite' (Assmann XIV, lines 80-1). Specification of the crucifixion and mention of hell in this passage are also in the added text, and both passages possibly, therefore, reflect the same lost text.

The added passage on fols 2v-3r brings to a halt the opening of the address of the soul to the body, so that the text can digress to the complaints by sun, earth and angels about sinful man that constitute the narrative of the opening of the Visio Pauli material (Homily 1, lines 13-63). The rest of the Visio Pauli excerpt describes the fate of the good and evil souls when they leave the body, and can therefore be understood as background which complements the address of the soul when it returns to the body. The Visio Pauli material ends with a particular sinful soul, which has just left its body and which 'drihten' addresses angrily (Homily 1, lines 206-9). It is this soul who is made to take up the address to the body in the sentence (Homily 1, line 210) that effects the transition from Visio to address.\(^\text{15}\) There is nothing in the address of the soul to the body in the rest of Homily 1 to contradict this timing of the address immediately after death.\(^\text{16}\)

took this 'connective matter' to have been added some time later than and independently of what he believed to have been the mis-assembly of C.

\(^\text{13}\)Compare Homily 1, lines 215, 222, 236, 242, 246, 250, 260.


\(^\text{15}\)\(\)hio hine ðanne gegretað ðæs synfullan mannes. [fol.12r] sawl. 7 ðus cwaðð. Willard, 'The Address of the Soul', p.959, took the connection to be 'sheer coincidence'.

\(^\text{16}\)For the timing of the address in this and other OE texts, see Healey, OE Vison of St.Paul, pp.45-8.
That part of the transitional sentence which is on fol. 11v may be assumed to represent, though not necessarily to reproduce, that part of the restatement of the soul's address which was erased from fol. 2v.\(^\text{17}\)

The passage, Homily 1, lines 207-9, immediately preceding the transitional sentence may be compared with the corresponding passage in the Latin *Visio*:

\[\ldots \text{7 drihten hir to cweol.} \]

\[\text{'nu get ðu wenst ðat ðu sige on wyrold. swa swa ðu in ware. Ac eower ælc. lihð on oðrum 7 ðær is synna.'} \]

\[\text{et dixit deus: Adhuc reputas in seculum permanere? si hunus quisque uerstrum illic peccans caelat et abscondit peccatum suum proximo suo; uero non absconditur quicquam.}^{18}\]

The correspondence of the passages I have underlined is clear. It is no less obvious that the OE 'Ac eower ælc ... synna' is based on the Latin (italics indicate verbal correspondence), but here the brevity of the OE contrasts with the preceding comprehensive rendering of the Latin. The ending, '7 ðær is synna', is particularly terse and involves ambiguity in that either the location 'on wyrold' or the fact that one 'lihð on oðrum' could be indicated by 'ðær'. In the Latin the possibility of concealing sin in the world is contrasted with the impossibility of doing so before God's throne. The OE alters the sense of the Latin. The sense of OE 'lihð' is 'deceives,

\(^{17}\)Healey, *ibid.*, p.72, gives a passage from the Latin *Visio*, mentioning 'angelus anime peccatricis', in parallel to the part of the transitional sentence on fol. 11v, but *ibid.*, p.5, she notes that the latter is not in the Latin. As Healey notes, *ibid.*, p.5, fn. 12, Anna Maria Luiselli Fadda, 'Una Inedita Traduzione Anglosassone della *Visio Pauli* (MS. Junius 85, ff.3r-11v)', *Studi Medievali*, 15 (1974), 482-95 (p.483), noted the similarity of the transitional sentence to other restatements of the address of the soul.

lies', but it seems 'lihôn on' can have the sense 'make a false charge against'.\(^\text{19}\) Thus 'eower ælc lihôn on oðrum' may be rendered 'you make false charges, one against another', and the OE may be read as implicitly contrasting the expectation of getting away with falsehood in worldly disputes with the impossibility of being falsely charged before the throne of God.\(^\text{20}\) If 'lihôn on' carries a sense of actually making accusation, it may be that this sense seemed appropriate to lead into the address of the soul to the body, with further contrast between false accusation in the world and the truth of the charges against the sinful body.

However one reads the transition from *Visio Pauli* to soul's address, it cannot be argued that the link is well made, but I see no textual grounds to argue that a link was not intended.

At the juncture of the interrupted address and the beginning of the *Visio* material, there is no attempt to make an explicit link. The added text on fols 2v-3r merely truncates the address text and the *Visio* material is introduced at the top of fol.3r with a short passage, not in the Latin, in homiletic style, '7. mæn ða leofestan. hit sægð her on ðisum hælcam gewrite. þæt ... ' (Homily 1, line 13). Though the address and the *Visio* texts are not actually run together (as they are at the end of the *Visio* material), the homiletic introduction of the *Visio* material precludes argument on textual grounds against the view that the texts were brought together intentionally.

The textual indications that the scribe of fols 3-11, Hand B, knew that the end of his stint was meant to provide a link with the address are supported by the observable evidence of the manuscript. The gathering, fols 3-11, is made up of four bifolia and a singleton, fol.11.\(^\text{21}\) The membrane of all the leaves is of the same distinctive quality, the appearance of Hand B's writing and of his ink throughout the gathering is uniform, and there is nothing to suggest that fol.11 has been added to a pre-existing quaternion. The gathering was ruled for sixteen lines, but on fol.11 Hand B ignored the (still visible) ruling and reduced the number of written lines to fifteen. He was left with a part line on fol.11v ('ðæs synfullan mannes', Homily 1, line 210), which he enclosed in a bracket, and thereby avoided leaving a line half empty before the full page, fol.12r.

\(^{19}\) *BTSupp.* s.v. 'leogan'.

\(^{20}\) See Healey, *OE Vision of St. Paul*, p.82, for a slightly different reading of the passage.

\(^{21}\) As Healey, *ibid.*, p.6, fn.15, points out, Ker, *Catalogue*, p.411, mistakenly counts fol.3 as the singleton.
Because fol.11 is a singleton, the possibility must be considered that it was once the second leaf of a bifolium whose first leaf has been removed from before fol.3, where the stub of fol.11 is visible. The speech of the sun at the beginning of the Visio material in C occurs near the beginning of the Long Latin Version, and it is possible that a lost leaf bore text drawn from the opening of the Visio, though it seems unlikely that the putative removed leaf bore text which so ended that the text on the leaf, fol.3, began neatly with a homiletic introduction of further text. However, there is the possibility that text was erased at the top of fol.3r to accommodate the homiletic introduction. The top two lines of fol.3r are as follows:

7. m. hit sægð her on ðisum halgum ge

write. þæt sunna is sprecende

The first line is retouched and also shows blurring of ink which might suggest that the surface has been roughened by erasure. But fol.3r is in poor condition, being especially worn around the outside edges, and some ends of lines and the bottom two lines are also retouched and blurred, as is some of the writing within the page. The cross strokes of the two 'ð's are turned at either end, the form used by both Hand B and the hand that added the text on fols 2v-3r. In the second line, only 'sunna is' (except for blurred 'i') certainly belong to Hand B's original copy. 'write' and the large abbreviated 'þæt' may have been carefully retouched. Because of the poor condition of fol.3r, the only point that can be taken to suggest that the text has been fitted in over erasure before 'sunna' is that the latter word begins hard up to preceding 'þæt'. As far as I have been able to see, it cannot be decided whether or not Hand B's copy of Visio Pauli material originally began on a lost leaf before fol.3. But the question does not affect the point that the Visio material was intentionally combined with the soul and body homily. It can be argued that a decision to begin with the sun's speech was an afterthought, and that the first leaf of a quinion was removed at the moment of compilation. This is a likely possibility, since it might be thought that Hand B, knowing he needed nine leaves for his stint, would have included the extra leaf within the quaternion, rather than placing it at the end.

22That the beginning of the OE does not coincide with the beginning of the Latin seems to have led Healey, ibid., p.6, to believe that a leaf has been lost.
23The question is complicated by the appearance that 'sprecende' is over erasure: see Commentary to line 14, where reference to a photographic reproduction of fol.3r is given.
Although it cannot be claimed that the combination of texts was expertly executed, there is no reason to doubt that the combination was intentional. Moreover, because Hand B knew that his stint, fols 3-11 (with or without an original leaf before fol.3) was to end on fol.11v in a link with text on fol.12r, it follows that the *Visio Pauli* material was copied for the single purpose of expanding the soul and body portion of Homily 1.

It seems reasonable to suppose that whoever wrote the added text on fols 2v-3r and the additions to Hand B's work on fols 3-6r is the same person whose idea it was to add the *Visio Pauli* material. I disagree with Healey's assumption that Hand A is identical with this compiler, whom she, too, supposes to be the writer of the additions, because I cannot see that the identification can be supported on palaeographical grounds (see above, pp.49-50). I think that the compiler is identical with neither Hand A, B nor C, but is a fourth member of the scriptorium staff. This person I refer to as the 'reviser' of Homily 1, rather than the 'compiler', since the latter term might imply that he was responsible for supervising the compilation of C as a whole, and this, though likely, cannot be shown.

The extent of the reviser's role in the production of the *Visio Pauli* material in Homily 1 should be considered carefully before assessing the significance of the text in C for the textual tradition of the *Visio Pauli*. I offer a few remarks on this point.

In the next chapter it is noted that instances of yo spellings, which are scattered throughout C, are frequent only in the *Visio Pauli* portion of Homily 1 (see below, pp.85ff). It is also noted that in the work of the reviser of Homily 1, yo spellings are almost regular (nine instances, beside one y spelling). Amongst other possibilities it raises, this spelling evidence

---

24 This is the point where Ker, *Catalogue*, p.409, records loss after his 'quire 2'. Of course, in my opinion there is no loss here.


26 A comprehensive study of the *Visio* in Anglo-Saxon literature is yet to be accomplished. Healey's chapter, 'The Old English Tradition of the Vision of St.Paul', *ibid.*, pp.41-57, is broadly concerned with themes and motifs that derive more or less directly from the *Visio* itself, but includes notice of genuine *Visio* material in OE.

27 For example, one could speculate that the reviser came to the C scriptorium from some centre where yo spellings were traditional, bringing with him an OE *Visio Pauli*, which had been either translated or copied at this centre, and which served as the exemplar for the *Visio* text in Homily 1; bringing with him, too, the yo spelling habit, which was having a slight influence on Hands A, B and C. Since he did revise, it is safe, I think, to base speculation on the idea that the reviser had a senior position in the scriptorium.
suggests that the reviser may have draughted the Visio material before he had Hand B make the copy in fols 3-11.

Compared with the Long Latin Version, the Visio material in Homily 1 is much abbreviated: it represents less than half of the corresponding portion of the Latin text in James's edition. It may be that the reviser, when he was preparing an exemplar for Hand B to copy, was responsible for at least some omission of source material.

It may be rash to go so far as to suggest that the reviser translated from the Latin, either from a full or, what is more likely, from an already abbreviated version, but it does not necessarily follow from his apparent lack of skill as a compiler of homilies that he lacked competence as a translator. This begs the question, 'how competent is the translation?' For example, did the reviser revise fols 3r-6r having realized the inadequacy of his translation when he saw Hand B's fair copy? Such questions cannot be pursued here. One textual question concerning the reviser's additions on fols 3r-6r should be briefly considered, however.

Healey proposes that the reviser corrected the text with reference to another, 'better copy of the Vision', but there is no reason to invoke a second exemplar. Most of the additions could have been invented by the reviser. There are only two points where an addition corresponds to the Latin, and these could as well have been drawn from the original exemplar, with reference to which the reviser could have corrected Hand B's copy. The two additions are '7 wiccacraeftas' (Homily 1, line 25), corresponding to Latin 'maleficia', and the repetition of 'gast' (Homily 1, line 75) corresponding to repeated 'spiritus' in the Latin. The reviser's addition of 'ge da:ges. ge nihtes' (Homily 1, line 66) is over an erasure and could have been substituted for some other phrase corresponding to the Latin 'indeficienter omnibus diebus uite uestrae'.

---

28James, Apocrypha Anecdota, p.12, line 5 - p. 20, line 3. In James's edition the text is divided into fifty-one sections; the OE is drawn from sections 4-17.
29Close comparison of the OE text with James's edition shows much reworking besides mere omission. I am strongly inclined to believe that the reviser was not responsible for all the additions, substitutions and rearrangement involved in the production of the OE text.
31James, Apocrypha Anecdota, p. 13, line 4; James, The Apocryphal New Testament (Oxford, 1924), p.528, line 2, translates 'maleficia' as 'witchcrafts'.
32Ibid., p.15, line 6.
33James, Apocrypha Anecdota, p.13, line 34. For Healey's example, OE Vision of St. Paul, p.30, of the addition of 'bine' before 'halgan stowe' at Homily 1, line 32, to correspond with Latin 'sanctum locum tuum' (James, Apocrypha Anecdota, p.13, line 9), see Commentary to line 32.
The fact that fols 3-11 are not included in the run of filled letters on fols 12-16 (and probably fol.17) and 25-70r suggests that the gathering was a later addition. However, as we have seen in the preceding section (above, pp.58-9), Hand B's bracket on fol.11v is closely related in design and execution to other brackets in C and this a good indication that the addition of fols 3-11 was not far separated in time from other acts in the compilation process. Moreover, neither recto nor verso of fol.2 shows filling of letters, and it may be that the filling was done by a scribe (either Hand A or C, say) who had fols 12, etc., to hand, while, say, Hand B was occupied with the addition of fols 3-11 at the end, marked by what is now fol.2, of the rest of the collection, or while the reviser was working with fols 2-11.

There is a fairly sound palaeographical indication of time lapse between Hand A's copying of fols 2 and 12-16 and his copying of fols 25-33. In the latter gathering his use of certain alternative letter forms (f, r, s and st ligature: see above, pp.46-7) is more developed than in the former. Another indication of separate occasions is the difference in appearance between the punctures in fols 12-16 and those in fol.33 (see above, p.55), suggesting that the pricking instrument Hand A had to hand when he prepared fol.33 was not the one he used for fols 12-16. Thus it appears that the compilation of C was arrested after the copying of the soul and body homily on fols 2v and 12-17r, and completed, a little later, by the addition of fols 25ff. and the insertion of fols 3-11.

The addition of the gathering, fols 18-24, is distinguished from the addition of fols 3-11 and 25-81 by the fact that the leaves of fols 18-24 had to be trimmed to match the size of the rest of the leaves in MS 85. The recopying and erasure of ends of lines on the rectos has been described in the preceding section (see above, pp.57-8). There are two possible explanations for the trimming of fols 18-24. Either the scribe, Hand B, made a mistake in measurement when preparing the gathering, or the gathering was not originally intended for inclusion in C. Evidence in support of the first possibility is that the leaves were originally cut too wide by exactly the width of the outer page margins: on the versos the writing begins hard up to the edges of the leaves. Thus Hand B could have confused the measurement for the width of a bifolium (fols 19-24 are bifolia) with the measurement for the width between the margins at the outer edges of a bifolium. This seems unlikely since the measurements of a bifolium would be all the
scribe needed at first. He would then have to assess how many leaves were required for his task, and how many lines per page, before he ruled his margins. Moreover, the fact that the rewritten end line at the foot of fol.19r has been partly trimmed off, and written once again, suggests that the leaves had to be trimmed for height as well as for width. It is possible, but scarcely credible, that Hand B quite mistook the bifolium measurements, but it seems safer to assume that fols 18-24 had to be trimmed because they were not originally intended for inclusion in C.

The gathering, fols 18-24, is distinguished further in that it contains the only homily in C to have been given a title, 'Dominica I in Quadragessima'. Also there is a difference in appearance of the filling of letters in fols 18-24 from the filling in fols 12-16 (and 17) and 25-70r (see above, p.53). The form of the brackets used to enclose rewritten letters seems to have contributed to the design of the ornamental brackets on fols 36-52 and 77v-79r, and this suggests that the addition of the Ælfrician homily belongs to that stage of compilation to which fols 3-11 and 25-81 belong. It will be remembered that the quality of the membrane of fols 18-24 is closely comparable to that of fols 3-11, and there is the suggestion that Hand B drew on the same stock of membrane for both gatherings. Thus Hand B may have copied the Ælfrician homily only shortly before copying the Visio Pauli material, which task may have preceded the copying by Hand B of fols 42-81, for which membrane of inferior quality was used.

The gathering, fols 18-24, is made up of three bifolia, with fol.18 a singleton. Half of the recto and all the verso of fol.24 were left blank. P.R. Robinson has identified fols 18-24 as a 'booklet'. The gathering fulfils three of the nine criteria she lists for identifying a booklet within a larger collection. Two criteria are that it contains a complete text and that it was originally of different dimensions from the rest of the manuscript. The third criterion is that 'the last page (or pages) of a booklet may have been left blank because the text did not fill the booklet', and here questions arise. Fol.18 is a singleton, and since it is unlikely that a gathering for which bifolia were available would have been begun with a singleton, it may be supposed that

---

34This is the day for which Ælfric composed the piece. Godden, Ælfric's Catholic Homilies. The Second Series, p.60.

35Robinson, 'Self-Contained Units', p.238. 'Booklet' is Robinson's term for a 'structurally independent production containing a single work or a number of short works'; the booklet 'may consist of several quires and these may be either large or small in dimension ... Nowadays a booklet is usually in a collection with other booklets' (ibid., pp.231 and 232).

36Criteria 1, 2 and 9 in Robinson's list, ibid., pp.232-3.
fol.18 was the first leaf of a bifolium the other blank leaf of which, after the mostly blank fol.24, was removed when C was compiled. If the booklet was to contain only Homily 2, not a lengthy text, it might be expected that Hand B would have contrived to fit the text within a quarternion by leaving the recto of the first leaf blank. One hesitates to accept the possibility that the proposed booklet contained homilies preceding Homily 2, because it seems inconvenient to make a homily titled for the first Sunday in the Lenten season of the Church year the final item in a booklet. Another of Robinson's criteria is that 'outer pages may be soiled or rubbed'. Fol.24v does appear dirty in comparison with the other leaves of the gathering, but since the singleton, fol.18, invites postulation of the existence of an original blank leaf after fol.24, the criterion is difficult to apply. None of the leaves of C is in anything like pristine condition, and some leaves may be more soiled than others because dirt has got in more easily between than within gatherings. Thus fol.25r, the first of a gathering and containing the beginning of Homily 3, is more discoloured than other leaves in the gathering until fol.32v, the last leaf. The text on fol.32v ends in the middle of the 'Three Utterances' exemplum in Homily 3, and discolouring of fol.32v cannot indicate the end of a booklet. Fol.36r, the first of a gathering, is more discoloured than following leaves and, again, fol.36r contains the continuation of text from fol.35r.

The possibility cannot be discounted that fols 18-24 had had a brief life as part of a booklet before being included in C, but the alternative possibility can be proposed that Homily 2 was copied with the intention of making the piece the first in a collection of homilies for Lent, and that this project was abandoned when it was decided instead to extend the existing collection, which ended with the soul and body homily.

Robinson proposed that C is 'a collection of four homily booklets', but she did not specify the other three or argue for their identification as booklets, and I proceed according to the view that fols 3-11, 18-24 and 25-81 represent a single, final stage in the compilation of C, and that fols 3-11 and 25-81 were copied with the intention of adding them to a former stage of compilation, represented by fols 2 and 12-17. That the compilation was complete is indicated

---

37Ibid., p.238.
38I do not mean to undermine Robinson's general proposition, ibid., p.235-6, that 'it may have been the practice to keep a collection of homiletic booklets loose in a wrapper rather than sewn into a binding'. For an example of a manuscript containing possible booklets, besides Robinson's examples, see W. Schipper, 'A Composite Old English Homiliary from Ely: Cambr. Univ. Libr.
by the fact that fol.81 contains the last eleven lines of Homily 5 on its recto, with the rest of the leaf left blank. The leaf is a singleton and probably had to be added to the gathering, fols 72-81, when Hand B found that the singleton, fol.77, which he had already included in the gathering, had not been sufficient provision. The remains of the former stage of compilation are still to be considered.

The soul and body homily ends in the fifth line of fol.17r. The rest of fol.17 is taken up with three charms and the beginning of a fourth. The first charm is begun in the fifth line of fol.17r, immediately after the end of the homily, and the whole of fol.17 is written in a hand which cannot be identified with any of the other hands of C. The incomplete text of the fourth charm indicates loss after fol.17. There is a gap in the present binding after fol.17, but this does not necessarily indicate that loss occurred in modern times. The gap is due to the spine having broken open along its whole height. The gatherings in the volume, MS 85, were bound so tightly at the spine that there is spring in the leaves, and the volume does not close flat. If the volume had been in a shelf between other volumes, strain would have been exerted on the spine, and it seems that the spine thus broke at its weakest point. The membrane of fol.17 is thick, the stoutest membrane in MS 85, and this may have contributed to making the point between the gatherings, fols 12-17 and fols 18-24, the weakest point in the spine. The volume is so full that it is most unlikely that a gathering has been lost since the repair to the present binding, though the loss of a leaf cannot be ruled out, and loss could have occurred at any time before the repair.

The gathering, fols 12-17, is made up of a central bifolium with two singletons on each side. It is a possibility that there had been an outer bifolium (so that the gathering was an improvised quarternion) whose second leaf bore the continuation of the fourth charm, and which was removed when the collection was enlarged and the Visio Pauli material added. But this would mean that the first half of the bifolium had intervened between fols 2v and 12r, and I have argued above that only the two and a half lines erased from fol.2v are missing from the soul and body address. In the abbreviated version of the address text found in Assmann XIV, the text moves from the point at which the lines were erased on fol.2v directly to a point several sentences

into the address text on fol.12r, and there is therefore no suggestion that a full leaf of address
text has been lost from the homily in C. A more attractive possibility is that fol.2, which
cannot be said ever to have been conjoint with either fols 16 or 17 (see above, p.7), had been the
first leaf of a bifolium whose second leaf followed fol.17 and contained the rest of the fourth
charm. When fols 3-11 were added this bifolium would have been removed, and the leaf with the
continuation of the charm would then have been cut off, leaving fol.2 with enough of a stub to be
sewn on to the outside of the gathering, fols 3-11. Fol. 2 remains problematic, but in order to
have survived I think it must have been attached to fols 3-11. If it had belonged to a gathering
which preceded an original gathering, fols 12-17, the only way in which I can see it could have
survived when the rest of the gathering was lost is if it had been used as a binding-leaf when the
putative Greek psalter was bound with C. But then why was fol.1 used as a binding-leaf rather
than another leaf from the lost gathering?

Robinson's 'booklet' articles are important generally in that they emphasize that texts
were not always copied with the end in view of making a bound codex. Thus the collection up
to fol.17 need not be thought of as having been bound before it was extended, and though C
seems to represent a completed collection it need not be assumed that completion was necessarily
followed by provision of a hard binding. It can be proposed that C remained unbound until,
some time in the twelfth century after the manuscript to which fol.1 had belonged had been
scraped, it was found that C could be conveniently used to fill a binding whose primary purpose
may have been to preserve a fragment of a Greek psalter. The one or more gatherings containing
the text of at least one homily may have already become separated from fols 2ff. by this time, or

39Homily 1, line 220; Assmann, *Angelsächsischen Homilien*, p.167, lines 81-2: 'Gehyr nu earma
lichama þu eart deofles hus forþan þu deofles willan worhtest'.
40Ker, *Catalogue*, p.410, states that 'a leaf or more is missing between ff.2 and 12', but on what
grounds he does not say.
41P.R. Robinson, 'Self-Contained Units' and The "Booklet": a Self-Contained Unit in Composite
Manuscripts', in *Codicologica*, 3, ed. A. Gruys and J.P. Gumbert, Litterae Textuales (Leiden,
42The principal contemporary term for a manuscript kept in a membrane cover is 'in
pergameno'; 'in quarterno' may have the same meaning; the terms 'quarternus' and 'libellus may
have been used to refer to 'booklets': see Robinson, 'The "Booklet"', pp.52-3. As Barbara C. Raw,
noted, there are examples of manuscripts described as 'in pergamenum' (sic) in a fragmentary
catalogue of c.1170, from Christ Church, Canterbury, edited by M.R. James, *The Ancient
Libraries of Canterbury and Dover* (Cambridge, 1903), pp.7-12.
separation may have occurred at the time of binding. Because the lost binding-leaf contained an OE text, it may be assumed (yet tentatively) that the binding was made in England, but the codex may have been taken to France in the late twelfth or early thirteenth century, when the title on fol. 1 may have been added.
I am uncertain about the value of phonology-based language analysis for the late tenth- and early eleventh-century homiletic manuscripts, and I therefore note some spelling features with the question in mind 'might the feature be a spelling convention that was traditional at certain centres and more or less familiar at others?' rather than questions concerning the relation of spelling features to regional dialect. One is acutely aware of the need for a comprehensive study of the spelling habits and conventions that make LWS a recognizable literary dialect.

A spelling feature which occurs with a high degree of regularity throughout C is the use of æ before n in words which in LWS would be spelt with an e. The feature is limited to words where n is followed by another consonant, except that 'mæn' is the usual spelling for the nominative and accusative plural and dative singular of 'man'. The distribution of the feature is as follows.

Fragment, perhaps Hand B, fol.2r

2 mæn, ænglas; 5 ænde.

Homily 1, Hand A, fols 2v and 12-16

267ff. mæn 9x beside 1 Men; 230ff. ængl- 4x; 253 advæncen and 305 geðæncep and 316 geðencean; 315 gevændod; 324 onwænded.

unattributed, fol.17r, lines 1-5

327 ænde (the feature is not occasioned in Charms, same hand, fol.17r, line 5 - 17v).

\[^1\text{Cp. Scragg's comments, Vercelli Homilies, p.lxxi.}\]
Hand B, fols 3-11

20 gewendan beside 93 gewendon; 26 mæn; 48ff. ængel, ængl-27x and 120, 133
heahænga, -e; 49 gebrængdæ; 83, 92 gesænde and 192 gesændan; 87 lændene; 138
onfængnes beside 197 onfengon.

reviser, fols 2v-6r

56, 61 ænglas, -an.

Homily 2, Hand B, fols 18-24

2ff. længtenlic- 4x; 29 bigængum; 30 geglængde; 56, 58 awænt; 88 gewændadæ; 89,
126 møn and 178 møn (all dative singular); 141 mæniscnesse, mæniscnyss; 150, 157
scæntan, scæntan; 182 ænglum; beside 80, 81 onfeng, -on.

Homily 3, Hand A, fols 25-33

1ff. møn 7x and 71 wifmæn beside 113, 127 møn; 3 acænndan (MS-endan) and
63 acænndæ; 9 ondfængge and 56 ondfængce; 87 ændææg; 88, 103 mænisclice (MS-ilce)
and mønisccean beside 61 mæniscum; 92 þænceð beside 125 gedence; beside 80, 81
onfeng, -on.

Hand B, fol.34

(the feature is not occasioned)

unattributed, fol.35r, lines 1-4

207 ænglum.

Hand C, fols 35r line 4 -40r

216ff. ænd- 5x and 281 ungeændedan; 223 ongemænged and 309 gemængede;
246ff. ængl- 3x and 309 heahængla; 252 ungeswæncdu; 253 unawæneddic; 277, 299
sændað, sændæd and 299 asændæd beside 282 gesende.

Homily 4, Hand C, fols 40v-41

1 møn; 27 mænnisse.

Hand B, fols 42-61

54, 229 ændæd and 93 geændede and 233 ændææg; 90ff. ængel, ængl- 3x beside
88 ænglas; 104ff. møn 4x beside 81 møn; 124 acænndæ; 172 besænctæ beside 88
besencton; 192 idelhænde; 218ff. gedæncean 3x beside 36 þence; 244ff. wænc- 3x; 260 onwændend beside 259 gewendon; beside 93, 176 onfeng.

Homily 5, Hand B, fols 62-81r

23 woruldmæn and 25ff. mæn 4x; 24 mænniscum; 32 ænðebyrdnesse and 240, 315 ænde beside 93 endebyrdnesse; 41 ðæncean; 76, 188 ænglum, -as; 148 onfæng beside 219, 308 onfeng; 190 gesænde; 263, 267 læng; 279 geswænced.

It may be that the feature should be regarded as being applicable in words where LWS would have e before m plus a consonant, but the verb 'fremman', along with its nominal derivative 'fremmeras', is regularly spelt with e, and examples of other words are very few:

Homily 1, Hand A, fols 12-16

300 fremmeras.

Hand B, fols 3-11

28 fræmda, fræmdan and 166 afræmdod; beside 171 stemne.

Homily 2, Hand B, fols 18-24

24 gefremme; 60 stæmne beside 59 stemne.

Homily 3, Hand C, fols 35r, line 4 -40r

239 unwæmman.

Homily 4, Hand B, fols 42-61

174 gefremman.

Homily 5, Hand B, fols 62-81r

23 fremmad; 37ff. nemne 3x.2

It may be noted that in C the word for 'voice' is more often 'stefn' than it is 'stæmn'. In the work of Hand A in Homily 3 (fols 25-33) the word is spelt with æ at lines 164 and 165.

Otherwise it is spelt with e:

Homily 1, Hand B, fols 3-11

37ff. stefan 4x and 115ff. stefna 3x.

2'nemne' may not be a LWS word form: see Campbell, OEG, para.484 and Hogg, GOE, para.7.91.1.
Words with -en- and -em- in LWS which have not attracted the æ spelling are as follows:

Homily 1, Hand B, fols 3-11
60, 62 ðenian and ðenode; 208 wenst.

Homily 2, Hand B, fols 18-24
52 gecweme; 71 wenst; 74, 76 renscuras; 176 ðenian.

Homily 3, Hand B, fols 42-61
34, 259 wenan and 36 wen and 74, 227 wenað and 201 wenstu; 80 gecwemran and 140 cweman; 122 ðenian; 220 renas.

Homily 4, Hand B, fols 42-61
43 weninga.

It may be confidently postulated that the spelling æ before n plus a consonant, where LWS would have e, was habitual with all the hands of C. The overall ratio of æ and e spellings is æ 152x to e 20x (plus one a spelling, 'manniscum, Hand A, Homily 3, line 61). In the work of Hand A the ratio is æ 36x to e 5x, and in the work of Hand B æ 97x to e 14x, both approximately seven to one, while Hand C's work shows the ratio æ 19x to e 1x.

The spelling æ before a nasal consonant has been noted and commented on with regard to several manuscripts, but it has not been possible to associate the feature with any particular centre or centres, or to locate it in any particular region. When the feature occurs in early manuscripts it is taken to represent an early stage of i-mutation of Germanic a before a nasal, a sound change which generally came to be represented by e.3 A view that in later OE manuscripts

3Campbell, OEG, para.193(d), and Hogg, GOE, para.5.78.
the æ spelling is to be associated with an Early Middle English dialect in the region of Essex was challenged by C. and K. Sisam on the grounds that the spelling occurs in OE manuscripts written at a range of locations, and no comments or studies have subsequently emerged to refine the Sisams' view that the spelling 'was not confined to OE manuscripts from South-Eastern districts, and that it was at least tolerated over a wide area of Southern England'. The point cannot be clarified until an assessment of the manuscript evidence is undertaken with due regard to the effects of the circulation of texts and the possible movement of scribes in the ecclesiastical network. Here I consider briefly a few manuscripts which exhibit the feature, in order to suggest the level of discernment which I believe will probably be required for the assessment of the spelling evidence of later OE manuscripts.

The text that prompted the Sisams' investigation of the spelling is the gloss to the Athanasian Creed in the Salisbury Psalter. The gloss was written 'by the scribe of the Latin (c.975), presumably at Shaftesbury'. Since the gloss is independent of other glosses of the Creed, they could not show whether the scribe copied the gloss or translated the Latin himself. They describe the scribe's use of the spelling as 'almost consistent'. However, the spelling is limited to the words 'acanned' (5x) and 'mennisc-' (3x), these beside 'gescendedan' and 'gewendo', and therefore the text is witness only to an apparently regular use of æ before nn-.

Campbell notes that there are instances of the spelling in the twelfth-century manuscript, Hatton 116, which contains a collection of homilies. Two of the homilies are edited by Assmann (homilies III and IV) and a look through Assmann's collation with other copies of his homily III shows that the spellings are more regular in another twelfth-century manuscript, CCCC 303, and in homily IV (not in CCCC 303) the spellings are not at all conspicuous. In homily III, for example, at lines 30, 43 and 114, CCCC 303 has 'acænnednesse' while Hatton 116 has 'enn-', and at line 95 CCCC 303 has 'ungewæmmned' where Hatton 116 has 'emmm'.

---

5Ibid., p.12; cp. Ker, Catalogue, p. 451, 'perhaps from Sherbourne'.
6C. and K. Sisam, Salisbury Psalter, p.46; the Creed is Hymn XV, pp.305-8.
7Campbell, OEG, p.75, fn.2. Hatton 116 is Ker, Catalogue, no.333. The manuscript contains glosses by the tremulous scribe of Worcester, and its homily collection is similar to those in other Worcester manuscripts, Hatton 115 and CCCC 178. Palaeographical evidence also points to the West of England, according to Ker.
8Assmann, Angelsächsischen Homilien und Heiligenleben. CCCC 303 is Ker, Catalogue, no.57: the palaeography of the manuscript links it with Rochester and Canterbury.
A manuscript of the eleventh century which exhibits \( \textit{ae} \) spellings is CCCC 201. Ker dates the manuscript to 's.xi med.' and it is therefore roughly contemporary with C.\(^9\) In this case we are fortunate that Raith, in his edition of English versions of the Apollonius legend, notes all the instances in the OE \textit{Apollonius} in CCCC 201 and surveys the manuscript for instances in other texts, all of which were written by the \textit{Apollonius} scribe.\(^10\) On Raith's showing the distribution of \( \textit{ae} \) spellings is not closely comparable to the distribution of the feature in C. In the \textit{Apollonius} text, the ratio is \( \textit{ae} \) 34x to e 23x. The high proportion, compared with C, of e spellings seems to be due to a selective application of \( \textit{ae} \) spellings rather than to a generally weaker tendency to employ (or preserve) them. Thus, for example, the CCCC201 scribe appears regularly to spell the verbs 'wændan' and 'sændan' and their derivatives with \( \textit{ae} \), but the noun 'ende' and its verbal derivatives are regularly spelt with e; parts of the verb 'acænnan' are regularly spelt with \( \textit{ae} \), while 'men' and 'mennisco.' are spelt regularly with e; 'engl.' ('angel') is the regular spelling, and so is 'þenc.' ('think').\(^11\) In C \( \textit{ae} \) is usual for all these words. Not only does Raith survey all the work of the CCCC 201 scribe, but he notes the spellings in other manuscripts where there is overlap of content with CCCC 201: these are always e. On the evidence of the \( \textit{ae} \) spellings, the CCCC 201 scribe seems to have been an unusually careful speller.\(^12\)

One manuscript which may be specially mentioned here, because it uniquely contains a full copy of the Latin charm whose first few words are also preserved (albeit with error) at the end of C's fol.17, is BL Harley 583. The manuscript contains, in OE translation, \textit{Herbarium Apulei} and \textit{Medecina de Quadrupedibus} along with the collection of charms titled \textit{Lacnunga} by Cockayne.\(^13\) Ker dates the bulk of the manuscript to 's.x/xi' and two added sections to the first

\(^9\) CCCC 201 is Ker, \textit{Catalogue}, no.49. Its contents connect it with Wulfstan, but its origin is obscure.

\(^10\) Josef Raith, ed., \textit{Die alt- und mittelenglischen Apollonius-Bruchstücke} (Munich, 1956), p.9. The scribe is Ker's Hand (1), the principal scribe of his Part B.

\(^11\) Ker's comment that the work of his Hand (1) shows '\( \textit{ae} \) regularly for WS e before a covered nasal' is therefore inaccurate. Note, too, that the \( \textit{ae} \) spellings in CCCC 201 extend to such words as 'pænig' and 'wænian'.

\(^12\) Dorothy Whitelock, ed., \textit{Sermo Lupi ad Anglos}(London, 1939; revised edition, Exeter, 1976), pp.37-44, discusses the \( \textit{ae} \) spelling, along with other spelling features, as it occurs in CCCC 201 and other manuscripts connected with Wulfstan. For comments on the feature and for more manuscripts showing it, see Hogg, \textit{GOE}, para.5.78. See also Ker, \textit{Catalogue}, p.xxxxvi and Healey, \textit{OE Vision of St. Paul}, p.33.

\(^13\) T.O. Cockayne, \textit{Leechdoms, Wortcunning and Starcraft of Early England}, 3 vols (London, 1864-6); \textit{Herbarium} and \textit{Medecina} are edited \textit{ibid.}, I, pp.2-373, \textit{Lacnunga} is \textit{ibid.}, III, pp.2-80.
half of the eleventh century. All Leonhardi’s examples are with n, mostly in words where a consonant follows the n but including ‘mæn’ and the words ‘pænig’ and ‘hænep’ (‘hemp’). The latter part of Lacnunga (fols 179, line 11-193) is one of the later additions, and here I count twenty-three ae spellings to two e spellings, all before n plus a consonant (no such spellings with m are occasioned). I have not attempted a survey of the feature in the Herbarium and Medecina texts, but it is clear from Cockayne’s edition that ae spellings are frequent in Harley 585 (Cockayne’s ‘H’) against e spellings in Cockayne’s base text (from BL, Cotton Vitellius C. iii, his ‘V’), and that the spellings occur in the later addition (the table of contents, fols 115-29) as well as in the body of the text. The ae spellings in Harley 585 are often shared by the other manuscript in Cockayne’s collation, Hatton 76 (his ‘B’).

Since the degree of regularity of ae spellings in Harley 585 and C is comparable, the question is raised whether the two manuscripts, bearing in mind that Ker dates Harley 585 earlier than C, are comparable palaeographically. Judging from the facsimiles of pages at the beginning and end of Grattan and Singer’s edition of Lacnunga, the script of Harley 585 is not closely comparable to that of C, except that the tongue of e always tends to join with any suitable following letters. Head strokes of g and t also have a tendency to join with following letters, but not with a. Though there are examples of ege combination, the head stroke of g does not usually project to the right of the down stroke and combination is thereby inhibited. In the facsimile of a
page from the later addition, however, head stroke of g does tend to project to the right of the
down stroke. 19

Healey has noted another spelling feature which occurs in both Harley 585 and C: yo for
LWS eo. 20 In Harley 585, the examples seem to be very few in the Herbarium and Medicina
texts: all I see in Cockayne's collation are two instances of 'hyo', both in Herbarium. 21 The next
examples occur in the Lorica gloss (within Lacnunga) where there are three yo spellings, and
then there are seven examples in the rest of Lacnunga, including one within the later addition,
fols 179-193: all these examples are cited by Healey.

Healey notes three manuscripts, besides C and Harley 585, which have yo spellings.
Since Healey's edition, a study of one of these, 22 Yale University, MS Beinecke 578, 23 containing
fragments of the 'West Saxon Gospels', has been published. 24 The manuscript survives only as
binding strips and an endleaf, in a fourteenth-century psalter, but it is of particular interest in the
present context because of the appearance of a high degree of regularity in the use of yo
spellings. Liuzza gives all the examples: '(be)twyox, dyofel, hyofenan, hyora, byo, cnyowum,
hryofla, syocnesse, syo, twyonedan', these beside one eo spelling, 'eode'. 25 Palaeographically,
Beinecke 578 has in common with C the use of tongue of e in combinations, on which feature
Liuzza comments that 'e is low, but the projecting tongue combines with following letters
whenever possible, even the back of d'; he regards this feature as a 'misuse of e ligatures'. 26 The
back of d is horizontal, within the line, a form unlike any form in C. In the facsimile published

19 Ker, Catalogue, p.306, comments that in Harley 585 'high e ligatures [are] usual'. Ker
comments on e ligatures, ibid., p.xxxiii. In the facsimiles, the e of such ligatures is not much
higher than low e.
21 Cockayne, Leechdoms, I, pp.94 and 268.
22 The other two are CCCC 162, Ker, Catalogue, no.38, where the yo spellings are in additions to
an early eleventh-century homily collection, and the mid-twelfth-century psalter from
Canterbury, Cambridge, Trinity College, R. 17. 1., Ker, Catalogue, no.91. Ker, Catalogue,
p.xxxxvii, notes, along with Harley 585, the manuscript of the Parker Chronicle, CCCC 173, as
having yo spellings 'in alterations', but I have not found any examples in the facsimile, Robin
Flower and Hugh Smith, eds, The Parker Chronicle and Laws, EETS, 208 (London,1941), nor
are any noted in the highly detailed language description in Janet M. Bately, ed., The Anglo-
23 Ker, Catalogue, no.1.
25 Ibid., p.75; 'eode' is noted from line 5 of Liuzza's transcript of the recto of the endleaf, ibid.,
p.81.
26 Ibid., pp.73 and 74.
with Liuzza's study (Plate VI) it can be seen that cross stroke of \( g \) combines with following \( e \) and \( i \), cross stroke of \( t \) with following \( o \) and \( e \). The angular open-tailed \( g \) is of the same form as that written regularly by C's Hand C. Ker dates Beinecke 578 to 's.xi' and on palaeographical grounds Liuzza suggests the first half of the century. The origin of the manuscript remains obscure.

In C, yo spellings are most striking in fols 3-11 of Homily 1 (the text of Healey's edition). Here there are thirty-four examples (not including those in the hand of the reviser), while the rest of C shows a total of twenty-three examples. The distribution of yo spellings in C, along with eo, y, and io spellings of the words cited, is as follows.

**Fragment, perhaps Hand B, fol.2r**

1 syo.

**Homily 1, Hand A, fols 2v and 12-16**

323 lyofe.

unattributed, and Charms, fol.17

(The feature is not occasioned).

**Hand B, fols 3-11**

16 lyoman; 42 underbyoded; 52 wyorcum and 182 wyorc beside 49ff. wyrc 5x; 70 nyowelnessa; 79 gyodan beside 156 geode and 183 geode and 149 eode; 105 dyostrum and 192 dyostru; 11ff. dyostr-5x; 11ff. byo 8x beside 118ff. heo 5x and 134 hio 5x (all feminine singular); 122ff. yordan 5x beside 98ff. eordan 3x and 22, 131 yrde; 132, 180 syo ('be'); 143, 182 syo (demonstrative) beside 22, 184, 204 seo; 134 nyorxnewanges; 143 tryogode; 166 byo beside 132 beo; 194 gehyorde ('heard') beside 119ff. gehyrde 4x; 164 mildhyorta and 203 mildhyortnyse beside 77 mildheortnes and 73 hyrtan and 75 hathyrtnyssa.

**reviser, fols 2v-6r**

23, 31, 34 syo (demonstrative); 24 yorbe and 37 yordan and 52 yorölíc beside 34 yrbc; 27, 40 hyora; 63 hryowsian.

**Homily 2, Hand B, fols 18-24**

120 wyofode ('altar'); 156 geryordodon beside 20, 149 gereord-.
Homily 3, Hand A, fols 25-33

165 hyo beside 44ff. heo 7x; 166 ðyostre.

Hand B, fol.34; unattributed, fol35, lines1-4

None: not occasioned.

Hand C, fols 35r, line 4-40r

251 syo beside 225ff. seó 7x; 273 ðyostre and 296 ðyostre beside 216, 269 ðeostra and 250 geðeostra.

Homily 4, Hand C, fols 40v-41

29 tyðigean beside 2 teoðung- and 8, 17 teoðan.

Hand B, fols 42-61

49, 52 syo (demonstrative) beside 60, 218 seó; 53 hyo; 161 hyortan beside 160 hyrte and 102ff. milðheortnesse 3x.

Homily 5, Hand B, fols 62-81r

136, 270 syo (demonstrative) beside 300 seó; 174 twyonum beside 238 betweonum; 216ff. hyortan 4x beside 152 hyrtn; 233 milðhyortnesse beside 100 milðhyrt and 115ff. -heort- 4x; 251 hyorde (flock).

Healey provides a phonological analysis of the feature as it occurs in fols 3-11, noting that it 'is not limited to any one condition but ranges freely wherever eo [short or long] would normally appear',27 and similarly the examples in the rest of C cannot be tied to any particular words or groups of words.

In the small sample provided by the hand of the reviser in fols 3-6r, the yo spelling is regular, except for 'yrhe', otherwise 'yorð-', at Homily 1, line 34. That the reviser's additions are to the only text in C (the Visio Pauli translation in fols 3-11) in which yo spellings can be described as frequent is an interesting coincidence (see above, pp.69-70). In the rest of the work of the scribe of this text, Hand B, yo spellings cannot be said to be markedly more frequent than in the work of Hands A and C. In fols 3-11, Hand B's eo and y spellings in words where the reviser has yo have been noted when there is overlap, but it may be noted further that for the reviser's 'hyora'(2x) Hand B regularly has 'hyra' (9x) and once 'here' (line 28). For the reviser's

---

27Healey, OE Vision of St Paul, pp.36 and 32 and 34.
'hryowsian', Hand B has 'hrywsunge' (line 192), 'hrywe' (4x) and 'hrewe' (line 39). Only in fols 3-11 are eo spellings in a minority: eo 19x, y 21x (not including 'hyrde', 'shepherd', 3x), i 5x ('hio', 'she'), e 2x, yo 34x.

In Hand B's copy of the Ælfrician Homily 2 we find eo 46x (including 'heora' at line 128, the only instance of the word) beside y 7x, i 2x (line 114 'sio' feminine demonstrative and line 182 'hio' plural pronoun) yo 2x. The y spellings in C, where the copy of Homily 2 in CUL, Gg. 3. 28., which provides Godden's base text and is considered to be closest to Ælfric, has eo, are line 74 'wyrce', line 100 'tylunge', line 119 'fyrðing', line 160 'genysodon' and line 2 'scylan' (present indicative plural). In the latter case it seems that LWS had also the spelling 'sculon', the usual form in Wulfstan's work, but eo is usual in Ælfrician texts. In four of five instances of present indicative singular 'sceal, scealt' in the homily (so spelt in CUL, Gg. 3. 28.), C has 'scyl'. Two y spellings in C where CUL, Gg. 3. 28. has u are line 5 'wyrþian' and line 50 'awyrða' (imperative singular). Here the u spelling seems to be usual in Ælfric's work, while eo is usual in Wulfstanian texts.

Hand B's stint in Homily 4 shows the ratio eo 79x to y 37x (not including 'hyra', which is regular, 16x beside 'here' at line 105) with two examples of i at lines 68 and 75: 'mæsepriostas' beside '-pryst- 6x and '-preost- 4x, and yo 3x. At lines 88, 117 and 167 Hand B has corrected his original ew spelling to eow in words 'cneowe', 'æowdom' and 'æow' (cp. 'niogan', with 'o' added at line 205).

In Homily 5, Hand B's work shows the ratio eo 45x, y 32x, i 1x (line 294 'sio' 'be'), yo 9x; e appears twice: 'æowdom' at line 15 (beside 'æow-' 4x) and 'ætewde' at line 85.

Hand B's work on fol.34, in Homily 3, has only eo spellings: 'heora', 'geornlice', 'heortan' at lines 189, 197, 203.

In the rest of Homily 3 eo spellings preponderate heavily: Hand A's stint has eo 73x beside y 3x (line 23 'wyrcean' beside 'weorc-' 4x, and lines 70, 110 'ætywed', 'ætywde'), e 1x (line 78

30 Hogg, GOE, para.5.67.
31 Ibid., para.5.184.
32 For such LWS y spellings, see ibid., paras 5.24. and 5.84.
atewde\textsuperscript{e}), yo 2x. Hand C's stint has eo 41x, y 12x (line 238 'wyrccum', lines 251, 305 'geywed', 'ætywede\textsuperscript{a}', line 279 'ahwyrfan', and 'hyra' 8x), io 5x (all 'hiora'), i 1x (line 307 'brihtnes' beside line 246 'breethtnes') and yo 3x.

Hand C's stint in Homily 4 has eo 8x and y 2x (line 27 'hyra' and line 28 'wyrce\textsuperscript{a}') and yo 1x.

Besides the single yo spelling, Hand A's stint in Homily 1 shows only eo and io spellings, in a nearly equal ratio, eo 19x to io 24x.\textsuperscript{33}

In C, then, the commonest alternative to LWS eo is y, but y spellings are frequent only in Hand B's stint, fols 42-81r, that is Homily 5 and most of Homily 4, and in the same scribe's stint, fols 3-11, while in his copy of the one text that surely originated in LWS spelling, the Ælfrician Homily 2, y spellings are infrequent.

In the work of Hands A and C in Homily 3 y spellings are few.

There are no y spellings in Hand A's stint in Homily 1, where io is the marginally dominant alternative to eo, but limited to words 'hio' (feminine pronoun, once plural at line 303), 'hiora', 'sio' (demonstrative) beside 'seo', 'bio\textsuperscript{a}' beside 'beo-', 'diofol' beside 'deofol, deofl-' and 'gesionne'.\textsuperscript{34}

Hand A's stint in Homily 3 has no io spellings, while Hand C's stint in the same homily shows io only in 'hiora' beside the slightly more usual 'hyra' and one instance of 'heora' at line 215. Hand C also writes the genitive plural pronoun as 'hiera' at lines 219 and 244. which is the regular spelling of this word by Hand A in Homily 3.

In the work of Hand B io spellings are few and are limited to the words 'hio' (feminine pronoun in Homily 1, plural pronoun in Homily 2, line 182) and 'sio' (feminine demonstrative at Homily 2, line 114, 'be' at Homily 5, line 294).

The fact that yo spellings occur in all texts in C and in the work of all hands makes it likely that the C scribes introduced the feature into their copies, even though, overall, the feature.

\textsuperscript{33}A word of varying frequency which always has eo and has been left out of the counts (for which I cannot claim absolute accuracy) is 'heofon-'; two common words of varying frequency which have also been left out are 'beol' and 'beon', but here Hand A's work, Homily 1, line 304, has 'bio\textsuperscript{a}'.

\textsuperscript{34}Gesionne occurs at a point of textual difficulty, for which see Homily 1, Commentary to line 248.
can by no means be described as a confirmed spelling habit, and therefore stands in contrast to the æ spellings considered previously. However, substantiation of the likelihood that the yo spellings are to be connected with the C scriptorium is suggested by their almost regular occurrence in the reviser's additions to that part of Homily 1 which has frequent yo spellings (see above, pp.69-70).

ie spellings, characteristic of West Saxon language written before the evolution of LWS, occur only in Homily 3 and are as follows.

Homily 3, Hand A, fols 25-33

18 aliesde; 27, 40, 66, 126 (2x), 133 hiera, -e (genitive plural pronoun); 34 gehieren and 161 gehiere; 39 tienfealde; 42 niehstan; 44, 171, 183, 187 hier (genitive feminine singular pronoun); 97, 166, 168 siendan; 118 þiesta.

Hand B, fol.34
None.

Hand C, fols 35r, line 4 -fol.40r

208 awiergedra; 219, 244 hiera (genitive plural pronoun); 223 ætiewed.

A common word which only once appears in its LWS spelling is 'self'\. The example in LWS spelling, 'sylfum', is in the Ælftrician Homily 2, line 101, where it occurs beside nine instances of 'self'. The frequency of the word in other texts, where the spelling is always e, is as follows.

Homily 1, Hand A, 3x; Hand B, 1x.

Homily 3, Hand A, 11x; Hand C, 1x.

Homily 4, Hand C, 3x; Hand B, 8x.

Homily 5, Hand B, 14x.

35Campbell, OEG, para.201; Hogg, GOE, paras 5.82-84.

36Campbell, OEG, paras 325-6; Hogg, GOE, para.5.171, fn.2.
PART TWO. TEXT

INTRODUCTION

The primary aim of the present edition is to enable consideration of questions concerning the use of the manuscript, the principal question being, was C actually used for preaching? Though other points are necessarily considered (especially for the Visio Pauli material in Homily 1, where dialogue with the commentary in Healey's edition is required) the Commentaries to each homily are focussed on the question of the deliverability of the texts: could the homilies be fluently read aloud and consistently understood by both reader and listener? Overall, so many difficulties arise that it seems impossible to answer this question affirmatively, but I suspect that close study would produce similar results for perhaps the majority of copies of homilies. Scholarship has not squarely addressed the question of deliverability of homilies1 and this edition represents an appeal for consideration of this culturally vital point, though it cannot offer any conclusions.

The commonest sort of correction in C is the superscript addition of letters by the copyist, but there are a few instances when a hand other than the copyist's has made an alteration. These are all minor alterations, however, and what I have found to be difficult readings (those discussed in the Commentaries) are passed by. In Homily 1 one addition by the reviser of the Visio Pauli material supplies an otherwise grammatically deficient reading,2 but attempts to correct are otherwise scarcely in evidence. In Homily 4, the text with perhaps the most difficulties, the additional punctuation suggests that a reader has tried to improve the deliverability of the text. One may postulate that this reader read the homily, recognized that it was particularly difficult, but believed that it could be serviceable if read carefully with sufficient pauses.

2The reviser supplies a main clause at Homily 1, lines 48-9.
Besides the deliverability of the texts, the usefulness of C as a collection for preaching is also in question. Only Homily 2 has a title, for the first Sunday in Lent, and one would expect that titles would be required for any reasonably well organized collection of homilies that was to be used for preaching. Homily 3 is clearly a Lenten piece (see lines 18-22). The copy of Homily 4 in the Blickling manuscript is titled for the third Sunday in Lent, but its content (concerning tithes and priestly responsibilities) is not specifically suitable for Lenten preaching, and the statement at lines 4-5, 'þæt nu nealæceþ ðæ dagas þæt we sculan ... ure wæstmas. gesamnian', is particularly inappropriate for a Lenten sermon. In the laws the tithe of young animals is payable 'be Pentecosten' and of crops either 'be emnihte' or 'be ealra halgena ðæs ðæs'. The homily to which Fragment is likely to have belonged is titled for a day in the Church year in two of the six manuscripts in which it is extant. In CCCC 302 the long version is for Rogationtide, and the short version is 'quando uolueris' or for the fifth and seventh Sundays after Epiphany in CCCC 302 and BL, Cotton Faustina A. ix. Assmann XIV, which draws on part of Homily 1, is also in CCCC 302 and Faustina A.ix, where it is 'quando uolueris' or for the fourth and sixth Sundays after Epiphany. Homily 5 is for St Martin's day, 11th November. Thus Fragment and Homilies 1, 2 and 3 may be regarded as possibly following the order of the Church year, but there is a gap of several months before Homily 5, and perhaps Homily 4, would be needed. However, though Homily 4 begins in Hand C's gathering, fols 36-41, after the end of Homily 3, there is possible loss of an indeterminate amount of text before Homily 5, and the collection may therefore, if Homily 4 was for Lent, have included homilies that would have bridged the gap between Lent and St Martin's day.

---

3Noted, Willard, Two Apocrypha, p.35.
5Ker, Catalogue, no.56, arts 33 and 12, no.153, art.6.
6Ibid., no.56, art.11, no.153, art.5.
These concluding few lines of a homily have been printed from C by Szarmach, who gives spelling and reading variants from the six other manuscripts which contain copies of the text. In all six the passage concludes copies of the same homily. The manuscripts are CCCC 421, CCCC 302, BL, Cotton Faustina A.ix and Bodley 343 as well as the Vercelli and Blickling manuscripts, where the homily is numbers X and IX respectively. Blickling IX is fragmentary and has only the less distinctive part of the conclusion, 'crist wunan ... amen.' The homily is drawn upon for a composite in the Bodleian manuscript, Hatton 113 and 114. CCCC 302 has a copy of the latter half of the homily as a separate piece, as well as a full text. Cotton Faustina A. ix has only the shorter text. The homily has a source, Sermo de Misericordia, in common with Homily 2."

Homily 1, fols 2v-17r, line 5

Previous editions have separated the homily in fols 2v and 12-17r from the Visio Pauli material in fols 3-11.

Fols 2v and 12-17r have been edited by Fadda, Nuove Omilie, Omelia VIII, pp.163-73. Approximately half of the homily has been printed by Willard, 'The Address of the Soul to the Body', pp.961-3.

Fols 3-11 have been edited by Healey, OE Vision of St Paul, pp.63-73. These editions are referred to in the manuscript notes and the Commentary by author's name.

The Visio Pauli text is found only in C. Some version of the homily on fols 2v and 12-17r was used for the composite homily Assmann XIV, extant in two manuscripts, BL, Cotton

---

7Paul E. Szarmach, 'MS Junius 85 f.2r and Napier 49', English Language Notes, 14 (1977), 241-6 (pp.242-3).
9D.G. Scragg, ed., The Vercelli Homilies and Related Texts, EETS, 300 (Oxford, 1992), pp.191-5, discusses the manuscript relations.
10See fn.5, above.
11See fn.22, below.
12Healey's edition supercedes that by Anna Maria Luiselli Fadda, 'Una Inedita Traduzione Anglosassone della Visio Pauli (MS Junius 85, ff.3r -11v)', Studi Medievali, 15 (1974), 482-95 (pp.486-94).
Faustina A.ix and CCCC 302. The material used is the soul and body address and the 'god ælmihtig us lærāð ... diofol us lærāð' passage (Homily 1, lines 1-12 and 210-287; Assmann XIV, lines 76-112). The material is abbreviated, but there seem to be some additions: Assmann XIV, lines 86-7, 90-3, 94-6, 105-6, 107. Aside from lines 86-7, a mention in the address of the Last Judgement, all these probable additions concern church attendance. Homily 1, lines 313-6, also appear little changed at Assmann XIV, lines 116-19. Assmann XIV, lines 7-76 are redacted in abbreviated form from a copy of Blickling Homily VIII, and Assmann XIV, lines 130-9, are drawn from a copy of Vercelli Homily XV.

The Visio Pauli text has not been connected with any known Latin Version of the Visio. Wright has noted a Latin text of the 'god ælmihtig us lærāð ... diofol us lærāð ...' passage. Charms, fol. 17r, line 5-17v

The charms have been printed by Cockayne, whose edition (from a transcript forwarded by a friend) is corrected in the manuscript notes. The first three charms are extant only in C, but the incomplete fourth charm is extant in full in Lacnunga, BL, Harley 585. In Harley 585, the opening is 'Christus super marmoream sedebat petrus tristis ante eum stabat manum ad maxillum tenebat et interrogebat eum dominus ...' The text in C, 'Sanctus petrus supra marmoream', must therefore have introduced a garbled reading.

15Scragg, Vercelli Homilies, p.260, lines 184-199. For these and other manuscript relations of Assmann XIV, see ibid., pp.250-2 and Scragg, Corpus of Vernacular Homilies, pp.245-6. For the source and analogues of a short passage in the Blickling VIII part of Assmann XIV see Charles D. Wright, 'The Pledge of the Soul: a Judgement Theme in Old English Homiletic Literature and Cynewulf's Elen', Neuphilologische Mitteilungen, 91 (1990), 23-30.
18Cockayne, Leechdoms, I, pp.392-4.
19Ibid., p.392, fn.3.
20Ibid., III, p.64; Grattan and Singer, Anglo-Saxon Magic and Medicine, p.186.
Homily 2, fols 18-24

Homily 2 is Homily VII, for the first Sunday in Lent, in the Second Series of Ælfric's *Catholic Homilies*.\(^{21}\) Godden's edition is relied upon for textual collation with other copies when these are referred to in the Commentary.

Lines 43-105 are drawn from a Latin source, *Sermo de Misericordia*.\(^{22}\)

Homily 3, fols 25-40r

Fadda's edition, *Nuove Omelie*, Omelia I, pp.7-31, is referred to in the manuscript notes and Commentary by author's name. Willard printed lines 152-203 parallel with other texts of the 'Three Utterances' exemplum.\(^{23}\)

Wack and Wright have discovered a copy of the Latin source for the 'drastically abbreviated version' of the 'Three Utterances' exemplum at lines 162-198 (with the Latin *incipit* at line 158).\(^{24}\) As Fadda first noted, the motif of food and drink for the soul at lines 123-5 and 139-145 has a recognizable Latin source.\(^{25}\) Though comparison of the body's and the soul's food and drink might provide a useful homiletic motif, I have come across only one other occurrence of it, in Blickling Homily V: 'swa we þonne ða gastlican lare unwærlicel ne sceolan anforlætan, þe ure saul bigleofæþ 7 feded bið; swa se lichoma buton mete 7 drence leofian ne mæg, swa þonne seo saul, gif heo ne bið mid Godes worde feded gastlice hungre 7 þurste heo bið cwelmed'.\(^{26}\) Cross identified a Latin source for the Doomsday passage at lines 258-296.\(^{27}\)

It should be noted that, just as the homilist cites Latin *incipits* for the 'Three Utterances' exemplum and the Doomsday passage, the Latin at lines 58-60 probably also indicates direct reference to a source. Here a gospel citation (John 15:4) is followed by an exegetical question on Christ's birth. The 'Three Utterances' and Doomsday passages are both quite long, between thirty

---


\(^{24}\)Wack and Wright, 'A New Source for the "Three Utterances" exemplum', p.188.


\(^{26}\)Morris, *Blickling Homilies*, p.57, lines 8-12.

\(^{27}\)J.E. Cross, 'A Doomsday Passage in an Old English Sermon for Lent', *Anglia*, 100 (1982), 103-8.
and forty lines of the edited text, and the present unidentified source material may be of similar extent, and may then include a passage of which there are verbal echoes in Blickling Homily I, for the Annunciation. Compare Homily 3, lines 78-9 and 84-6 with the following from Blickling I: 'Wel ðæt eac gedænæpp ðæt he to eorþan astige þurh þa clænan leomu þære halgan fæmann ðæt we þæt gearor wiston ðæt he is ordfruma 7 lareow ealre clænnesse'.

The Latin at lines 100-102 does not exactly quote the gospel (Matt. 23:37-40), and may also indicate a non-scriptural Latin source. Wright has noted, not with reference to Homily 3, a source, the Questions of Bartholomew, for the notion, stated at line 51, that angels were created from fire and water.

Homily 4, fols 40v-61

Homily 4 is Blickling Homily IV. In the Blickling collection the piece is titled for the third Sunday in Lent. In the manuscript notes and Commentary, the Blickling manuscript is given the sigel B, after Scragg, 'Corpus of Vernacular Homilies'. None of the text is extant in any other manuscript.

The source of the tithing portion of the homily, lines 4-49 and 193-276, is the sermon 'De reddendis decimis' by Caesarius of Arles. Willard printed the tithing text parallel to the source. Two brief passages, lines 57-8 ('ðæt god ... dura') and 86-98, draw on some version of Visio Pauli. Lines 182-5 have the scriptural commonplace, Matt.16:19 and 18:18, which is the

28Morris, Blickling Homilies, p.13, lines 19-22. Mary Clayton, The Cult of the Virgin Mary in Anglo-Saxon England (Cambridge, 1990), pp.222-30, discusses the Blickling homily and its main Latin source, noting (p.229) that the end of the homily, including the passage I have quoted, is not in the source she identifies.


only recognizable biblical reference outside the tithing portion. Lines 70-72 may be compared with the following from the so-called *Poenitentiale Pseudo-Ecgberti* (corresponding passages underlined):

> se halga apostol Paulus lærcæ ælcum mæssepreoste þe godes folce to lareowe bið gesett þæt heora nan ne wandige for nanes mannes ege ne for lufe ne for nanum sceatte, þæt hy ne bodian ælcæn men hwæt him sy to donne 7 hwæt to forganne, gif hy sylfe wyllað þæt heom beo beborhgen on domesdæg beforan gode sylfum.\(^{34}\)

Two points arising from a recent discussion by Milton McC. Gatch of Homily IV/Blickling Homily IV may be mentioned. First, Gatch is troubled by the use of the the word 'godspel' (line 7) in the phrase 'us crist selfa bebead on ðysum godspelle', when only Caesarius's text can be meant.\(^ {35}\) But this use of the word may be compared with instances in Homilies 1 and 3 where 'godspel' is not used of scripture. At Homily 1, line 293, '... cwæð se halga man. þe ðís godspel wræt', the OE homilist apparently invokes a non-scriptural source. At Homily 3, lines 128-9, 'swa ic ær sæde on þissum halchum godspelle', the word seems to refer to the homily generally, though it is not clear to what point in the text the clause refers. At Homily 3, line 164, '7 hit is cweden on ðissum godspelle', the word seems to refer to the 'Three Utterances' exemplum. Thus Gatch may be right to suggest that the Homily 4 homilist thought of "a gospel" in the sense of a text that is being adapted for delivery to a congregation.\(^ {36}\) Second, Gatch regards the piece as mixing 'address to laity and to clergy'.\(^ {37}\) but only once are the clergy directly addressed in the homily.\(^ {38}\) I read it that the portion of the homily which treats priestly responsibilities supports


\(^{36}\)ibid., p.103.

\(^{37}\)ibid., p.105.

\(^{38}\)At lines 152-3; in the Blickling text variant (Morris, *Blickling Homilies*, p.47, lines 22-4) the passage is not in the second person plural: '7 gif ða lareowas þis nellæþ fæstlice Godes folce bebeodan, þonne beoþ hi wiþ God swyþe scyldige'.
exhortation of the laity to give tithes by indicating that the duties of the priest are by no means a light burden and that their spiritual role in society is worth paying for.

Homily 5, fols 62-81r

Homily 5 is extant in two other copies, in the Vercelli and Blickling manuscripts, for which the sigla, A and B respectively, are adopted in the manuscript notes and Commentary, the sigla being those in Scragg, 'Corpus of Vernacular Homilies'.

The source is the *Vita Sancti Martini* and *Epistola tertia ad Bassulam* by Sulpicius Severus, but an indication that the OE probably drew on an already abbreviated Latin redaction of Sulpicius's work is the Latin citation at line 157: the Latin and the OE text, lines 158-62, it introduces are not in Sulpicius.

Manuscript pointing and capitalization is retained in the edition. An essential aim of the edition of the texts is to allow the modern reader to put him/herself in the position of a contemporary reader. Thus it is an obvious requirement that the manuscript pointing is retained. The normal mark is the medial point. It often marks clauses, though it marks phrases and single words, too. Sometimes it is absent when a grammatical and sense pause is obviously required, and thus, although pointing is frequent in C (relative, say, to the sparse pointing in the Blickling manuscript), it cannot be relied upon to make for an easy read where a modern reader is concerned. The texts are therefore printed sentence by sentence, each sentence spatially distinguished on the page, a paragraph to every sentence. When it is uncertain whether a sentence should include more than one main clause, usually because of the presence of a conjunction, usually '7' or 'ac', the limits of a sentence are decided according to sense. As well as permitting faithfulness to the manuscript without loss of readability, this method of presenting


40Scragg, *ibid.*, prints the pertinent parts of Sulpicius's work.

41Patrick H. Zettel, 'Elfric's hagiographic sources and the Latin legendary preserved in BL MS Cotton Nero E. i + CCC MS 9 and other manuscripts' (unpublished dissertation, Oxford University, 1979), pp.129-30, lists Latin biographical material for St Martin, from which it appears that no such *Vita* as the OE homily may witness is extant.

OE prose also has the advantage of visualizing an aspect of the composer's style. It is also easier

to locate particular passages.

The pointing in C is applied in a manner that does not vary greatly from text to text or
from hand to hand, except in Homily 2. The author of Homily 2, Ælfric, seems to have devoted
considerable attention to punctuation: Godden is able to present an easily readable text by
retaining punctuation from CUL Gg. 3. 28., the Second Series manuscript closest to Ælfric.43
Homily 2 is the only piece in C to have frequent use of the punctus versus (printed ';'), as well as
one instance of a punctus elevatus (printed ';', line 72), and this, along with the similarly
relatively frequent use of capital letters, may be regarded as having been copied from an
exemplar which also had retained Ælfrician punctuation and capitalization.

I have added inverted commas to passages of direct speech simply because a modern
reader is entitled to expect them. This is a fixed convention, whereas other punctuation is, in
English anyway, always to some degree a matter of writer preference.

I have not supplied a glossary, but the texts may be read with the aid of BT and BTSupp.
wherever necessary, and wherever I have found that lexical difficulties have remained after
consultation, these are considered in the Commentaries.

[ ] Square brackets indicate uncertain readings, omissions supplied from other
manuscripts, editorial additions of letters out of view in the binding, probably modern
superscripts and the occasional irresistible emendation. All instances of square brackets are
commented on in the manuscript notes and further in the Commentary when more space is
 needed. Where it has seemed unsafe to supply faded or destroyed (as in Homily 5, fols 72-81)
letters, a maximum number of lost letters is indicated by the the number of colons (;) in the
square brackets.

' ' This sign is used in the manuscript notes to indicate letters added, usually
superscript, sometimes at end lines, and usually by the copyist. Whenever added letters are not
certainly by the copyist, comment follows the lemma.

43Rudolph Willard, 'The Punctuation and Capitalization of Ælfric's Homily for the First Sunday
in Lent', The University of Texas Studies in English, 29 (1950), 1-32, collates the punctuation
and capitalization of Homily 2 from its manuscript copies.
Round brackets indicate contemporary additions. In Homily 1, fols 3-11, they indicate the reviser's additions. In Homily 2, they indicate the rewritten letters on rectos occasioned by the trimming of the gathering. Pointing is not reproduced when it is associated with rewritten end lines, because it seems that points were used to mark letters to be erased and it is not possible to be certain in every case whether points belong to the text or to this marking that preceded erasure. Not only are there points, probably associated with the trimming, at end lines but sometimes it may be that the copyist reproduced such points when rewriting. At line 9, the rewritten pointing, is regarded as being certainly textual, because it is within the rewritten text. In Homily 4 round brackets indicate additions, subsequent to copying, in a reddish ink, most frequently of the *punctus versus* (or of a 'comma' to an existing medial point) and often of the prefix 'ge-'.

FRAGMENT

song. 7 godes lof 7 [ðæs heh]stan cynincges [hereness] 7 syo birhtness. ḍa[ra] ha[ligra] 7 ḍa soðfa[stan scin[að swa] sūnna 7 mæn rixað swa aznglas. on hēofonum 7 [we] wætron ðider gehatene. 7 gelaðode. to ðam halgan ham 7 to ðam cýne[lican friðestole; þær drihten. cris. wúnað. 7 rixað mid halgum sawlum; a in ealra worulda woruld. soðlice būtan ænde?–AMEN

4 a] written with an ascender. 5 Worulda] 'a' written with an ascender.
Men ða leofestan we geléornodon on godcundum gewritum þæt æghwylces monnes sawul. æfter þisse wecorulde scyl gesceegan eft ðane lic[..:.] þissum wordum

ærest þus sprecaþ 7 cwéð þæs synfullan monnes sawle.

'gehrystu earma senfulla lichoma. ic cyrr to ðe to ðæn þæt ic ðe werge. 7 þine ungleanfulnesse gesecege.

6 'forhwon earma lichoma lufodesðu þone feond. ðæt wæs se diofol.

'forhwon lyfdest ðu. þæm [:] þe forlærde þurh synne lustas. 7 forhwon earma lichoma noldest þu. gelyfan [::]m alysende gode ælmihtigum. se for ðinum

9 ðingum manigfeald wite þrowode.'

god gefæste .xxx. dage[..:]os[..:]:nne 7 æfter ðam fæstene. he self [:]


3r brm 7. ðæn ða leofestan. hit sægð hér on ðisum halgum gewrite. þæt sunna is sprecende ofer manna bearnum. (7 ðus) cwéðende.

15 'drihten god ælmihtig. hu lange scyl ic lócian ofer manna unrihtdæda;

'ac forlæt me (drihten) þæt ic gehyde lýoman mines mægnes. þæt hi agyten.

þæt ðu eart ána soð god.'

ða andswerede drihten. ([: : : : : : ]) 7 ðus cwéðende. þæt

---

1 'ge'leornodon] see Commentary. þæt retouched as abbreviated form, but space for two letters following. 2 ðane] cross-stroke of ð missing MS. 2-12 For missing letters, see Commentary. 4 gehyrstu] retoucher 'gi'. senfulla] Fadda emends to 'synfulla', despite Willard's note that 'sen-' is probably the original spelling; the 'c' can be discerned under ultra-violet light.

5 'ge'secge. 6 for'h'won. 'se'. 7 '7'] squeezed in on line.

13 7] in left margin. 14 sprecende] see Commentary.

15 drihten] 'd' in left margin. 18 an'd'swerede. For missing letters see Commentary.
'ealle gesihðe mine eagun gescoð. 7 ealle gecynesse. mine éaran gehréð. Ac
min gedylfd onbit. oð þæt hi gewæðand. 7 hrywe don. hyra synna. 7 gif hi nyllað.
ic heom (ge)deme. on ðæm heardeast dóme.'

7 seó yrðe cegde to drihtne. ofer manna bearnum. 7 ðus (wæs) cwæðende.

'drihten god // ælmihtig. ofer ealle ges[c]æfta ic ðæm gescoðæð. (cwæð syo
yorðe) 7 ðær[e]nda manna forhealdnessa. (þæt is) unrihtasmine. 7 morðæðæ. 7
stala. 7 mane æðas. 7 lyblæc. (7 wiccacr[æ]fta) 7 untidætas. 7 oferdurncennesse.
7 (tielnyssa 7) ealle ðæ yfel. ðæ mæn gedoð.

'se fæder arist ofer his sunu. 7 se sunu ofer his fæder. ([þæt] is hyra æger
óðerne oferhogaþ) 7 se fræmda ofer ðæne fræmdan. swa þæt here ãnra gehwylc.
óðerne beswiceðo.

'se fæder astiðo ofer his sunu reste. þæt he ðæ besmiteð. 7 se sunu hæmð. wìð
his fæder lafæ. (syo synne gestigaþ to hylle) 7 ðylice manigfealdum
léaþrum. hi besmitað (drihten ðine) halgan stówe. on ðæm beoð. brihta

onsægðyssa on ðinum halgan // naman.

'7 mín ðæmg.' (cwæþ syo yrþe) '7 mine ðægmænas. forðæm ic heom unwillum
gegærwise. Ac forlaþæt me drihten ælmihtig. þæt ic gebrecce mægen minra ðægmænas.

þæt ðu hige swa to ðæ gecyrre.'

dò ðæ wæs geworden drihtenes stéfen (to ðære yorðan. 7) ðus cwæðende.

'ne mæg ænig man. his synna wìð ðæ me ged[ìg]lian.' (cwæð drihten) 'ac ðæs ealle
ic wát. ac mín haligdom onbit. hwæðer ði gecyrnan willan. 7 hréwe don. 7 gif hi
nyllað geswican (hyra misðæða) sóðlice ic heom gedeme. on ðæm heardeast
dóm.'

23 ges[c]æfta 'gesæfta' MS; retoucher emends 'e' to 'c'.
24 ðær[e]nda 'bærnenda' MS; Healey's emendation. ðær[æ]t is] see Commentary.
25 wiccacr[æ]fta 'wiccacrftas' MS; retouched to read 'ocræftas'. 7 untidætas] '7'
in left margin. 27 [þæt] supplied (so Healey); one letter space before 'is', at outside
eedge of page.
31 syo] Healey '7 syo', but traces preceding 'syo' are of one of the reviser's insertion
markers, not of '7'. 'drihten (ðine)'] see Commentary.
(to ðære yorðan. 7) 'ðære' retouched to read 'ðær'; 'yorðan' at beginning of line
over erasure, '7' squeezed in. 38 ged[ìg]lian 'gedwelian' MS; Healey's
emendation.
(7) geseoð nu man ða leofestan. þæt ægðwilc gescæft is gode underðyoded.  7
þæt mænnisc cyn ðe næfre hyra gebeda. ne geswicð. (ðara manna sawla.
becumað [:::]o paradisam) //

45 'Nu ðonne' cwæð sanctus. paulus 'ic laðre manna bêarn. þæt hi ne geswican
(on) callum tidum. dæges 7 nihtes. (þæt hi) drihten bletiende. 7 (wuldrier. 7)
ealra swiðest. ðanne sunne to setle gânge. forðæm ðe on ðære tide ealles folces
þænglas. wera. 7 wîfa. farað to drihtne. hi to gebiddanne. 7 hi[ge] (ðanne urum
drihtne)gebrængad. manna wyrc. swa hwæt swa ðæra gehwilc bið wyræcende fram
ærne merigen. ðu æfæn.

51 'Eac swylce ic geseah' cwæð sanctus paulus. 'on ða tid ðe sunne. hige. ywedæ.
þæt ealle ænglas cóman. to drihtne. mid ðæm wyorcum. ðe ðæra gehwilc (yorðic
man;) on ðære nihte ðæs wyræcende.'

54 (7) ða ðæs geworden drihtenes stefen. (to sancte paule. 7 ðus) // cwæðende.
'hwanon cóman ge úre ænglas.'

(7) hi ða andsweredan drihtne. (ða ænglas 7) cwæðdan.

56 'we cóman. fram ðæm mannum. ðe on ðe geléfdon. 7 ðinne naman. cegdon.
Ac middangeardes gelsan hige ðærme gedydon. swa þæt hige anne ðæg. on callum
hyran lihe. hige wél ne dydon. (ða ðærman lichaman.)

60 'Ac tohwan (drihten) scylan we ðenian swa synfullum mannum.'
drihtnes stéfen ða ðæs geworden. to (þam ænglan* ðus cwæðende)
'dearf is þæt ge heom ðenian. ðu ðæt hige. gecyrran. 7 hrýwe ðócn. 7 gif hige.

63 (hryowsia[n]) nyllað. ic heom gedéme. on ðam heardestan ðómc.'

44 [:::]o paradisam] Healey supplies 'into' and reads 'paradisum'.
45 Nu] 'N' in left margin.  48 hi[ge] 'ge' erased, at end line; see Commentary.
(drihtne) '[i' in margin, 't' squeezed in on line, 'nè' superscript; Healey, "riht" over
erased "him",') is probably right, though I see no trace.
52 (yorðic)] '0' not visible.  56 hi] Healey reads 'hige' with 'ge'
erased; some roughening of membrane surface after 'hi', just enough space for 'ge'.
(ða ænglas)] '0' lacks its cross stroke; faded traces of 's' at outside edge of leaf. 60
Ac] 'A' in left margin.
(þam ænglan)] 'p' altered from 'h', has a cross stroke; 'am ænglan' over erasure: so
Healey; top of original '0' visible over 'g'. 63 (hryowsia[n]) 'n' supplied: one letter
space between 'a' and outer edge of leaf.
Ongytað nú manna béarn. forðem swa hwæt swa fram ús bið gedón. gódes

odðe yfeles. eall þæt fram ænglum // gode bið gesæd. (7) forðan bletsiðað. (eow) 7

gebiddað eow. to drihtne. (ge dæges. ge nihtes.)

"Þa æfter þan' cwæð paulus. 'mé genam. drihtenes ængel. 7 cwæð

"(ge)folga me. 7 ic ðe ætýwe. arleastra stówa. þæt ðu ongýte. (paulus.)

hwider hige beoð gelædde. ðanne hige forðférende beoð."

7 se ængel hine (ða) gelædde (paulus.) on nyowelnessa. ðær hylware wærón.

7 he him ðær æteowode. on hwilce. stówæ. arléasra sawla. gelædde beoð. ðanne

hi of ðæm lichaman ðát (ge)gangeð.

7 paulus ðær geseah. ondrystlic weald. ðara mænaga gásta. ðe manna hýrtan
beswicað.

þæt is tælinessa gást 7 forhealdnyssa.(gast) 7 háthyrtnyssa.(gast) 7

leasunga.(gast 7 ofermodignyssa gast. 7 eaðbylhyrnsa. gast. [:]ngsum. yrra. gast

7 æwergednyssa gast.) 7 ða(s) wæron buton æícere. // mildheortnesse.

(ealla) hyra loccas wæron swiðe. gemanigfealded. 7 fyrene spéarcen. of hyran
muðan. út gyodan.

paulus ða ahsoðe. ðane ængel. 7 cwæð

'wealdend. hwæt syndan ðás.'

se ængel him andswerede. 7 cwæð. (to pale)

'ðís syndon (ða gastas) ða ðe beoð gesænde. to arleastra manna sáwulum. on tide

hyra forðfore.'

paulus ða eft lócode. on hea[h]nesse. 7 he ðær geseah. ðore ænglas. ðara
ánysne scinan swa swa sunne.

hyra lændene. wæran mid glydnum gyrdelsem begýried. 7 palmtwigu on

hyran handum hi hæfdon. 7 mycele. manðowearnyssa. hige wærón gefyllede.

66 (ge dæges. ge nihtes) [ge dæges. ge ni' over erasure at end line, 'hteis' in
margin. 67 þa 'p' in left margin. 68 7] in left margin. 75 7 for healdnyssa] '7'
in left margin. 7 leasunga] '7' in left margin. 76 [:]ngsum see Commentary.
80 paulus] 'p' has extended descender in left margin.
85 hea[h]nesse] Healey 'heannesse'; a doubtful reading: an ink blot where ascender
of second 'h' may have been written.
7 paulus ða ahsode ðane ængel. // ðe hine lædde hwæt ða wæron on swa
mycelre fægernesse.

se ængel him andswerede. 7 cwæð.

'ðis syndon soðfæstynysa ænglas. ða beoð gesænde to soðfæstre sawlum donne
hige of lichaman ðut ganged ðe hyra hiht. on drihten gesetton. 7 to him gewendon'

7 paulus ða cwæð to ðæm ængle ðe hine lædde.

'wealdend. ic wolde geséon soðfæstra. 7 synfulra sawla of lichaman. ðut
gangende.'

se ængel him to cwæð.

'loca of heofonum on eorðan.'

7 paulus ða lócode. 7 he geseah alne middangeard. ðon gelicost ðe hit niht
wære.

7 paulus. his wæs ða swiðe wundriende. 7 he cwæð. to ðæm ængle. //

'wealdend is ðis eall. manna mycelnyssa.'

se ængel him andswerede. 7 cwæð

'ðis syndon ða ðe singað. fram ærne merigen ðð æfen.'

7 paulus. ða eft lócode. 7 he geseah ealne middangéard. on ðyostrum gesetted.

7 sume soðfæste sawle of lichaman ut gangende.

7 hire ða ongæn cóman. ða gódan gastas. 7 he geseah hi wépende. 7 hige
cwæðon

'eala ðu sawul. hu ðu ús nu beflihst. forðan ðe ðu gewrohtest. godes willan on
éorðan.'

7 se ængel ðe ðare sawle hýrde on worulde wæs. cegde to ðæm dyoflum. 7
cwæð

'cyrrað on bæcling scámigende. forðan. ðe ge ne mihton ða sawle beswican.

ða ða hyo on lichaman was.'

94 7] in left margin. 95 w'e'aldend. 99 7 paulus] '7' in left margin. 101 'he'.
104 s'il'ngað.
7 | 7 da æfter. // ðan ða gebyrede hit. þæt paulus. gehyrde stefna on héofonum
     héanyssum. cwæðende.
117 | 'gebringað ða sawle to ús. fordan ðe heo gewróhte godes willan on eordan
     'þæt hyo geléfe. 7 ongyte þæt se is soð god ðe heo lufoðe.'
     7 mid ði ðe heo wæs ingangende on héofonum. paulus. gehyrde ðusend ængla.
120 | 7 heahængla cygendra. 7 cwæðendra.
     'gewærlice do ðu gode sawul. 7 wes ðæ geströngod. 7 ealle we ðe efenlice
     gefoð forðan ðe ðu gewróhtest godes willan on yordan.'
123 | 7 hi ða gelæddon to drihtnes. gesihše. 7 michahel. 7 eall ængla werod.
     gefoollan ða to fotscamele. drihtnes fòtum. 7 hi gebædon. 7 hi ætewdon ða sàwe
     8 | drihtne ðus cwæðende //
126 | 'ðís is ealra god. se ðé gewrohte. to his anlicnyssa.'
     7 se ængel ðe ðare sawle hýrde wàs. cégde to drihtne. 7 cwæð
     'gemune. drihten hire gewinenes. ða ðæ ic ðe ælce dæge gebrohte. geld hire nù
     129 | æfter ðínum dòmé.'
     7 ða wæs gewórden drihtenes stéfen cwæðende.
     'swa he me ne geùnrotcdest. on yrðan. ne ic him nù ne geunrotsige. 7 swa hio
     132 | wæs miltsigende swa ic hire nù. beo miltsigende. 7 syo hige. nù gesçald michahele
     ðam héahængle.'
     7 he hige laède o[n] nyorxnewánges geféan. þæt hio ðãr syoð domesdæg. æfræ
     135 | má nu mid eallum halgum.
     7 paulus. ða gehyrde æfter ðàn. ðusend. ðusendo ængle. lòfigendra. 7 god. //
8v | wuldrigendra. 7 hérigendra. 7 cwæðenda

115 ðan] Healey "ða" over erasure in original hand; 'ð' a little blurred, but erasure
doubtful.
123 hi] space for two or three letters following, but no sure trace of erasure: so
Healey. 124 hi gebædon] space for two letters after 'hi': Healey reads 'hige' with
'ge' erased, but I see no sure trace of erasure.
131 geunrot'sode. 134 o[n] nyorxnewánges] 'onymorxnewanges', MS.
sy] space for one or two letters following: perhaps 'o' erased as Healey's reading; see
Commentary.
'Riht eart ðu drihten. 7 rihte synden ðême domes. forðan nis háda ofangnes. befóran ðe. ac ðu forgylst ánra gehwilcum after his gewrihtum.'

7 se ðængel ðe lædde paulus. him to cwæð

'lóca of dúne'

7 paulus ða lócode on yordan. 7 he gesæh. sumes arléesæs mannes sawulc. of lichaman. utgångende. 7 sýo. trygode. drihten. dæges 7 nihtes. 7 hio wæs
cwænde. ðæt hyo nán ðinc elles ne cuðe. on ðissum middangearde. buten éten.

7 drincen. 7 heo éac wæs cwænde.

'hwylc astígeð to hylwarum. 7 eft ðanan astígeð. ðæt he ús asecge hwylce ða
dómás ðær sigen.'

7 paulus. ða lócode. 7 cwæð

(ic gel/seeah on ðære tide ðe hire sawul of hire lichaman eode. ealle hire synna.

7 hire yfel. befóran hire licgean. 7 on ðære tide ðe heo sweolt. swa yfel dóm be hire
wæs geworden. swa hire selfre ware selre. ðæt heo náefre geboren ne wurde.'

7 ðær ætsomne cóman. ða halgan ænglas. 7 ða godan gástas. ac ða haligan
gástas. nan gewéald on ðara sawle náfson. ac ða yfelan gástas. hige læddon ða
sawle. 7 cwædon.

'Eala ðu éarme sawul. lóca to ðinum. lichaman. 7 ongyt din hús ðanon ðu út
geodest. forðan ðe on dómestæg. ðu scylt eft to ðinum lichaman gehwýrfan. 7
ðême synna onfôn.'

Se ðængel ðe ðara // sawle hýrde wæs on worulde. cegde to ðære sawle. 7

 cwæð.

(ic casm din ængel. 7 ic cærdode on ðe ða hwile ðe ðu on worulde wæfe. 7 ælce
dæge ðiene wyrc gode ic brohte. swa hwæt. swa ðu wyrcende wæfe fram ærne
mæregen ðód æfæn.

'7 gif ic geweald hæfde. dónne ne ðenode ic ðe. ænigen dæge. Ac se
mildhyorta drihten. 7 se sóðfæsta déma. ús bebead. ðæt we cow ðenian ðod ðæt ðe
gæ gehwýrfan. 7 hrywe dón.

138 'Riht] ’R' in left margin. 142 7 paulus] '7' in left margin. 152 hal'ig'an.
'ac ōu forlūre ðinre hrywe tīd. 7 forðan ic byo aʃraeʃmdod todaeg fram ðe. 7 ðu bist ascādēn fram me todaeg. to ðæm écan witum.'

168 7 æfter ðissum cwæd sanctus paulus. 'ic gehyrde on heofonum heanyssum.

169 ðængla stéfnæ // cwædende.

"awyrpæ ða earman sawle. þæt hyo wite hwylc se god is ðe hyo his beboden."

171 7 paulus. gehyrde ðœusend ðœusenda ðængla ealle anre stemne. cŷgendre.

7 cwædende.

'wa ðe ðu earme sawul. for ðæm wyrcum ðe ðu ofer yórðan. gewrohtest.

174 'hwæt hæfstu to andsweriganne. ðinum drihtne. ðonne ðu cyrmst. þæt ðu hine gebidde.'

7 ðære sawle ængel cŷgend ða. 7 he cwæd.

177 'wepæ ealle mid me mine ða léofan frynd. þæt ðeös sawle reste hæbbe. mid me.'

7 ða ænglas him andsweredan. 7 cwædan.

179 ac syo hige anumenc. of Ûre mundwiste. forðan ðe mid fûlnesse. hyo ðæs ingangende.'

179 7 æfter ðan. syo sawul ðæs // gebroht beforan gode. se ðe hige wroht. to his

183 anlicnesse. 7 hire ængel hire beforan geode. cwædende.

'drihten god ælmihitg. ðis is seo sawle. ic ðe gebroht hirre wyorc. ða ðe hio
gewroht. dæges 7 nihtes.

186 'geld hire nu. æfter ðinum dôme.'

7 drihten se sôðfæsta ðéma. hire to cwæd.

'hwar syndan ðine wæstnas. for allum ðæm gôdum. ðe ic ðe gesêalde.

189 'ic lêt scînan mine sunnan ofer ðe. call swa ofer ðane sôðfæstan. 7 ic
gegearwode ðé. yórðan wæstnas. emne swa ðæm gôdan. 7 ðæs ðu wære me

\|\r

undancful. 7 forðæm ðu syge nû anumenc hêonan. // 7 ðu sy gesêald. on dyoﬂa

171 7 cwædende 7' in left margin. 174 þonne 7'p' has a cross stroke.

182 ðæs // gebroht 7'wæs ge // gebroht', MS. 188 for 7'2'-shaped 'r', at end line.
hand. 7 hi ðe gesændan. on ða utran ðyostru. 7 ðær bið wóp. 7 hrywsunge. 7
tōda gristbitung. 7 ðu ðær gewunige. ða ðódomesdæg.'
7 eft paulus gehýorde. ðængla stéfnæ. ðus cweðende.
'Sódfæst earðu drihten. 7 rihte syndan ðíne dómæs.'
7 eft paulus. locode on ðorðan. 7 he cweð.
'íc geséah ðære sáwle. of lichaman út gangende. 7 twa dyoﬂa hire onféngon. 7
hyo wæs swiðe sárlice wépénde. 7 cweðende
"gemiltsa me drihten. forðam ðe ic eam geseald ðísum twám dyoﬂum. ða me
gelaðadal. on ðara stówe ðe ic // nǽfre ær on næs."'
7 se lyfgernda drihten hire andswyrede. 7 cweð
'Eala ðu arleaþa sawul. hwæt gedydest ðu ðæt ðu wære geseald. ðýsum twam
dyoﬂum. ða syndan butan ælcere mildhyortynsse'
Seo sawul him geандswyrede. 7 cweð
'ne gesyn gode ic nǽfre. drihten.'
7 se lyfgernda drihten. ða geweard. swiðe yrre forðan ðe hyo gecweð. ðæt hio
nǽfre ne syngode 7 drihten hir to cweð.
'nu get ðu wénst ðæt ðu sige on wyrolde. swa swa ðu íu wære. Ac eower ælc.
lihþ on ð עודum 7 ðær is synna.'
7 hio hine ðanne gegretað ðæs synfullan mannes. // sawl. 7 ðus cweð.
'gehyrstu hearda lichoma. þu ungeleafullæ. scéawa on me. to hwylcere susle
ðu eart toweard.'
7 hio þanne gyt þus clypþ. 7 cweþ.
'geherstu forworhta lichoma. forhwan lærde þe deosol to helle. butan þæt þu
fela yfela dydest.

193 ðær] 'b' lacks cross stroke. 197 twa} followed by 'dyof', cancelled at end line.
200 gelædadal] 'gelædadal' MS, both 'd's being very short. 202 Eala] 'E' in left
margin. 204 See] 'S' in left margin. 205 gesyn gode] erasure between 'g' and 'o': possible 'n' discernible. 209 7] in left margin. 210 hin'e'. ðæs synfullan
mannes] in bracket. 211 hwylcere] between 'h' and 'w', 'y' cancelled.
'forhun noldest ðu forwordena 7 eac forwyhta. gehéran ða godcundan láre.

219 þe þe lárdon to godes rice. 7 þu noldest gecerran to him.

'ac þu éarma lichoma þu eart déofles hús. forðan ðu déofles willen worhtest.

'þu wære. yrres hyrde. 7 oferhydig.'

222 þonne cweþ seo sawl.

'wá me forðæm ic þa awirgedan. þinc. mid ðe lufode.

223 'wá me forðæm ic ða tóweardan // þingc ne gemunde.

225 'wa me forðæm. þe ic me helle wite ne ondréd.

'wa me forðæm þe ic heofona rice ne lufode.

'wa me forðæm þe ic gehafaðe. ealle ða yfel þe þu dydest. forþon ic nu for

228 ðinum gewyrtum eom cwylmed. 7 for þinum yfelum dædum. ic eom on helle wite bescofen.

'Ic wæs godes dohter. 7 ængla swistor gescapen; 7 þu me hafést forworht. þæt

231 ic eam déofles béarn. 7 déoflum gelic.

'forþon ic ðe wrége. 7 þe ofercyme mid wærginesse. forþæm þu me forworhtest. 7 awergedne gedydest.'

234 þonne mæn ða leófstan. ungelice sio gode 7 seo clæne sawl grét þone lichaman sióððan hio him ofalæd biþ.

hio hine eft seeþ. 7 þanne him þus to cweþ.

237 'gehyrstu eadiga lichama. 7 þu un/synning. ic eom to ðe toþan þæt ic þe.

hyrige. 7 þine geselignesse. þe secge.

'geherstu góða lichoma. 7 þu geleaffulla þu wære godes brytta. forðon þu

240 godes willan worhtest.

'þu þæt géorne beodeost. dagum 7 neahtum'

hio ðonne. eft seo gode sawl him þus to cweþ

216 forwo'rhta. 218 gehéran} Fadda sees 'i' added to give 'gehieran', but her 'i' seems to be an inkspot. 228 eom cwylmed} after 'eom', 'cyw' (Willard and Fadda 'cyl') erased. 230 godes} 'g' altered from 't'. 232 wærginesse} Napier thought the 'i' retouched; perhaps, but could be 'e' erased and altered to 'i' by copyist. 242 cweþ] Fadda 'cweþ', but 'æ' written as abbreviation for Latin 'et'.

228 'i' added to give 'gebieran', but her 'i' seems to be an inkspot. 229 'cyw' (Willard and Fadda 'cyl') erased. 230 'g' altered from 't'. 232 'wærginesse' erased. 242 'cweþ} Fadda 'cweþ', but 'æ' written as abbreviation for Latin 'et'.

229 'cyw' (Willard and Fadda 'cyl') erased. 230 'g' altered from 't'. 232 'wærginesse' erased. 242 'cweþ} Fadda 'cweþ', but 'æ' written as abbreviation for Latin 'et'.

230 'g' altered from 't'. 232 'wærginesse' erased. 242 'cweþ} Fadda 'cweþ', but 'æ' written as abbreviation for Latin 'et'.

232 'wærginesse' erased. 242 'cweþ} Fadda 'cweþ', but 'æ' written as abbreviation for Latin 'et'.

242 'cweþ} Fadda 'cweþ', but 'æ' written as abbreviation for Latin 'et'.
'geherstu gesælīga lichoma. wel þe wel þe. forðam þu þinum feonde deofle ne
geherdest se þe wólde forlætæn. þurh synne lustas. Ac þu gytswiðor ongæte 7
heolde. þa godcundan láre þa þe laþedon to þam upplican rice. on heofonas.'

hio hine ðanne gyt. herep sio clæne sawl þonne lichomæn.

'geherstú gebletæoda. lichoma. sceawa on me to hwilcum setle þu eart towearð.

'7 þin með // is in me fægere gesionne. þæt þu most simble éces éardes brúcan
in blisse.'

7 hio hine ðonne get greþep 7 to cwyð.

'wel þe gode lichoma. forþam þu me hafast medonme gedon. þæt ic eam máre
manegum sīðum þara micelra goda. de nís æniges mannes muþes gemet. þæt þæt
aseçgan mæge. ne næniges mannes mod. þæt hit adæñenc cunnæ. hwilce þa
geféæn éaron þe god gegærwod hafað eallum ðam mannum þe hine her on wurulde
lufiað. 7 lufian willað.

'þu eart halig lichoma. 7 wæstmérende. 7 þu eart godes hus. forðæm þe god
wunaþ on þam 7 eardað de his bebodu fylgiaþ. 7 healdæþ.

'ðu wære. þæt scearpustæ. scyrsex. forðon þu cuðest. synna þe fram //

acéorfan.'

7 hio þonne get cweð seo sawl

'gehersðu min se léofesta lichoma. ic wæs godes dohter. 7 ængla swyæstor. 7 þu
m[e] hafast gemedæmod monegum sīðum. 7 for ðinum gewyrhtum. ic com in
heofona rice. þær is leóht. 7 éce lif. 7 unaspringenlic gefea.

'forðæn ic gelomlice cume to þe mid miclum geléafan. 7 mid sibbe þæt ic þe.
dancæ do. 7 secge. 7 ic þe bleæsic. 7 þu bist gebletæd mid me. 7 ic mid ðe á in
éçnesæ.'
\[267\] 112

267  þæt. mæn ðæ leofestan. glæwlícæ ðus is to ongitanne þas word ðe mon us mid

grétan wile. godes ðode yfeles. ūren ærgewyrhtum.

Eac gehycgen we. hwæberne læraw. we wyllen habban.

\[270\]

God ælmihtig us lærað // 7 læðað to heofona rice.

diofol us læðað 7 wile forlārænan. 7 eac forlāsdan to helle witu.

God ælmihtig ús cigeð to heofona rice.

\[273\]

deofol ús læðað to wite 7 beswiceð to déafe.

God ælmihtig us lærað. wæccan. 7 gebedu.

diofol. ús lærað. slæp. 7 slaecnesse.

\[276\]

God ælmihtig. us læraðp. fæstan.

diofol us lærað. oferfylle. 7 untidætas.

God ælmihtig us lærað. rummodnesse.

\[279\]

diofol us lærað gitsunga.

God ælmihtig us lærað claënnesse.

diofol us lærað derne geligro.

\[282\]

God ælmihtig us lærað līþnesse 7 gefeohtsumnesse.

diofol us lærað. yrre. 7 unrotnesse.

God ælmihtig us lærað eadmmodnesse.

\[285\]

diofol us lærað ofermoetto.

\[288\]

Uton we bönne tilian mæn ðæ leofestan. þæt we þas word on gemynde habban.

7 in singalum gebedum. bidden we godes ælmihtiges mildheortnesse ærest forþam

þas dagas þisse worulde syndan swipe mid sare geswæntce. 7 gedréfode.

\[291\]

Ac uton we nu gedon, þet we æfter þisse wecorolde in helle ece witu prowian ne

durfen.

\[267 \text{þas} \] Willard 'pa'. 270 heofonæ] Fadda gives 'e' superscript. 272 b'èofona.
added, as Fadda reads. gefeohts'u'mnesse. 285 diofol] 'd' in left margin.
ofermoettæ. 286 wynsumnesse] Fadda 'win-'. 287 wrohte] after 'w', 'o'
cancelled. 289 mildheortnesse] '-nesse' MS, mid-line.
`Þæt wæron þa mæn' cwæð se halga man. þe ðís godspel wrát. 7 sette. `Þæt ne
mæg ægber ge seo fægernes h[ef]ofona rices. ne seo grimnes. helle wites. ne ða
uneadmodnessa from hyra synnum. acerran.'

Swa sanctus paulus se apostol. reahte. 7 sæde // Þæs word cwæð.

usque ad uesperum. tempus omne in secula.

`Þæt gelimpeð on ðæm nixtum tidum þisse worulde. þæt beop þa mæn þe hie
selfe willað herian. 7 ðæter feogan. 7 onscunian. 7 beop oferdrinceras 7
unriðhæmed fremmeras. 7 ealra manna ðahta him underðodeð. for leasum
tihtum. 7 for leasungum dyfe genymað. 7 þæt get mære yfel bid hiora suna. 7
hiora dohra. 7 hiora mæn unrihtlice him to æhtum nimað.

'7 hie beoð gitseras. godes. 7 hiora selfra. 7 beoð ahafeone on ofermette. 7 hio
biod yrsiende earmum mannnum;

'ðas ðinc hie doð. 7 þissum gelice. forðam þe hie ne gedænceþ þane miclan //
domesdæg.'

Þæs word sanctus paulus sægde. 7 reahte.

Mæn da leofestan. þonne magan we on ðisse weorolde oncnawan þi we hie of
bocum magan areccan. forðam cumað gelomlice on ðisse middangearde. 7 on
manna cynn. mistlicu 7 uncuplicu þingc.

ðæt is þonne uncube adla gelôme. swæncð æghwæþer. ge mæn. ge þa þinc
ðæt ne sculon biglibban

forðan. Mæn da leofestan. ús is swiþe mycel nyðdearg. þæ[t] we glæwlice.
ongiten þas scortnesse þisse worulde. 7 þa ecnesse ðære toweardan lifes.

`Þæt ne bid nefre geændod. ne synfullum ðæt éce wite. ne ðam sòpfæstum. þæt
ecce lif.

291 gedon] Fadda 'n' 'espunto', but 'n' is in form of capital N and is filled. ðæt]
Fadda 'þæt'; followed by erasure of two letters. 294 h[ef]ofona] superscript 'e',
marked with inverted 'v', probably modern. 297 omne] 'omnen' MS. 298 þæt gelimpeð] abbreviated 'þæt' in left margin. 299 feogan. 310 þi'n'ge.
311 gelome] possible erased 'm' after 'ge', at end line. þi'nc. 313 þæ[t] 'þæt' MS. 314 to'weardan.
Ealla ðæs ðinc. Mæn ða leofestan. uton we geornlice. geðæncean. 7 eal ure

lif. 7 ure // þeawas uton we simle to ðam beteran gecyrran. þæt we þurh ðæt godes lufan. 7 mid lichoman. clænnesse. 7 sawle drefnesse we us sceawien 7 gecéosen þone ecan god on heofonum. 7 we ne beon mid ðam synfullum wit[nod]e innan

helle. ac þæt we motan bémon. mid gode 7 mid his halgum ænglum inne ðam ecan rice. þær næfre. lyose. ne todæloð. ne laðe ne gemetað.

witodlice þa mæn. þe þis willap gefyllan. mid clænum dædum. þæt we nu

gehyrdan. befóran us secgan 7 læran hie þanne næfre ne beod. onwaėned. fram

ðam. æcean gefean heofona rices. // wuldræs. ac hie mótan féran. 7 becuman in ðæt úpplice wuldor. 7 þær brúcan. mid his gecorenum ænglum; a in ealra wurulda

wuruld; a buton ænde; amen

317 ði'nec. geðæncean] 'ge' very faint, at end line: Fadda 'erased', but 'ure' at end next line is retouched and had been also probably faint. 320 wit[nod]e 'witodne' MS. 321 ac] 'a' with ascender.
HOMILY 1. COMMENTARY

Most of the writing on fol. 2v has been retouched. This includes superscript letters (and '7' in line 7) and it is impossible to state with confidence where the copyist was responsible or which additions were made after copying. Accents are also uncertain: of the three shown (there may also be one on the first syllable of 'lustas', (line 7) only that on 'forlærde' is unretouched; others may be lost.

2 eccesan eft ðane lic These letters are not retouched, and seem to have been added by the reviser of fols 2v-6r. 'lic' is written in the gutter margin and the first half of the next line is illegible. Willard reports '7' 'at about two letters distance to the left of "pissum": I am not sure about this '7', but a possible reading is '...lichaman 7 mid þissum...'

3 sawle This nominative singular form occurs also in the Visio Pauli material, at lines 177 and 184. See Healey's note to her line 147 for discussion of these and other instances of the form; she notes, too, the nominative singular forms 'synne' used by the reviser at line 31, and 'synna' at line 209, as well as the probably nominative singular form 'hrywsunge' at line 192.

7 þæm [::] Willard reports that Napier believed the missing letters are 'ðe', and of course the relative particle is to be expected here.

8 gelyfan [::::]m Willard supplies '[on þa]m'; '[on þæ]m' is also possible, of course.

10-12 god gefæste...lys[::] 'god' is not retouched. The whole passage was added by the reviser of fols 2v-6r. Willard, who saw more letters than I can make out, supplies the following, partly conjectured, reading:

    god gefæste .xxx. dage[s?] [t]os[o]mne 7 æfter ðam fæstene he self w[æs on] rode
gefæstnod his fet 7 his hand ... ge nægllum 7 ðurh ð[a] ð[row]unge he us [w]olde of hylle
    [witum?] alysan

Willard notes: 'the conjectured letters of "ða ð-rowunge ... wolde of helle[sic]witum" are Napier's, the rest mine'. 'rode' is perhaps discernible when it is expected, and there is a possible 's' two letter spaces to the left of the word, with two further letter spaces before the edge of the leaf, just
space for 'wæ'. If the line below was also begun hard up to the edge of the leaf, there is a possible maximum of eight letter spaces before 'ge nægllum', as I indicate in the text.

The reviser's bringing together of Christ's fast and the crucifixion reflects, of course, the Church calendar, not the gospel narrative.

14 sprecende This word is written twice. The appearance is that the second half of the second manuscript line and two or three letters at the beginning of the third manuscript line must have been erased. 'sprecende' appears over the possible erasure in the second line, but only the retoucher's ink is visible; the reviser of fols 2v-6r has also written the word, beginning in the left margin and extending into the blank space in the third line, with final 'e' written over 'o' of 'ofer': the whole word (of which 'e' has been lost in the binding) has been cancelled. Some of the copyist's original text, a very few words, has been lost from the second and third manuscript lines, but what this might have been remains a matter for speculation. For a possible explanation of how the reading arose, see note to line 46, below. For the possibility that the passage '7 mæn ... gewrīn' (line 13) has been added over erasure, see above, p.68. There is a good photographic reproduction of fol.3r in *Old English Newsletter*, 11.1 (Fall, 1977), p.15. This reproduction also shows the reviser's added text at the foot of fol.3r, as well as the ends of added lines that extend into the gutter margin of fol.2v.

18 drihten ([:\\:\\:\\\:\\]) 7 ðus Interlinear traces of letters over about a ten-letter space are scarcely detectable: Healey reads 'ðær' as the first three (I see possible 'ðæ') and supplies the conjectured reading 'ðære sunnan'.

20 hi gewændan Healey 'hige wændan': the 'hige' spelling of the 3rd person plural pronoun occurs certainly for the first time at line 36. I prefer 'hi' here, in keeping with 'hi nyllað' in the present line, and with the occurrence of 'gewendon' with a similar sense at line 93.

24 forhealdnessa. unriðhæmed (þæt is) Healey notes that the added abbreviated 'þæt' is 'probably over erased' '7': aside from the context of the list of sins, some blurring of the letter and the fact that there is space for '7' between the point and 'unriðhæmed' are grounds for the probability; 'is' is superscript. Healey considers that the reviser regarded 'forhealdnessa' (which translates Latin 'fornicationes') as meaning sins in general, and that for this reason he added 'þæt is', introducing the list of particular sins. However she adduces evidence that the stem 'forheald-'
occurs (except for an instance in *Beowulf*) when sexual sin is meant, and the reviser's added 'þæt
is' (replacing '7') could as well indicate that the reviser regarded 'forhealdnessa' as meaning much
the same as 'unrithhæmod' (Latin 'adulteria').

30 sunu for genitive 'suna': see note to line 115, below.

32 (drihten ðine) Healey gives only 'ðine' as reviser's addition, with 'drihten' added 'over
erasure in original hand'; 'ðine', extending into the right hand margin, is certainly the reviser's,
but 'drihten' is uncertain: some blurring of the ink suggests that part of the word, at least, was
written over erasure, but the word could as well have been added by the reviser. It seems likely
that the reviser added 'drihten ðine' over erased 'ðine'. *Cp.* Healey's reference (p.30) to the
reading in her discussion of the reviser's additions.

ðæm in error for 'ðærc', agreeing with 'stowe', feminine plural.

46 (þæt hi) drihten bletiende. 7 (wuldrian. 7) Latin 'benedicite dominum deum
incessabiliter'. Healey emends by eliminating the first '7' (see her note to her lines 34-5), but
another possible explanation for this awkward reading is that the reviser intended 'bletiende. 7' to
be deleted and replaced by his clausal construction. The construction, verb of ceasing
('geswican', line 45) plus present participle, is 'not common', but not
unknown, in OE: see
Mitchell, *OE Syntax*, I, para.979. The translator, it will be observed, makes free use of the
construction, verb 'to be' plus present participle.

It may be that the peculiar case of 'sprecende' (see note to line 14, above) is to be
explained similarly: the reviser adds 'sprecende' in the margin, leaving a preceding rejected
reading to be erased later, which it is, 'sprecende' then being written in the line, and the reviser's
marginal addition cancelled. The rejected reading may have been marked for deletion
('expunged': the usual method being to mark the words for deletion with a subscript point) in the
case of 'sprecende', but in the present case the reviser may have omitted to do so. A difficulty
with this explanation for 'sprecende' is that the reviser seems to have erased two or three letters in
the third line to make room for his addition: why then did he not erase the text in the second
line? The answer could be that he did not wish to spend the time.

48 bi[ge] Healey assumes that the reviser is responsible for the erasure of 'ge', because he
makes an addition at this point in the text, but such an assumption is not safe. It could be that
the erasure occurred before the reviser made his addition, when 'hige' was followed by 'gebrængæð'. This erasure would then be comparable to 'hi gebædon' (line 124, Healey, line 102), where there is a possible erasure after 'hi', and where repeated 'ge' may have seemed infelicitous, as Healey herself implies in her comment on this instance. The form 'hige' is retained before a 'ge-' prefix at line 62, but note that there is a point between pronoun and verb in this case. The copyist, Hand B, may have occasionally corrected the probably strange form of the pronoun as he worked. Another possible erasure of 'ge' of 'hige' is at line 123. The spelling 'hige' is used for the accusative feminine pronoun as well as for nominative and accusative plural. At lines 134, 153 and 182, where the accusative feminine pronoun 'hige' precedes a verb, the verbs do not have 'ge-' prefixes.

52-3 anra gehwylc (yorolic man;)
The reviser would perhaps have been more correct to add 'yorolicra manna', in the genitive. Cp. the same construction, but with a pronoun, at line 28, and see Healey's note to this line (her line 17) for further examples of this construction with a pronoun. An example with both pronoun and noun is below, Homily 3, line 235, 'hyra anra gehwilc dara manna'.

73 mænaga A peculiar spelling, for 'maniga (manigra)', as Healey notes. Although Healey is right in saying that no other low stress words ("bone, þonne, hwanon") in the text are spelt with 'æ', the copyist, Hand B, writes 'pænne / ðænne' at Homily 2, line 88 and Homily 4, lines 107 and 192. However, all other instances of the word (in Hand B's stint in Homily 4 and Hand A's in Homily 1) have the spelling 'man-', with two instances of 'mon-' (one in each stint).

76 [:]ngsum. yrra. gast Cp. Healey's note (her line 65). Fadda read '7 angsume ...', perhaps assuming the point before 'yrra' was the trace of an 'e'. Healey read '7 [:][:]gsum'. The back of possible 'a' and all of 'n' are clearly visible. Between the edge of the leaf and probable 'angsum' there is space for one letter.

81-3 hwæt syndan ðas ... ðis syndon For neuter singular 'ðis' (see also lines 92 and 104) with a plural verb and complement, see Mitchell, OE Syntax, I, para.342, and compare the same use of 'þæt' at ibid., paras 323-5.
92 ænglas. ða beoð 'ða' is better read as a relative pronoun (Latin 'angeli ... qui'). If read as a demonstrative, the antecedent of the relative 'ðe hyra' at line 93 would be syntactically ambiguous, either angels ('ða') or souls ('hige').

102 eall. manna mycelnyssa 'mycelnyssa' can hardly be, as it looks, genitive plural, and must be either nominative singular or (partitive) genitive singular. Healey (see her note to her line 84) prefers the former. For 'call' plus genitive, see Mitchell, OE Syntax, I, para. 455.

104 singað for 'syngiæ'; cp. 'syngode', line 207, and see Healey's note to her line 85.

107 ða godan gastas Mention of evil spirits (= 'ðæm dyoflum' at line 111), as in the Latin, is required here for the sense of the narrative in lines 107-14. It is the evil spirits who should weep and address the soul. See Healey's note, where she supplies '... 7 ða yfelan gastas, ac ða yfelan gastas nan geweald on ðora sawle nefdon ...', conjectured from the example of lines 152-3.

115 heofonum for genitive 'heofona'. Healey notes the possibility that '-um' may reflect the use of an open a in an exemplar. Open-headed a is not necessarily a very early form (see Ker, Catalogue, p.xxviii), but another possibility is that the error reflects square a, a common tenth-century form (see ibid.). The same error occurs at line 168, and cp. 'sunu', line 30, for genitive 'suna' and 'eagun', line 19, for 'eagan'.

121 gewærlice = Latin 'viriliter'. Healey notes an instance (without the 'ge' prefix) of 'werlice' spelt with 'æ' (see her note to her line 99). There is also a possibility that the reading arose from confusion with 'wærlice', 'prudently'.

121-2 efenlice gefeoð Latin 'congaudebimus'.

128 gewinnes. ða ðæ 'ða ðæ' for 'ðæs ðæ' or 'ðæt' after gen. neut. sg. 'gewinnes'. The ending '-nes' could perhaps have been perceived by a copyist as the feminine noun ending. Cp. Healey's note to her line 105.

131 he ... him for 'heo ... hire' (as Healey emends), although I have not found an instance of '(ge)unrotsian' taking the dative.

132 syo hige. nu gesead Here and at line 180 ('syo hige anumen') the accusative form of the feminine pronoun occurs where one would expect the nominative.

134 sy ða The possible erasure of 'o' of 'syo' here, as Healey notes, is comparable to the erasure of 'ge' of 'hige' at line 48 (see note to this line), but again it is not safe to assume with
Healey that the reviser was responsible for the erasure. It is, however, admittedly more likely that a reader rather than a copyist would be concerned with this sort of detail, which would only matter when pronounced.

152 ða godan gastas for ða yfelan gastas', as Healey notes (Latin 'sancti angeli et maligni').

168 heofonum for 'heofona': see note to line 115 above.

170 hwylc se god is ðe hyo his beboden for Latin 'quia est deus ut contempsit'. Either 'his beboden' is a corruption of the 3rd person singular of a verb meaning 'to despise', or a verb meaning 'to despise' has been omitted and 'beboden' derives from the accusative plural noun 'beboda/u'. Healey offers an emendation: 'hwylc se god is ðe hyo [hyspte] his bebod[u]'.

177 and 184 sawle See note to line 3 above.

184 sawle. ic Strictly, syntax requires a relative particle 'ðe' before 'ic'.

208-10 See above, pp.65-7.

209 synna See note to line 3 above.

210 hine The pronoun, of course, does not refer to its syntactic antecedent 'drihten', but anticipates 'lichoma' at line 211.

246 þonne for 'pone'.

248 fægere gesionne. þut ... If, as it appears, 'gesionne' is an inflected infinitive, preceding 'to' has been omitted: for the strict regularity of 'to' with the inflected infinitive, see Mitchell, OE Syntax, paras 921 and 935. The redacted version of the soul and body text in Assmann XIV (line 99) has 'fæger 7 gesyne 7 ...', raising the possibility that 'gesionne' could be read as an adjective, with 'fægere' an adverb.

251 medomne acc. masc. sg., for 'medome', acc. fem. sg.

mare Fadda considered the comparative of 'micel' difficult and emends to 'mære' ('illustrious'), but the emendation does not seem to solve the difficulty of the whole clause 'þæt ic eam mare ... goda'. The general sense is clear enough, that the body's behaviour has continually increased the soul's share of heavenly benefits, but a close translation is elusive.

282 gefeohtsumnesse The word occurs uniquely here. A.S. Napier, 'Contributions to Old English Lexicography', Transactions of the Philological Society (1903-6), 265-358 (pp.293-4), and thence BTSupp., accepts the word as deriving from 'gefeon' 'to rejoice', but since the stem is
'gefeoht-' and therefore closer to 'gefeohtan' 'to fight' (a wholly inappropriate meaning here) there is the possibility that the word has been mispelt.

295 uneadmmodnessa Another word which occurs uniquely here, noted only in MCOE. The prefix 'un-' must carry here its pejorative, not its negative, sense. The word may then be translated 'humiliations', and included with the preceding phrase 'ne seo grimnes. helle wites': 'nor the ferocity, nor the humiliations of hell's punishments'. The sense fits well with the description of the overbearing persons in lines 298-306.

299 oðer for 'oðre', accusative plural.

302 man for 'manna', genitive, in keeping with 'suna' and 'dohtra', whose possessions,'æhta', may be understood in following 'æhtum'.

303 hie beoð gitseras. godes. 7 hiora selfra Again a noun seems to be understood after the genitives: 'they are misers of god's and their own (things').

303-4 hio bioð yrisiende earmum mannum Although no doubt these grasping persons would be enraging to poor people, perhaps the sense is rather that they treat the poor angrily.

308-9 ponne magan we ... areccan I cannot find directly translatable grammatical sense here: 'oncnawan' seems to require an object, since the clause 'þi ... areccan' does not seem to constitute its complement. I hesitate to postulate corruption, since sense is expressed: the expression may be genuinely elliptical, depending on a grammatical ambiguity of 'þi', which may be here at once pronominal (in instrumental case, complemented by the accusative plural pronoun 'hie') and conjunctival (= 'because'). The general sense must be that 'through books we can be forewarned about evils that visit the world'.

311 man for 'mæn', accusative plural.

314 ðære for 'ðæst', to agree with 'lifes', gen. neut. sg.

318-21 þæt we ðurh ðæt godes lufan ... ac þæt we motan beon This passage does not read easily. 'þæt we ... lufan' may be emended in two ways: either delete 'we' and 'ðæt' to give 'þæt ðurh godes lufan', or emend the noun 'lufan' to the verb 'lufian' to give 'þæt we ðurh ðæt godes lufian, with the genitive 'godes' then having a noun (or noun phrase) understood (see notes to lines 302 and 303 above), so that we may translate, 'so that thereby we may love what is proper to
God'. The latter alternative is preferable, since it is the simpler. At line 320 I would emend '7' to 'þæt', particularly in order to fit in with 'ac þæt ...' at line 321.

322 lyofe presumably = 'leofe'.

326 7 þæt brucan It seems unusual for 'brucan' to be intransitive, but cp. Homily 3, line 206, where an analogous passage has the same phrase.
CHARMS

wid wif bearn eacenu;

Maria virgo peperit cristum elizabet sterilis peperit iohannem baptistam; Adiuro te

infans si es masculus; Aut femina. per patrem. et filium. et spiritum sanctum; vt
exeas. et recedas et ultra. et non noceas neque insipientiam illi facias. amen;

Videns dominus flentes sorores lazari ad monumentum lacrimatus est coram iudesis

et clamabat lazare unui forsas et prodit; ligatis // manibus. et pedibus qui fuerat
quatriduus mortus; Writ dis on wexe de nafre ne com to nanen wyerce. 7 bind
under hire swiordan fot;~

9

Wid gestice.

wid cristes mel. 7 sing. drywe daran. dis. 7 pater noster; longinus miles lancea
ponxit. dominum et restitit sanguis. et recessit dolor;

12

Wid uncudum swyle.

sing on dine laecfinger. iii. pater noster. 7 writ ymb bat sare. 7 cweod. Fuge
diabolus cristus te sequitur. quando natus est cristus. fugit dolor; 7 eft. iii. pater

15

noster. 7. iii. fuge diabolus;

wid tod ece.

Sanctus petrus supra marmorean //

---

drywe daran] Cockayne 'driwe daron'. 13 iii] Cockayne 'in'. 14 cristus] 'xpc'
MS. eft. iii] Cockayne 'aftur'.
DOMINICA I IN QUADRAGESSIMA

MEN DA LEOFESTAN EOW EALLUM IS CUð (ðæs) gærlica ymbryne us
gebringð eðne (nu ða) clænan tid længtenlices fæstenes (on ðam we) scylan Þre
3 gemeleaste 7 forgæged(þyss . úrum) gæstlicum scriftum geandettan (7 mid) fæstene
7 mid wæccum 7 gebedum 7 ælmes(dædom) fram synnum aðwéan. þæt we
bealdlice mid (gast)licere blisse ða eastarlican mæðr(sunge) cristes æfristes wyrðian
6 motan (7 ðæs) halgan húsles ðigen mid geléafan (under)fón. Þre synna to
forgifenesse (7 to ge)scyldnesse deoflicra costunga.

(witodlice) þis feowertigfaelde fæsten wæs á(steald) on ðære éaldan gecyðnessa.
9 ða ða (se) hérétoga moyses fæste . xl. daga (7 xl. nihta. tosomne) to ði þæt he
moste godes. æ. under(fón)

Eft syððan se mæðre witega. elias. eall (swa) lang fæsten þurh godes mihte
11 (afæste) swa swa se ðær gefylde; 7 syððan. he // wearð gefered lichamlice on
heofonlicum cræte to ðam uplican life. 7 cyðm eft he 7 enoh togænes antecriste. to
ði þæt heo ðæs déofles leasunge míð godes sóðfæstnesse oferstælan;
13 Drihten ðac on ðære ñýwan gecyðnessa fæste ðurh his godcundan mihte. xl.
daga. 7 xl. nihta. fram eallum eorðlicum bygleofan;

Dus wæs Þre længtenlic fæsten æstéald. ac we ne magon for Þre tyddernesse
15 þyllic fæsten ðurhtean;

Nu is alyfed Þurh læreo wa ealdordom þæt we dæghwamlice on ðyssere
længtenlican tide urne lichaman gereordigan. mid forhæfdesaes: 7 ðyfernisse 7
18 clænnysse;

11 Eft 'E' in the original left margin. 12 he] in a bracket at the bottom right corner of the page.
Stunlice fæst se længtenlic fæsten se þe on ðisum clænan timan mid galscipe
hine sylfne beflə;

Unrihtlic is þæt se cristena man flæsclice hustas gefremme on ðam timan þe he
flæsclice mettas forgán scyl;

witod/lice on callum tidum gedafenað crist(e)num mannum þæt hi góde weorc
begán. 7 ælmes(dæ)da. 7 swa ðeah swiðost on ðisum gemæn(licum) fæstene;
Se þe on ðorum dagum. to sláw. wære to góðynsse. he scyl huruðinga (on)
ðisum dagum acwúcian on góðum bigængum
Se þe ær glædllice mid góðum wearcum hine selfne geglængde. him gedafenað
þæt he (on) ðisum dagum geornlicor mid weallendre lufe his góðynsse gecyðe;
Ne bibe nan fæs(ten) gode gecweme. buton se man hine selfne fram leahtrum
forhæbbe;

Beóð gemyn(dige) ðara twégra worda ðe drihten cwað (on his) godspelle; he
cwað;

‘forgiða ð 7 eow bið (for)gifen;
’Sellað ð 7 eow bið geseald;’
þæs (twa) ælmesena cyn us synd to begánne (mid) micelre gecnýrdnesse. þæt
we ðorun man(num) mid inweardre hérortan forgífan (gif hi) á hwæt ús gebylgodon.
to ði ðæt ús god (for)gynnesse do ure synna.

7 uton dón ðearfum // 7 wanspedigum súme hwéðe úra góða. þam ælmihtigum
gode to wyrdmynte. ðe hit ús alænde. þæt he ús mare on ðam towéardan forgife;
Mildheortnyss is synna lǽcedem; heo alyst ús fram ðam écean deáðe. 7 ne
gedaða ús þæt we to forwyrde becuman;
Mildheortnyss ana gemundað ús on ðam myclan dome. gif we on andweardum
life hi ðorum mannum cyðað;
Witodlice ðam bibe dóm butan mildheortnyssse se ðe nu ðorum demð buton
mildheortnyss;

28 he scyl huruðinga] blurring suggests on erasure, by copyist. 30 Se] 'S' in
original left margin. 41 ðearfum] added, not by copyist, at bottom left corner of
page; traces of the original rewritten word, cut through, at bottom right edge of leaf.
Of rihtwisum gestréonum man sceal ælMESSAN dælan swa swa hit awritten is;

Awyrda ðinne drihten mid ðinum æHTum. 7 of ðinum frumwæstemum. syLe

déarfum;

ða ælMESSan dé of réalface beód geséalde syndon gode swa gecweme swylce

hwæ acwelle ðôres mannes cild. 7 bringe ðâm fæder þæt heatod to lácे;

God bebyt þæt man ælMESSan wyrce. 7 forbead fácн 7 reallac;

Se unrihtwisa berepó ðôre. 7 blissad // hine selfne;

Eft gif se ðearfa hine bit (æl)MESSan. þonne geunroSAð he. 7 awént his (neB)

aweg. 7 forgyt déæs witegan cwíde;

Se dé (awént) his neB fram clypiendum ðearfan (he self) clypód eft (t)o gode 7

his stemne ne bið (gehe)redd;

Ahyld ðíne éaran to ðæs wædlan (bëne) þæt god eft ðíne stámne gehyre;

Dæl (of ðám) dé de god forgáf. 7 ðíne gód beód gemænigfealdeD;

Gif ðu forgemeleasost to dæ(l)enne ælMESSan. god de benymó ðînra gode (7

dú) belýfSt syddóan wæ’dla;

God forgifó (ricum) welan genihtsumlice. 7 ðám ðearfan (on)tíhó;

Hwi swa

þæt he afándige ða rican (ðurh) his ðearfena hafenlésCt.

God ge(wrohte) welegan 7 ðearfan. 7 wolde þæt se ðearfe wæ’re ased ðurh bÔne

rican;

God ge(sette) bÔne welegan on his gódum.

hwí scyl he (ðonne) him anum geáhñian þæt heom ban for(gifen) wæs;

Gif ðu talast to ðinum geswince/ ðæt dæt ðu hafast. ðódé gif ðu wénSt þæt

dæré eordán wæs[t]mas þíne synd. þonn cwêd se ælmihtiG wealdend to ðe:

‘efne nu ic de oftéo minié fulturn. 7 hafa de þín geswCn;

‘ic oftéo mine rénscuras. 7 ic wyrcé ðin land únwæsmbærė;

‘Gif þæt lánd þín is. se rén is min.

58 [t]o superscript ‘t’, marked with an inverted ‘v’ is probably modern.
71 geswince] ‘ce’ in a bracket below ‘in’. 72 wæs[t]mas] superscript ‘t’, marked
with an inverted ‘v’, is probably modern; see Commentary. 73 þ’i’ñ.
'teoh ðu forð rénscuras gif ðu miht. 7 gewætera ðine æceras.

'Gif þu mæge dó þæt sunne scíne þæt ðine æceras ripian,'

Witodlice þæt yfele land þæt ðu ðe geahnast. nis ðín ac is ðæs aelmihtigan swa swa se witega cwæð;

_Domini est terra et plenitudo eius._

81 'seo eorðe 7 hire gefyllednyss is godes;

God cwæð eft to ðe.

'mine ðéarfæn hæbbæð ealle ðing gif hi me ænne hæbbæð;

84 'hwæt heafstu gif ðu me nærst;

'Du hiwast swilce ðu ðínnum cildhe hit sparige. 7 nást hwæm hit gescytt;

Swa swa se witega cwæð;

87 'On ðídel swincð ðe ðe gold hórðæð. 7 nát hwæm he hit gegaderæð;

'seaf ðín feoh // ne atórical ðeah geændæð ôin lif ðængne ðu læst wenst.'

swa swa crist self (cwæð) be sumum ricum mænn on his god(spelle)

90 He cwæð

'sum welig man ðæs on worul(do) 7 his væstmas genihtsumlice ðugon

'(ða) sméade se rica 7 cwæð;

93 "Hwæt do ic la (nu ic) næbbe hwær ic mæge ealle mine væst(mas) gegadrian;"

'Eft he cwæð

"ic wille ryman minne berti. 7 mine berene geécac(nigan) 7 ðider gegadrian ealle mine væstmas 7 cwæðan to minre sawle; 'Mín sawul (ðu) hæft fyla gódæ to manegra gæra (bryce) Gereste nu. 7 ett. 7 drinc. 7 gewist(fulla)"

'Pa cwæð god to ðám rican;

99 "Du stuntu (nu to)niht ðu scylt ôin lif alætæn;

"hwæs (beoð) donne ðine tylunge;"

'Swa bið se ðe him (sylfum) goldhordæð. 7 nís on gode welig;'

90 He] 'H' in left margin. 91 væstmas] 't' written over a minim. 96 Gereste] 'G' in left margin. 98 ða] 'p' in left margin.
Efne (ðu on)dræst ðe on ðam gedale. ne ondræt (ðu ðe) to dælennæ. ðu ðe nast

hwæðer ðu mergenes // gebist;

Cyð mildheortnesse ëarmum mannum mid ðinum begeæte. ne forlæt se.

ælmihtiga god ðe se ðe to dælere gesette.

be ðisum cwæð drihten on his godspelle;

'ne behyde ge eowerne goldhord on æordæn. ðær ðær ðom 7 mohðan hit awestað

7 ðéofæs. adelfað. 7 forstelað; Ac hordiað eowerne goldhord. on heofonum. ðær
ne cymð ne ðm ne mohðe ne ðéofæs ne adeælað ne ne ætredað;

'sodlice ðær ðær ðin gold is ðær bið ðin heorte,'

hu magon we ure hord on heofonum behyden buton ðürh ælmesæan;

Swa hwæt swa we be anfealdum. godes ðearfum for his lufan sylłað. he hit ðs
forgtæl be hundfealdum on ðam toweardan life;

Gif ealle. men on worulde rice waren ðonne ðæfde sio mildheortnyss næne
stede þæt seo ælmesse ðære synne lèg adwyscte swa swa hit awritten is;

Sicut aqua extinguit ignem ita elemosina // extinguit peccan;

Þæt is swa swa wæ(ter) adwyscð fyr swa adwyscð seo æl(messe) ða synna;

Nis nan ðéarfa fram (ælmes)dædum acyred;

Witodlice sum earm wuduwe ðæfde calra æhta buton (æne) fyrðling. ðane heo
brohte to godes ([w]yofode) on criistes andweardnesse. 7 he hi (ðær)rihtæ mid his
halgan müde geheredæ ([7] cwæð)

'sod ic cow secge þæt ðeos ðarme wuduwe (brohte) máran lác ðonne ænig oðer

man on ðisum. dæge. ðordan ðe heo brohte call þæt heo (hæfde) mid estfullum
mode,'

Eft on ðøre stowe cwæð drihten on his godspelle;

'Swa (hwæ) swa cylðo anum ðyrstigum menn (caeld) wæter on minum naman.
ne forlæost (he his) médæ ðære dæda;'

102 - 126
Soðlice ne bið ús (to) ælnessan geteald gif ðam mannum sellað ðe heora

neoda habbað. forðan ðe god ne hét ús gewelian ða hæbbendan. // ac þæt we ðam
wædliendum gefultumedon;

We willað gét ænne cwide ðære godspellican gerecofnesse eow gereccen on

ðisum ilcan andgyte;

Drihten spræc ymbe his tocyme to ðam myclan dome. [7 ðus cwæð;

'Witodlice mannes bearn cymð on his mægenðrymme. 7 ealle englas samod

mid him to ðam micclum dome.]

'danne sit he on domsetle his mægenðrymnesse 7 beðð. gegadrode ætforan him
ealle ðeode. 7 he toscat hi on twa swa swa hýrde toscæt scæp fram gátum;

'danne gelogað he ða scæp on his swiðran hand. 7 ða gæt on his wynstran;' We willað eow geswutulian nu ærest gif eower hwylc nyte hwæt mannes bearn
sy. þæt is crist self mannes béarn se ðe is anes mædenes sunu ðære eadigan marian

on ðære mænischnesse. 7 seo mænniscnyss bið gesewen on ðam dóme ðonne he self
sit on his dómsetle. 7 ða rihtwisan on his swiðran hand. 7 ða synfullan on his
wynstran;

ðonne cwæð crist Hodes sunu // to ðam ðe on his swiðran hand stan(deð)

Venite benedicti patris mei percipite (regnun) quod vobis paratum est ab initio
(mundi)

'Cumæð ge gebletsode to minum fæder (7 ge)ahniað ðæt rice ðe eow gegærvod
was fram frymðe middangeardes;

'Me (hin)grode. 7 ge me gereordon;

'Me ðyrste (7 ge me) scænten;

'Îc was cuma. 7 ge me undorfen(gon) on eowrum gesthûse;

'Îc was nacod (7 ge me) scryddon;

'Îc was geuntrumod. 7 ge me (genéo)sodon;

'Îc was on cwarterne. 7 ge comon (to me) 7 ge me gefrefrodon;'

128 'we'. hæbbendan] 'dan' in a bracket at bottom right corner of page. 133-5 [7 ðus ... dome] supplied, see Commentary. 141 ðonne] 'ð' in left margin. 145
Venite] 'V' in left margin. 147 Cumæð] 'C' in left margin. 150 scæn'e'c'tan.
Danne andswarian (ða) rihtwisan crist 7 cweþdæ;
156 'Drihten (hwæn)ne gesawan we ðe hungrigne. 7 we ðe ge(ryor)dodon; ðode ðurstigne. 7 we ðe scæntan
'(ðode) hwænne ware ðu cuma. 7 we ðe under(féngon)
159 'ðode hwænne gesawe ðe untrumne. ðode (on) cwarerne. 7 we ðe
genysodon;'
Danne and(wyrt) se cyning. ðam rihtwisum ðisum wordum. //
23 v 162 Sod ic eow secge swa lâinge swa ge dydon anum ðisum læstum on minum
naman. ge hit dydon me selsem;
Donne cweð he eft to ðam synfullum ðe on his wynstran healfe standæ;
165 Discedite a me maledicti in ignem eternum qui preparatus est diabolo et
ængelis eius;
'Gewitæd fram me awyrgdon in to ðam ecan fyre ðe is gegærcod ðam deofle. 7
168 his awyr[g]dum gastum;
'Me hingrode. 7 ge me ætes forwyrdon;
'Me ðyrste. 7 ge me drincan ne sealdan;
171 'Ic wæs cuma. 7 ge me undorfon noldon;
'Ic wæs nacod noldon ge me wæda tyðian;
'Ic wæs untrum. 7 on cwarerne. noldon ge me geneosian;
174 Donne andsweriæd ða unrihtwisan. manfullan;
'la leof hwænne gesawe we ðe hungrigne ðode ðurstigne. ðode cuman. ðode
nacodne. ðode geuntrumodne. ðode ðon cwarerne. 7 we ðe noldan ðënan;
177 Danne andwyrt se cynig. him 7 cweð;
24 r 'Swa lâinge // swa ge forwyrdon anum mæn of (ðisum) litlum. 7 noldon him on
minum naman ((tyðian) Swa længe ge me selsem his (for)wyrdon;
180 Donne (farað) ða uncystigan. 7 ða (unriht)wisæn. into écere (cwic)susle mid
deofle. 7 his (awyrgdum) ænglum; 7 ða rihtwisæn gecyrræð (fram) ðam dome into
δαμ écan life. mid (criste) 7 his gecorenum ðæglum; Mid δαμ hio lībað. 7

183 rixiað. on sawle. 7 on lichaman. (ā) in ealra worulda woruld amen.:-:-:—

183 a] written with an ascender.
HOMILY 2. COMMENTARY

Godden’s edition, Ælfric’s Catholic Homilies. Second Series, pp.60-66, is referred to by author’s name, along with line number.

1 IS CU3 All other manuscripts have ‘is cuō ḫæt’. The copyist perhaps failed to rewrite ‘ḥæt’, causing the ungrammatical reading.

3-4 7 mid fæstene ... ǣoweane (Godden, lines 4-5) Like C, Bodley 340 and 342, CCCC 198 and CCCC 162 omit ‘us’, object of ‘ǣoweane’, before ‘mid’.

8 wutodlice At the end of the preceding line, ‘wutod’ appears to be written by the modern hand who added superscript arabic numbers at points throughout Homily 2. Superscript ‘2’ precedes ‘wutod’. Perhaps ‘wutod’ was still visible and the modern hand retraced the letters, but no other erased end lines show traces of letters (erasure at end lines is indicated by roughening of the surface of the membrane). ‘7’ at the end line preceding ’7 xl. nihta’ seems also to have been written by the modern hand. For modern additions, see above p.22.

22 Stunlice For ‘Stuntlice’.

42 on ǣam toweardan (Godden, line 46) Only CCCC 302 has ‘on ǣam toweardan life’; at line 113 all manuscripts have ‘life’ in the same phrase and in similar context, and cp. lines 45-6, ‘on andweardum life’, all manuscripts. BT does not give a substantive use of ‘towearda’. There is potential ambiguity here, since it could be taken that some time in the future is meant, rather than the after-life. Cp. Homily 4, line 277, ‘ge her on wyrolde. ge on ǣere toweardan’, where the feminine ‘ǣere’, agreeing with ‘wyrolde’, indicates that ‘toweardan’ is adjectival rather than nominal. A look through MCOE shows several instances like this in Ælfric’s work, but none of a nominal ‘towearda’, the only instance of which I have seen is in a hymn printed by Michael Korhammer, Die Monastischen Cantica im Mittelalter und ihre altenglischen Interlinearversionen (Munich, 1976), p.314, where ‘on ǣam toweardan’ glosses ‘in futuro’. If there is omission error in the present case, familiarity with the use of adjective ‘towearda’ in a paired phrase referring to present and future could account for its persistence or coincidence in the copies. However, if a nominal usage of ‘towearda’ is strictly ungrammatical, there is a faulty
reading here, though there is not a failure of sense. On adjectives used as nouns, see Mitchell, *OE Syntax*, I, paras 132-5. Such forms as 'ða uncystigan. 7 ða unrihtwisan' at line 180, of persons, are unexceptional.

72 *wæstmas* The superscript addition of 't' is marked with an inverted 'v' and is probably modern (see above, p.22). At line 91, the copyist, Hand B, began to write 'wæstmas' but altered the first minim of 'm' to 't'; *cp.* also 'unwæsmære', at line 75. In Homily 4, also written by Hand B, an added 't' in 'wæstmas' at line 189 is marked with an inverted 'v'. The letter 't' is omitted from a consonant cluster at line 22 above; *cp.* also 'scæntan', line 157, and 'scæn'c'tan', line 150, where the superscript is by the copyist. It may be that these spellings reflect the copyist's pronunciation.

78 *hæt yfele land* (Godden, line 80) Like C, Bodley 340 and 342 and CCCC 162 have 'yfele', while CCCC 198 has 'yfe'. All other manuscripts have the plainly correct 'sylfe'.

105 *se ðe* (Godden, line 103) All other manuscripts have a further 'ðe', 'you', object of 'gesette'. In Bodley 340 and 342, CCCC 198 and Hatton 114 the word is added.

121-2 [7] *cwæð soð* (Godden, line 120) I cannot agree with Godden that 'soðlice' was the original reading for 'soð', as he indicates in his collation. He discusses the point in his notes to the homily (p.351), taking it that 'soð' was cut off when the gathering was trimmed and rewritten on erased 'lice' at the beginning of the next line. '[7] cwæð' has been rewritten and, judging by the smaller numbers of the other examples of rewritten letters, I do not think that there could have been space at the end of the original line for '7 cwæð soð'. Neither is there space at the beginning of the next line for 'lice' where 'oð' now is, 's' being in the margin. It may be that 'S' was erased from the margin to be replaced by 's', making more room to rewrite '7 cwæð'. However, it is a minor point which does not involve a difficult reading, nor need it raise doubt about the place of C in the textual tradition represented by Bodley 340 and 342, CCCC 198 and CCCC 162.

133-5 [7 *hus cwæð ... dome*] Supplied from Godden, lines 131-3. Hatton 114 has the same omission, presumably due to homeoteleuton. The omission has not brought about an unserviceable reading, though Ælfric's text is marred by it, particularly by the loss of mention of 'mannes bearn' (line 134), which is explained at lines 139-41.
159 gesawe for 'gesawe we'; CCCC 198 and CCCC 162 also omit 'we' here.

178 forwyrdon for 'forwyrdon'; in CCCC 162 the same error has been corrected after copying. In CCCC 198, CCCC 162, CUL ii. 4. 6. and CCCC 178 the 'n' has been omitted from the same word at its next occurrence (line 179), where in CCCC 162 the copyist this time makes the correction. The added partial copy of the homily at the end of Bodley 342 has the same error at line 169. In none of these cases is the context suitable for the verb 'forweorpan' in its usual sense 'perish', etc. It is odd that the error is made, in some or all cases independently, at different points in copies of the same passage, especially when it is considered that the preterite plural of 'forweorpan' is commonly spelt 'forwurdon', as well as 'forwyrdon' in LWS.

182-3 What look like neums are drawn over 'criste', 'his', 'ge' of 'gecorenan' and 'ra' and 'wor' in 'ealra worulda'. These neum-like marks are in the same ink as a pen trial that follows the end of the text and cannot therefore be taken to suggest an intoning of the homily conclusion (see above, p.35).
HOMILY 3

25r Geherað nu man ða leofestan. hu ús godes béc moniegap. 7 myndigað to ures lifes clènnesse. 7 lícháman 7 sáule. þæt is þæt we hæbben ærest rihtne geléfan. to

3 þam acænn[e]dan7 þam ælmihtigan gode. forðan butan rihtan geléfan 7 rihtum dædum nan man to gode becumán ne mæg.

forðan ús myndigað godes béc þæt we ure ælmaessan sellan earmun mannum 7
to godes circéean. 7 dæghwamlice ær we to urum gereordum gesitten þæt we síme hwæthwega gode to willan gedón.

hæbbe æghwilc man be his mæðe þa gód þe god wite þæt he gedón mæge. 7

9 seo ælmesse sceal béon symle mid rihté begyten. gif heo gode ondfænge beon scæl.

25v 7 síme to halgum tidum we hie // gernost sellen forðan þe hit awritten is on cristes bocum þæt man mid þære ælmaessan mæge his synna adwæscean. swa man mæg

12 mid wætere fyr adwæscean. gif hie mid rihté gestrenede beodð.

hu mæg se cristena man beon sopfæst 7 clæne 7 gode gecórøn gif he nyle godes cyricean sceean. halchum dagum. þam þe we freolsian scéolan. 7 þær þa halchan

gerýno gehýran. 7 to þan halgestan. 7 to þan hēhstan tidum to húsle gánan.

7 ealle we scéolan anum gode þéowian. þam þe on heofonum is. 7 ealles middangeardes wealdend.

18 he ús mid his þrowunge aliesde of þam heardestan 7 þam grimmestan helle

26r witum. forþy we nu on þas halchan tide sculan onfōn // an ure [:]nd[:]:tón cristes þam halgum gerynum. ond [:]:o[:]:n we him þis fecowertiga nihta on clènnessa. 7

21 on forhæfndesne unrihtlices lichaman lustes. þæt we mægen on þa eastertid rihtlice

7 mid clènnesse 7 mid hihte becumán to þam halgan húsle órsorhlice.

3 acænn[e]dan 'acænnendan' MS; see Commentary. 4 'ne'. 8 god] Fadda reports a final 'u' erased; space for one letter, but copyist's spacing between words is often generous. Fadda's 'u' seems to be shine-through of first two minims of 'middangeardes' on verso. 15 tidum] followed by two or three letter space: possible erasure. 16 heofonum. 18 aliesde] Fadda 'aliesde ond', but her 'ond' (=7) is shine-through from recto of abbreviated 'þæt'. 19 and 20 For missing letters see Commentary. 20 fe'owertiga.
forþan manige syndan sóðfæste weorc. þe man wyrcean scæl on þas halgan tid.

24 eac þam fæstene.

þæt synt ure gelýfedan cýrícósçna. 7 hálga weccæan. 7 halige gebédu. 7
æmæsson. 7 dru[n]cennesse to forgánne.

27 ne he selfa ne he oberne ne bidde ðy læs hiera bégra saul þurh ðæt forloren
wéorpe. forþan þe se druncnesse manige synne weccð on fultum fyrenlustum. 7 on
unrihtum geflitum. 7 on gitsungum. þe him þurh deofles biswicensse. þurh þæt
druncen. bið tó bóren. forþan þe he simle wile fram gode atéon. swa fela swa he
mæst mæg. 7 on þam écum wítum gebríngan. ealle þa þe his lárum geheran.
willað.

30 ac us man simle bebedeð on godes bebodum þæt we genéache ure cýricean
sécean. 7 þær gehieren ráedan þa godcundan wórd þe drihten sélfa gescóp. ealra
codcundra gesamnunge.

33 ac beo ge nu géþyldíge. þah eow man mid wordum trehege. þæt ge þa yflan
word ne forgylfden. mid oprum yfelum wordum. And þeah man gehere oðérne him
on ðweorh sprécan þanne ne geandswérghe he na him mid nane // ýfele. þanne bið
his saule eft agyñen tienfealde. wæstmæs on godes gesamnunge.

36 ac beo ge nu géþyldíge. þah eow man mid wordum trehege. þæt ge þa yflan
word ne forgylfden. mid oprum yfelum wordum. And þeah man gehere oðérne him
on ðweorh sprécan þanne ne geandswérghe he na him mid nane // ýfele. þanne bið
his saule eft agyñen tienfealde. wæstmæs on godes gesamnunge.

39 ac andetad þe ge eow nu eowra sýnna. 7 doð híera sóðe hréwe þanne beoð eowra
saúla þurh þæt gehælde þe ge fnánðæ eft forgylfnesse. eowra sýnna on þam
niehstan dæge.

42 7 he bið þanne orsóðr forðan þe he zér dyde sóðe hréowsunge his sýnna. forþan
on þa tid þe his saul of his lichaman gewítæt 7 heo biþ synfull. þanne biþ hieræ

calles gelíc þeah heo. þanne wólde hréowe don. forþán heo syþpan náder ne mæg
ne synnigian ne hréowsian

26 dru[n]cennesse] superscript 'n', marked with an inverted 'v', is probably
modern. 27 [for'loren] 'for' not added by copyist: 'f' is crossed, unlike the form
used by copyist, and tops of descenders are formed differently. 33 ac] 'a' written
with a short ascender. 36 [tre'he'ge] Fadda prints 'trege', thinking that copyist
meant to emend to 'trehe', but no indication that 'ge' should be deleted. 37 And]
'A' in left margin. 40 ac] 'a' written with a short ascender. 43 forþan] Fadda
'forðan'. 
ac bebeorgan we us nu ða niderlican witu. 7 gægærwian we ús nu ða
heofoncúndan lǽoh. 7 ðísne hǽfon 7 ðas wætér. // 7 ðís fyr.
ac we ne magon geseon hwænan hie cumad hider. ac we. magon. scewian
ðísne heofon 7 ðas wætér 7 ðís fyr her on eorþan. 7 nis on hefonum gesewan náder
ne fyr ne wætér. ac heofona fyr. 7 heofona wæter syndan gódes ænglas gewordene.
ac utan nu geecarnian þæt we ne becumon. to þam uncuðan witum ac þæt we
geseon mid gode æfter þisse wéorulde.

7 forþan drihten him sohte fæmnan innoð on to eardianne.
þæt he ús ðurh þæt ætewde þæt we sculan beforan godes gesihtøe drihtnes
ondfæńcge on him seluum geséon þæt he wæs man gewórdan.

forþan we þanne nu sculan gode onfón mid ús swa he selfa. cwæð;
In me manet[e] et ego in ubiṣ. sed quare deus noster nascendo per

urigine[m] sic voluit reformári ad uta. ut quia // [per] mulierem in hunc mundum

intrauerat:
he cwæð drihten be þissum manniscum kynne.
'wuniap on me. 7 ic on eow'

ac forhwæn wæs drihten acscenneð. þurh fæmnan innoð. bútan þæt he wólde ús
gescýppan to þam ecean lif.

forþan þæt géara gelamp. þurh éuan adames wif þæt deap wæs gangende on
middangeard. 7 ða wæs þissum middangearde ëft hiera hæle agyfen. þurh marían
þa fæmnan.

7 cuðlice þa drihten þy priddan dǽge of dáþe arás fram hélwarum. 7 ða
gebaðan him ærest wif tó. 7 heom wæs beboden þæt hie úrnon. 7 bodedan his
apostolum his ærist 7 he wæs ærest fram þam wimmannum ætywed.

forþan us ærest deað // þurh wifman ongefeoll. 7 þa ëft forþan wifman ærest
bódodan. 7 cyþdan mannhum his ærist.

51 ac] 'a' written with an ascender. gewordene]Fadda 'wurd-'. 52 ac utan] 'a' of
'ac' written with an ascender. 58-9 manet[e] 'manet' MS; virgine[m] 'virgine'
MS; [per] mulierem] 'mulierem' MS; emendations follow Fadda. 66 hæle] 'æ' is
written as abbreviated Latin 'et'. 69 bi'm. to] Fadda omits. 70 w[i]mmannum
superscript 'i', marked with an inverted 'v', is probably modern.
ond þæt wif þæt ærest deaðes byrgeæde. þa was hæo eft forþan éditw þrowigende.

from hire were. 7 þa scyld þe hæo þær dyde. seo hire waerþ on ecnesse

75 ongewrecén. 7 hira synna wéron miicium begoten ofer ús.

7 þa ús wútoldlice becom ure drihten purh marian leoma. þære halchan faemnan

78 þæt was þæt drihten cóm to forþan purh hie. 7 god ætewede on ðam þæt he is ealra clænnessa frúma.

7 þus ús onsfeng ure drihten purh hine sélfrne. þæt he wólde þæt we hine

81 onfengon. on ús.

þis word þanne tacnaþ. þæt se mán onsfęp godes. se de rihtlice gehereþ swa

29r swa // hine wise gelæfraþ.

84 god ús hafaþ beboden þæt we him þéowigen on clænan lichaman forþan he was gebóøen þurh þære clænan faemnan leoma.

forþan he is lærow ælecere clænnesse. 7 ne mæg se náfre wésan cláne se de

87 nyla his syna geswican. ðer his ændedæge.

7 nu mænnisc[lic]e. we þe crist witen. luðian we hine. forþan síme mid cláne lichaman. 7 mid hluttre gehápance. þanne adilgað he ús crist fram ealum urum

90 synnum. 7 we magn geearnian gif we sélfe willāþ. þæt crist eardāþ an ús.

þis word þanne tacnaþ þæt crist selfa. behealdō þa mæn þa þe tela doð. 7

2Av deosol tihtaþ þam þe on þweorh // þæncead.

93 7 soplice þa þe crist ne luðiaþ. hu mangan þa cwedan þæt hie sien cristene. ac ús gedafnaþ anra gehwiþcum þæt he ús ahebbe on þa sóþan cristennesse. 7 forlæte þa wéorc þe se earma féond mæn lærap.

96 hu mæg se mán bédon cristen. gif he fliteð wiþ crīstes bebodu.
Diliges *dominum deum tuum ex toto corde tuo et ex tota anima tua et totis uribus tuuis. deinde diligis proximum tuum quam [t]e ipsum. qui enim diligit proximum totam legem impleuit; he cwaed ure // drihten be pissum menniscean cynne.

'ilufaef ge eowerne drihten. god mid ealre eowre heorten. 7 mid ealre eowre saule. 7 mid ealle maegne. 7 panne æfter pissum. lufluæ eowre ða nihtan. swa eow sæfe. 7 panne wītoldlice sæ ðe lufluæ his ðane nihtan ðanne gefyllæd se ælice godes æ.'

forpan he bebæad ægþær ge on þære ealdan æ. ge on þære niwan æ. þæt we heolden ures trihtnes bebodu hælendes. cristes. 7 ða he ús scalarde ða niwan æ. ða bebæad hé us on þære. þæt we lufadan us betweonum. 7 ða drihten hine ætywde oft on eort/pan æfter þan þe he up astigen wæs. þa cwaed he be his gingrum 'ge beeæp mine discipulo. gif ge eow lufluæ eow betweonum.'

7 fordan men ða leoestan weorþiaæ eow sæfe betweonan eow. fordan we

syndan ealre anra leoman. 7 crist is ure hæafod. forpan he ærest gescop ure ealra fader. 7 módær.

7 he is sóplícæ ðæt geþwære léohenæ bærn. 7 ða beoð wītoldlice þeostra bærn.

þa de willað simle stánan on dom maéstum geflíthum.

ac gehealden we ús þæt we sien þæs leohtestan leohtes bærn. nalæs þiestra bærn.

forðan se mán se de deð manige sýnna se bið þiestra bærn. 7 deofla bærn

geciged. 7 ða ðæn // ða ðe dód gód. 7 beoð ælmesfyllæ. þa beoð godes bærn

---

geciged. 7 ða mæn þa ðe dóð góð 7 drihtnes willan; þanne wuniað þara sáula in écum wúldre.

123 7 þare saule méte. bip wutodlice. þæt se man héalde drihtnes bebodo þa hwile ðe he lisiende sie. 7 ð[æt] bið ðære saule drinca þæt man him géornlice to gode gebidde. 7 þæt man gelóme fæste. 7 godes naman gédénce.

126 7 seo ælmesse bip hiera synna forgifenes. 7 hiere órganan beód. þa halgan godes wórd þe men singað. 7 ne seceþ drihten nan þinc mare fram þam mannnum bútan þæt hic his naman on ælce wisan wéorðian dæges 7 nihtes. swa ic ær sæde.

129 an ðíssum halchan godspélle.

3\v 7 we sculan swiðe géorn/llice mid urum sáulum. 7 mid urum lichaman ahebban þæs heofonlican cyninges naman. forþan ús wáráen of heofonum þurh þæne cyning swiðe fægre gifte hider onsænde. 7 gif we géornlice his náman begangað. þanne beóþ ðre saúla halie gewordene. 7 hiere becymeð swiþe gesféalic blis fram þam ecean cyninge.

132 7 ure lichaman. þe of éordan gewordene wáráen beóð ælce dæge fedde fram þam heofonlican cyninge.

135 7 þæs mannnes saúl bið liflic. 7 cymeð fram éordan. se lichama.

138 forðan he sceal béon. mid éordan féd.

132 7 þæs mannnes saul bið góðes orðes. 7 heo forðan scéal béon mid codcundum mægenum. 7 mid husle geféded.

141 7 forðan ús is to wilnianne þæt gód us ge/fýlle mid sódféstnesse.

144 forþan se lichama ne mæg nane hwile lyfgean swa deáah butan mete. 7 drincan. swa þæs mannnes saul ne mæg nane hwile beon butan godcundum weorcum.

147 arfæstnesse. 7 mid rummodnesse. 7 mid hálignesse. 7 mid smiltnesse 7 mid
geðungennesse. 7 mid [bile]hwitnesse. 7 mid rihtnesse. 7 mid godcundnesse. 7
tongue us man on ðe worh to sprece. 7 mid waccean

149 gel>ylmodnesse

150 7 mid mildheortnesse. 7 mid sigef{:
stnesse. 7 gemetfæstnesse. 7 mid ar//nesse
godcundra beboda.

his done is swiðe gästlic wéorc 7 swiðe hálwendlic. 7 mid þyllicum

153 mægenum bip ðæs mannes saul mid gereordum gefyllde.

7 þa mæn þe ðís eall beop donde. þanne beoð þára saula bréohtran þanne
sunne. þanne heo broehtest scineð. swa he self wæs cweðende.

156 Tunc just; fulgebunt scit sicol in regno patris eorum. qui habet aures audiendi audiát.

anima homines. peccatores cum exierat de corpore.

159 Drihten he cweð

'soðfæste mæn scinað on hera fæderrice efne swa sunne on hóesnonum. 7 þanne
nu se man se ðe ænig andgit hæbbe þonne gehiere he þisses cwides þearlwisnesse.'

162 hit // gelimpeð. þanne þæs sýnfullan mannes sául. gæð of his lichaman. done
bið héo seoson siðum swéartre. done se hræfen.

7 hit is cweðen on ðíssum gódspelle. þæt déofla lædan ða sáule.

165 7 þanne heo spreceð. wépëndre stæfne. to ðam déofoflum. 7 hyo cweþ.

'micle siendon. þa ôyostre þe ge mé. to lædað.'

7 þanne ándsweriað hire ða déofo. 7 hie cweðað

168 'máran. þe siendon tórward. in hélle.'

þanne cweð seo saul éft

'micel is ðéos únrotnes þe ge mé to lædað.

171 7 þanne. andsweriað. hiere þa déofole. 7 hie cweðað.

'máran gewin. 7 máre unblis. þe is gegearrowd. on hélle.'

7 þanne æfter þysum wórdum. hie lædað þa saule. on helle witu.
ond þanne bið þæs halgan mannes sául. wutodlice. // þanne héo of ðam lichaman. gánged. secof siðum heo bið béorhtre. þanne súnne. 7 þa hálgan godes ænglas. hie laéðad to paradýsum.

177 7 þanne cwyð seo sául to ðam ænglum. þe hie laéðad. 'éala mycel is ðeós blis. þe ic ongeléðad éam.' Ond þanne ðandswergead. híre. þa ænglas. 7 cweðad

180 'máre blis þe is on hóofonum gegéarwad.' Ond þánne seo sául éft cweð 'micel is þes þým. þe we on sýndan.'

183 7 þanne. ðandswéergeð. híre þa ænglas. 7 cweðad 'þu cymest. ful æt to máran. þrymne.' Ond þánne. cwyð seo sául. þriddan síde.

186 'mycel is þis. léoht þe ic on éam.' Ond þánne. ðandswéergeð híre. þa ænglas. 7 híe cweðad. 'þu gemetst. mare léoht mid góde.'

34v 189 Ond þánne sýngad þa hálgan ænglas swíde. gastli[glne // sang 7 béréð ða cláþnan sáwe. to gode on héora fæðmum. 7 híe cweðad to ðære sáwe;

_Béatus quem elegisti replebimur;

192 híe cweðad. 'eadig eart ðu sawl ðu name gode eardunge in ðínnum hús; 7 we nu gefyllad mid góde ðín hús.

195 'ðín témpl. his hálig. 7 wúndorlicre drýmnesse;' Ond híe cweðad eft be ðare sáwe. 'eadig eart ðu sáwl. ðu gehéolde ðines drihtnes bebodu; 7 ðu dydest géornlice

198 æfter ðines godes willan;'
Eala du halige drýnnes. fæder. 7 sunu. 7 halig gást // du de æfre wære 7 æfre
bist. 7 nu eart án ælmihtig god. untodæledlic; on de we geléfað. 7 hihted. ðæt us
ne ðurfe sceamian. 7 ðæt ðu úre fynd ne gebismrian;

Eala du god ælmihtig; 7 eala du éce drihten; 7 eala du undeadlice scyppend;
ðe we bidað. 7 halssiað. mid ealre úre heortan. 7 mid eallum móde. 7 mid eallum
mægene. ðæt ðu afýrsige fram ðus. ealle úre unrihtwisnesse. 7 we geáernian. ðæt
we motan becúman to ðínnum ríc. 7 mid ðe rixian on héofona ríc // wuldre; 7
ðæt we mid þe moton féran. 7 becuman inne ðæt upplice. wuldor. 7 ðær brúcan.
mid þínnum. gecorenum. ænglum.

And nu mæn ða leofestan. ondrædan we ús ðara awiergedra deofla
sweartnesse. 7 hellebrógan. 7 hiora dracona fulnesse. 7 hiora wyrma grædíngnesse.

7 wildeora roðnesse. 7 hiora susla micelnesse. 7 hiora ða écean witu.
ðær bíþ eagona wóp. 7 toþa gristbitung. 7 wélæra ðurst.
7 þær beóþ saula on micllum géflitum. toslitene.
7 þær bíþ. heortan fyrhtu. 7 þær bíþ saula únrotnesne. 7 prótene drygnesse.
7 þær bíþ singállic cyrm. 7 gelónlic gémorung.
7 þær beóþ ða synßullan saula forgítene. 7 hiora éardungstow bíþ mid déoflum.
7 þær bíþ wite. butan ænéde. 7 déostra bútan leohhte. 7 cleopung bútan
géhernesse. 7 micel wóp. 7 micel gémorung.

7 þær bíþ ðæt // éce sar 7 orwéne. þæt him æfre ðæs sár linne. 7 him her
næfre ne becymeþ næning frófor. ne næning help abútan sárlic ænéde
7 þæt beoð ða árleasan. ðe simle hiera deaðes wysceáð 7 him n[.] geseald ne
bíð na ðy hraðor.

205 7 mid ðe rixia\'n\'] squeezed in, with superscript at end line; written by copyist,
not added as Fadda reports. on heofona ríc\] bracketed in a drawing of a bird.
205-6 7 þæt we mid þe] Fadda reports \"7\" added on erasure and \'p\' of \'pe\' added;
whole phrase is cramped and shows blurring, could be on erasure; \'e\' of \'pe\' has
tongue extended upwards in form of 9-shaped abbreviation for \'s\'. 218 \'ðæt\'
added in margin, retouched. 220 n[.] Fadda prints 'na', but the letter is uncertain.
7 þær bīp fyrenmere swilce òðru sæ. 7 þæt is swīþe ormēte dēopnes. ðæs grūnd[es] 7 eal yfel ongēmænged on ðām grūnd[e] 7 þær nǣnig gōd ætscwēd bīp on ðām grūn[nde]

7 þær bīp seo eorðe gode ofergyten.

7 hie dær þ[a] wuniegað a worulda woruld. 7 ðis þonne [is] synfulra stow on to ēardianne. 7 hi[era] gebunes dær þonne

béop on þīsum w[ītum] ða forlēgeran. 7 þa godwrécan. 7 þa o[fer]welgan. þe mid unrihtnesse him [ær] bégéatan. 7 þa gitseras. 7 þa strud[er]fas 7 ða ðeofas. 7 dā

ðæodsceadan. 7 ðα [man]sworan // 7 þa lógeras. 7 þa gramhértan. 7 ða

lyblæcean. 7 þa ðe manige galdor cunnon 7 þa ðe gelōme galaþ. 7 þa unrihtfullan. 7 þa arleasan. 7 þa hātheortan. 7 þa æfaðegman. 7 þa yfelan. 7 þa ofermodan. 7 þa ðe eall yfel wro[h]tan. 7 þa ðe deofle wærōn simle gongende on hiōra

eardungstōwe. ðe hie noldan nǣnige hreowē dón. hyra synna. ær hyra forōfore

7 hyra anra gehwilc dāra manna. ðe nyle his synna geswican. þonne onse[h]e þe þyllicum tīntregum.

Swilce on þīsum bōcum sægeð. þonne æfter ðon. þa halgan. 7 þa sōðfæstan mid. criste. mid hyra godum wyrca

þæt þonne syndan ða unwēmman. 7 þa clēnan 7 þa rihtwisan. 7 þa gōdan //

7 þa manōwætæn. 7 þa gecorenan. 7 þa medoman. 7 mildhēortan. 7 þa

gēbyldegan. 7 þa getrēwan. 7 þa caðmodan. 7 ða ðe gode hēræp on calle tid. 7 þa rummodan. 7 þa snotran. 7 þa wisan.

7 þa ðe wērōn mid swīþe mycelre godes lufan gefyllede. hie hāfdon. mycle forhæfdnesse. 7 forwxynnednesse. hīera lichaman lustes. 7 hie nu eardiað mid criste. for hyra godum wēorcum. ðār bið lēohes lēoh∂ 7 willa ðæs lēoh∂es.

223–30 Bracketed letters on fol.35v are conjectural; manuscript readings at end lines are obscured by the paper end leaf, which has been pasted on to the inner edge of fol.35v. Supplied letters agree with those printed by Fadda (without comment) except that at line 229 Fadda reads ‘a’ for my ‘ær’. 230 [man]sworan ‘sworan’ in bracket at bottom right corner of page. 232 ofermodan] Fadda ‘ofernioðan’. 233 wro[h]tan] superscript ‘h’, marked with an inverted ‘v’, is probably modern. 239 At the foot of fol.36r a part line is enclosed in an ornamental bracket; this practice is continued through to fol.52v.
246 7 þær bið éce geféa. 7 þær bið ængla breohtnes. 7 haligra lufu. 7 þær biþ seo éce ár.
249 butan áende. 7 iuonð butan ýlde. //  
246 7 þær ne bið nænig bróga. néfre gesewen. ne ne gehéred. ac ðær bið blis
247r 7 þær næfre. niht ne gebéostrað. ac ðær simle. awunað. þær heofonlice léoht.
247 7 þær ne boð nænige tintréga geywed. ac ðær bið seo éce hæl. 7 syo éce lufu.
252 swipe ungeswæncedu.
253 7 þær bið seo unawæneldic. eadignes. 7 þær wuniað his ða. halgan. on ðam hyhstan wuldre. a in ealra worulda woruld.
253 7 þonne ne bið us mid gode ðon máre gewin. gesewen. ne gegearwod. þonne 
254 þysum halgum wæs. ðe ic big sége. Gif we willað ure synna geswican. 7 gode 
eadmode béon. swa drihten selfa wæs sprecende. 7 he cwæð.  
258 O fratres dilectissimi quam timendus est dies ille. in quo dominus propositum 
37v uenire cum flamam ignis. // quod inflammabil in adversarios. 
260 He cwæð.
261 'eala mæn ða léofestan. hu eow is to ondrædanne. se dég se ðe drihten. 
oncymed to éow. mid fyres ligum. 7 he ðonne forbærneð. ealle his þa 
widerwéardan.'
264 7 þonne wepað swiðe biterlice ealle ða ðe nu doð. unrihtwisnesse.
265 7 þonne magon elle corðlice mæn. geséon. ealra cyninga cyning. cumende 
ofer heofonas wolcnum. mid his ðam mielan órymme.

246 breohtnes] Fadda 'breohtnes'. 248 þæ'r' ne] long open r, not copyist's usual 
form, squeezed in between 'a' and 'n'; Fadda reports by a corrector, but ink and hand 
look like copyist's; another long open r is at line 253 in the first 'þær', written at the 
end of a line on fol.37r. 248, 250, 251 ac] 'a' written with an ascender. 253 ða.] 
between 'ða' and the point an erasure of four letters: first letter appears to have been 
an ascender, followed closely by possible tail of 'g'; then possible 'a' and 'n' (Fadda 
reports first two letters 'hg'). Thus it seems that copyist at first wrote 'balgan' and 
left space, perhaps, because of damage to surface of membrane, which shows 
scraping. 254 a] written with ascender. 259 uenire] at end line preceding, 'ueni' 
cancelled. 262 7] in left margin.
265 7] in left margin, but remainder of lines on this page begun directly below the 
's.' elle] Fadda 'ealle'. 280 gemæru.] Fadda reports an erasure of one letter after 
gemær', but I see no trace; Fadda may have been misled by the point and a stain. 
283 grystbitung] Fadda 'grist-'. 288 ðær] 'ðæ' written over 'ne' (Fadda 'na' or 'ne', 
but tongue of 'e' visible in bow of 'æ').
267 7 þonne beoð ealle gescæfta. swiðe ohnherede. beforan him. 7 heofon bið gefealdan on da tid swa swa bóc. 7 sæ bið adrúgod. 7 ealle gescæfta beod

38r  onhnherede. 7 sunne bið gehwýrfed on ðecastro. 7 mona ne seleð. // his leocht. 7

270 steorran feallad of heofonum. 7 eall heofona mægen bið onhnhered.

7 þonne ealle eordan mægða geseod. þæt micle sigebéacen. þæt is seo halige cristes rod.

273 7 þonne for ðære rode beorhtnesse. bið eall ðes middangeard. aðyostrad. efne swa niht. 7 þa synfullan. mgn. beoð ablende. 7 þonne forwyrdæ.

7 þonne se mycla dæg cymæð. 7 crist cymæð to ðam dóme. þonne magon ða

276 wérgan gástas. geséon hwone hie ær oferhogodan. 7 his bebodu. héaldan noldan.

7 þonne sændað drihten his ænglas on feower ændas ðises middangéardes.

38v 7 þonne beoð gesamnode. ealle gecorene. ða ðe // nu soð 7 riht willað. 7 fram

279 hyra synnum ahwyrfan.

7 þonne fram heofones heanessum. ðo eordan gemæru. beoð gesamnode. gód. on ða swiðran healfe. in ðone ungeándedan gefían. 7 blisse.

282 7 þa synfullan beoð gesende on ðone fyrenan ofn. ðær bið wóp. 7 toða grystbitung. se wæs gara gegéarwod. deoflum. 7 his ænglum. 7 hæðenum þeodum. ðam ðe ne woldan hyra saule geedniwian. on ðam líslícan þweale. 7 hie

285 noldan gelýfan. þæt he wære crist godes sunu.

wa la þonne ðam synfullum ðe hyra gebúnnes. bið mid déoflum.

39r Eala þær þonne bið ormëtic sead mid ðam deoðlum. 7 nǽfré ða wyrmas. // ne

288 sweltað ðe on ðam scead wuniað. 7 ðær ne bið nǽfré ðara tintrega fyrl fyr ðawysced. ne ðær nǽfré nǽnig stefn bið gehered. butan gnornunge þær nabbæð synfulle mæn nǽnige ðøre reste butan on ðelle. 7 nabbæð hie nǽfré nǽnige clænnesse.

291 butan ðam cealdan snáwe.

Wa la þam mannum. ðe ðær sculan béon onbelócene. on ðam synfullan scead.

7 hie beoð bedælde fram eallum ðam timbre ðe heom ær behaten wæs.

294 7 hie beoð gode ofergýtene. 7 hie ne becumað nǽfré on his gemýnde.
7 hyra méte bió tintrego. 7 hyra eardung bió mid deoflum. 7 þær ne bió næfre.

Av // nænig léoht geséwen. buon ðyostro.
297 seo stów þonne bió gegearwod. ðam yflum 7 þam ärleasum. 7 hit is
gengearwod. ðam mannum ðe hie wæron gefeonde on his ðæs nyhstan yfle.
7 he þonne æsendeð. his þa gecórenan. of ðara ärleasra. midle 7 sændeð hie
300 ðonne on his h[e]rn. þæt is ðonne to geregenesse. seo hæfonlice gebünes.
7 þær ðonne scinað ða sóðfesestan. on hyra fæderrice efnæ swa sunne.
7 hie dær ðonne næfre ne ðyrsteð. ne ne hingred. ne hie næfre ofer þæt ne
303 winnað.
ne dær ne bió næniges fléames fyrhto geméted. ne dær næfre nænig man mid
yfele forwyrðað. ne dær næfre nænig yfel ætyweð. // Ac dær drihten bió sittende on
306 ðam écean leohete.
7 þær bió singallice swiðe órmætut. brihtnes. 7 þær bió simle restedæg æfter
oprum. 7 þær bió simbel æfter simble.
309 7 þær beoð ða clænan sauła. gemængede wìd ængla þréatas. 7 heahængla. 7
hie ealle cumað to criste. on þam hæfonlican wuldre. 7 hie ðonne onginnæð singan
drihtne niwne sang swiðe unwiderweardlicum stefnum. 7 þær ðonne eardiað mid
gode.
ealle ða ðe him rihtlice hýrdon. Wuniað ðonne mid criste ðam ðe nu lyfað. 7
ricsað. mid god fæder. ðam sie wuldor. 7 lof. a in ealra worulda. woruld. abúten
315 ænde.

300 b[œ]rn 'bearn' MS; see Commentary. 309 b'e'ða. 315 a] written with long
ascender.
HOMILY 3. COMMENTARY

2 7 lichaman 7 saule  Usually in OE 'both ... and ...' is expressed by ('ægber) ge ... ge ...'. The second element can be 'and' instead of 'ge', but a formulation with 'and' (or 'ond') as the first element seems most odd. See Mitchell, OE Syntax, I, paras 1742-7. It seems unlikely that the influence, even if it were direct from a source, of Latin 'et ... et ...' would have suppressed the OE expression. There is a possibility that the first '7' is a mistaken reflex on the part of a copyist for 'on' (or 'an'). This could have occurred at any time, but would have been more likely to happen if the copyist were used to 'ond' being written 'on', as it is especially in the Tanner manuscript of the OE Historia Ecclesiastica. The form is discussed by Thomas Miller, ed., The Old English Version of Bede's Ecclesiastical History of the English People, 2 vols, EETS, 95-6 and 110-11 (1890-8), I, Part I, pp.xxvi-viii, where it is considered to be a probably 'Mercian provincialism' (p.xxviii) (cited Mitchell, OE Syntax, I, para.1232).

3 acænn[ë]dan  Fadda further emends the manuscript reading, 'acænnendan', to 'ancænnedan', but compare the following variants in other texts: in the two copies of the poem Soul and Body, where the word is used substantively of Christ, Vercelli has 'se acenneda' and Exeter has 'se ancenda', with 'an' a superscript addition (Douglas Moffat, ed., The Old English 'Soul and Body' (Wolfeboro, New Hampshire and Woodbridge, Suffolk, 1990), p.52 (line 51); in Godden, Ælfric's Catholic Homilies. Second Series. p.69, line 69, four manuscripts have 'an-' and four others 'acennedan'. In the latter case, the word is an adjective describing Christ 'sunu', in relation to 'se æelmihtiga fæder', and there need be no doubt that Ælfric intended the meaning 'only-begotten'. Taking both cases together, the variants raise alternative questions. Was 'acenneda' an accepted spelling of the word to mean 'only-begotten', or could the word thus spelt carry the sense 'incarnate'? In Homily 3, at line 63, in a passage (lines 54-64, concluded 84-7) focussing on the virgin birth, the participle 'acænnd' has the sense 'born', corresponding to Latin 'nascendo' at line 58. In the present instance the context does not require the meaning 'only-begotten', and indeed the epithet of God, 'the only-begotten and the almighty', seems odd. Whatever the sense intended here, the variants cited above must make one hesitate to propose
emendation. The original spelling 'acenda' in the Exeter Soul and Body provides one suggestion for how the error preserved or made in C (that is, seemingly present for past participle) came about. Fadda suggests that the 'n' of the prefix 'an-' has been transposed.

19 [::]nd[::]ton Willard, Two Apocrypha, p.35, fn. 19, reads 'andgiton', noting the poor legibility. It is difficult to decide whether the first letter is 'a' or 'o'. The prefix is spelt 'ond-' at lines 9 and 56, but the word is 'andgit' at line 161. The sense of 'andgit', 'capacity for' understanding, is apt. The ending '-on', where the 'o' is almost certain, is presumably for '-an': a weak form is attested BT and Supp.

20 [::]o[::]en Fadda reads and supplies 'dwærig[en]'; Willard, ibid., p.35, reads 'peowigen', without comment. I cannot see how Fadda reads initial 'o', unless in confusion with final 'd' of preceding 'ond'; 'dwærigen', 'agree', does not give good sense. Willard's 'peowigen', 'serve', gives good sense: the reading is supported by my reading '[::]o...', and descenders are visible where 'p' and 'w' would have been.

his feowertiga nihta An accusative neuter singular noun to follow 'pis', perhaps 'faesten', may be missing after 'nihta', which would then be genitive; for accusative of extent of time see Mitchell, OE Syntax, I, para.1383; thus 'during this forty night's fast'.

27 ne he selfa ne he oberne ne bidde The sense is 'may he not drink too much himself or ask another to do so'. Either the meaning is to be understood in an elliptical expression, as it stands, or perhaps there is an omission after 'selfa' of words which would have completed a first clause.

27-8 hiera begra saul ... weorpe For singular of 'words denoting (parts of) the body or the human mind or spirit', when more than one person is referred to, see Mitchell, OE Syntax, I, paras 87-8.

28 on fultum fyrenlustum The adverbial phrase with a preceding dative pronoun occurs several times in Janet Bately, ed., The Old English Orosius, EETS, SS.6 (London, 1980), e.g. p.58, lines 25-6, 'ba getugon Somnite him on fultum Pirrusan, Epira cyning, þone mæstan feond Romanum', and there is an example in Miller, Bede's Ecclesiastical History, I, p.50, lines 13-14, 'hi seaxna þeode ... him on fultum gecysdon 7 geladodon', and in the poetry there is one instance with a preceding noun in Robert J. Menner, ed., The Poetical Dialogues of Solomon and Saturn (New York and London, 1941), p.88, lines 134-5, '... se geapa [of obscure meaning], ðone God
sended freondum on fultum'. *Cp. also Homily 5, lines 190-1, 'martine on fultume beon'. The phrase 'on fultum fyrenlustum' is unusual in having the noun after the adverbial phrase, and, perhaps more remarkably, in that an abstraction, not a person or persons, is involved.

28-30 manige syrne ... þe him ... bið to boren 'bið' should be plural ('beoð'). For 'toberan' *BT gives only senses 'to carry off in different directions, to separate', while here the sense is 'are brought to him, produced in him' (see *BT, s.v. 'beran', sense II). Accented 'to' is probably not to be read as an affix here.

29-30 þurh þæt druncen A better reading may be with '7' before 'þurh'. A noun, masculine or neuter, 'druncen' is attested *BT.

55-6 we sculan ... man gewordan I cannot make good sense of this passage; 'ondfæncg' is a masculine noun, here with dative inflection, and cannot therefore be the object of 'geseon' as it stands.

66 hiera hæle 'hiera', if genitive plural, seems to have no antecedent, except Adam and Eve, but 'their (Adam's and Eve's) salvation was given back to this world' does not make good sense; alternatively 'hiera' is an echo of 'þissum manniscum kynne', line 61. Or 'hiera' could be genitive feminine singular, referring either to Eve or Mary. Whether singular or plural, the pronoun makes a difficult reading. The '-ie-' spelling suggests that the pronoun was in the exemplar, since '-ie-' spellings are only in Homily 3 in C.

68 7 þa gehædan '7' is superfluous, interrupting the 'þa ... þa ...' construction begun at 'þa drihten ...'

88-9 mid clæne lichaman. 7 mid hluttrew gef筳ce for 'mid clænum ... mid hluttrew ...', both nouns being masculine, except that *BT notes that 'geþænc' is sometimes neuter.

89 adilgað In its more usual sense of 'to do away with, blot out', the object of the verb would be 'sins' not 'us' as here, but *BTSupp, sense (2) cites a gloss where 'adilgian' has the same meaning as 'gefælsian', 'to purify, expiate' ('gefelsode ðode ðadilegode *expiauit*'), and this must be the verb's meaning here. The gloss is in the alphabetic glossary in BL, Cotton Cleopatra A. iii., *Ker, Catalogue*, no. 143, s.x med., printed in Thomas Wright, ed., *Anglo-Saxon and Old English Vocabularies*, 2 vols; 2nd edition, ed. Richard Paul Wölcker (London, 1884), I, p.395.
One of two alternative emendations is required here: either retain 'he' (= 'anra gehwilcum') and substitute 'hine' for the second 'us' (as Napier, 'Contributions to OE Lexicography', p.278, tentatively emends), or substitute 'we' for 'he', and inflect the following verbs 'ahebbe', 'forlæte' for the plural.

111 eft for 'oft'.

113-4 we syndan ealra anra leoman 'leoman' is presumably genitive plural (Campbell, OEG, p.125, fn.2, notes the identical form in Rushworth Gospels, the 'Mercian' part; Eduard Sievers, An Old English Grammar, 3rd edition, translated and edited by Albert S. Cook (Boston, 1903), p.201, note 4, notes a genitive plural in -an of weak nouns, for -(e)na', as a form of 'sporadic occurrence' in LWS). The whole phrase 'ealra anra leoman' I find syntactically intractable. The nearest analogue I have found is the genitive complement in 'manige men beod healdræ heortan', in Morris, Blickling Homilies, p.57, line 18 (cited Mitchell, OE Syntax, I, para.1584).

139 þæs mannes saul bido godes orôðes Another unusual predicative use of the genitive, in 'orôðes', but unlike the phrase in the genitive in the preceding note, here the sense is readily grasped, as a direct translation shows: 'the soul of man [or more literally 'the person's soul'] is of the breath of God'.

142-3 hwæt þanne we beod ... ac we willad ... etan The syntax of this sentence seems unusual. 'hwæt' should probably be read as the interjection, 'What!...', although the Modern English interrogative construction 'What (about) when ...?' may be brought to mind. If the latter were the case, the second part of the sentence, beginning 'ac ...', would also be a question. Whether or not the first clause is taken as a question, 'ac' could be construed as having both interrogative and negative force: 'What! when we are afflicted with thirst and hunger, do we not then want at once to drink and eat?' Mitchell, OE Syntax, I, para.1646, is 'reluctant to accept the notion that OE ac can serve as an interrogative particle except in literal glosses' where 'ahne' glosses Latin 'nonne' and 'numquid', and in one of the examples from Vespasian Psalter 'ah' alone glosses 'numquid' (for the examples, see Bruce Mitchell, 'Old English ac as an Interrogative Particle', Neuphilologische Mitteilungen, 78 (1977), 98-100 (p.98), where Mitchell comments that 'the usage is apparently Anglian'. To Mitchell's examples may be added Assmann XIII, p.162, line 244, 'ac ic hit drihten com', translating the Latin, which is cited, 'numquid ego
sum domine?). It is unsound to press the possibility of an interrogative 'ac' in OE usage on grounds of the present instance, not only because in a homily there is always the possibility that we may have to do with a direct translation of Latin, but also because the whole sentence can be translated positively: 'What! when we are afflicted by thirst and by hunger, we want then (nothing) but at once to drink and eat.' However, this translation is somewhat forced, and '(nothing) but' would perhaps be expressed more readily in OE by the phrase 'noht elles buton' (for an example see BT Supp., s.v. 'nawiht', sense I(b)).

144-5 ... swa deah ... swa ... A very unusual syntactic construction of apparently correlative clauses, which defies literal translation.

148 [bile]hwitnesse '-hwitnesse' is clearly legible at the beginning of a line on the recto of the leaf; other letters at the end of the preceding line are lost due to what seems to be water damage, except that the first letter, which is retouched, looks like a 'b'. For the damaged letters Fadda reads 'lilie-', without comment, but this would make a nonce-word (it has not been included in MCO£). Supplied 'bile-' gives a well attested word, apt in meaning ('simplicity, innocence'). BT distinguishes two adjectives, 'bilehwit' and bilewit', though the meanings given are about the same. BT Supp., s.v. 'bilewitness', gives a citation with the spelling '-hwit-', from the copy of the OE Bede in CUL Kk. 3. 18. (Ker, Catalogue, no.23, s.xi(2), 'written at Worcester'), where 'bilewinyaesse' (BT Supp. '-nesse') is a variant spelling for 'bilwit-, bylwyt-, bylywyt-' (Miller, Bede's Ecclesiastical History, I, p.62, line 1, variants, ibid., II, p.34). Other occurrences of the spelling with '-h-' are in John C. Pope, ed., Homilies of Ælfric. A Supplementary Collection, 2 vols, EETS, 259 and 260 (London, 1967 and 1968), II, pp.556-7, in Homily XVI at lines 226, 229 and 249. In the latter instance, Pope notes in his glossary that 'bylewit' has been corrected from 'bylehwite'. At ibid., line257, there is the spelling 'bylewitnyse'. All these examples are in Cambridge, Trinity college, B. 15. 34. (Ker, Catalogue, no.86, s.xi med.; Ker, ibid., p.132, comments that the connexions of script and illumination seem to be with Canterbury).

150 mid arnesse godcundra beboda Fadda emends 'arnesse' to 'arfæstnesse'. Since 'ar' on its own is a noun it does not attract the nominal suffix '-nes', and some emendation is required. Although the word 'arfæstnesse' has already been used in this list of virtues at line 147, it is the most likely emendation, giving the translation 'with respect for [literally 'of'] divine commands'.
The fact that 'ar-' is at the end of fol.32r suggests that the C copyist may have lost his place in turning the leaf, and that the error occurred in C.

161  hisses ewides hearwisnesse  This phrase, 'the severity/strictness of this saying', can hardly refer to the scriptural citation (= Matt., 13:43) at lines 156-7. The homilist seems to have adapted 'qui habet ... audiat' in his OE rendering to refer forward to the 'Three Utterances' passage which follows.

189  gastlige sang  Wack and Wright, 'A New Source for the "Three Utterances" Exemplum', p.190, print 'gastligne' for Fadda 'gastlingne', the manuscript reading, and give the Latin 'canticum spiritalem'. Willard, Two Apocrypha, p.55, notes '=' gastlicne', and cites a note by Napier, who, though the word has been retouched, was 'pretty sure' that 'gastlingne' is the manuscript reading. Napier thought 'a' of 'gastlingne' might be 'æ', but I do not think so. It seems likely that an unusual spelling 'gastligne' gave rise to the error in C. Campbell, OEG, para.452, gives one example of '-lig for '-lie' ('hulig', 'of what sort') among examples of '-ig' and '-ih' for '-ic' in Lindisfarne gospels.

193-5  edig eart du sawl ... wundorlicre ðrymnesse  The Latin source text, Wack and Wright, 'A New Source for the "Three Utterances" Exemplum', p.190, cites Psalm 64: 5 here: 'Beatus quem eligisti domine et adsumpsisti, inhabitauit in tabemaculis tuis. Replebimur in bonis domus tuae; sanctum est templum tuum, mirabile in aequitate'. Homily 3 quotes from this verse at line 191. As Wack and Wright comment, ibid., p.195, it is 'likely that the [OE] homilist has taken the liberty to remodel the verse to accord better with the context', by having the angels address praise to the soul, rather than sing the psalm verse in praise of God. The homilist was perhaps encouraged in this revision by the following passage, lines 197-8, which in the Latin begins 'et beatus es ...', and is addressed, it is to be inferred, to the soul.

Wack and Wright, with Fadda, take 'gode' at line 193 to refer to the deity, rather than to be an adjective qualifying 'eardunge', so that 'du name ... huse' translates 'you kept for God a dwelling in your house'. Willard, Two Apocrypha, p.55, prints 'huse' for 'hus' at line 194.

At line 195, Fadda emends 'halig' to 'haligre' and takes 'ðin templ' to be a second object of 'gefyllað', line 193 ('we fill ... your temple with his saints ...'), an emendation whose only advantage is to retain 'his', but, with Wack and Wright, 'A New Source for the "Three
Utterances’ exemplum’, p.195, fn.30, following Willard, *Two Apocrypha*, p.55, it seems better to read ‘his’ as an error for ‘is’. Wack and Wright suggest an emendation to ‘wundorlic in ḍrymnesse’, to correspond with the Latin ‘mirabile in aequitate’, thereby meeting Fadda’s objection to the dative, but in view of the genitive complements of the verb ‘to be’ at lines 113-4 and 139 noted above, it may be that ‘wundorlicre ḍrymnesse’ is another such case: ‘your temple is holy and of wondrous majesty’.

206 δερ brucan  *Cp.* homily 1, line 326, and Commentary.

218 orwene  A noun ‘orwene’, ‘despair’, is not attested *BT* or *MCOE*, the noun ‘orwennes’ being formed from the adjective; without the prefix, of course, the noun ‘wen’ and the weak form ‘wenena’ are common. Either ‘orwene’ is a unique occurrence of a substantive form, or omission has occurred, e.g. of ‘hie beo6’ before ‘orwene’. The second possibility is likely in view of the fact that the two dative pronouns ‘him’ in the same line have no immediate antecedent, and would have to refer back to ‘da synfullan saula’ at line 215.

221 fyrenmere swilce 06ru sē  ‘A fiery lake like a second sea/another sea’ has sense, if ‘sē’ is taken to be equivalent to Modern English ‘the sea’, that is the totality of salt water (*BT*, sense III and *cp.* line 268 below), but it is possible that the reading is not original. Fadda notes an echo of *Apoc.* 21:8 (see also *Apoc.* 20:13-15), where sinners will be immersed ‘in stagno ardenti igne et sulphure: quod est mors secunda’. The latter clause suggests a possible original reading ‘swilce odeer dea’, supposing, say, that the homilist had recalled the scriptural allusion. However, a reading ‘swilce odeer dea’ would contradict the sense of the preceding sentence, lines 220-1, where ‘da arleasan’ wish for death but are not given it.

226 þ[ær] beoð þa earman tintrogo. 7 hie δερ þa wuniegað ...  The passage would read more easily if instead of ‘þa earman tintrogo’, ‘the wretched torments’, ‘earman’ were a noun, providing an antecedent for pronoun ‘hie’ which otherwise has to refer back several lines either to ‘da arleasan’ at line 220, or, perhaps better because more generally, to ‘da synfullan saula’ at line 215. Perhaps an abbreviation mark is missing from ‘þa’, and the original reading was ‘þam earman tintrogo’, ‘torments for the wretched’.
227 his donne [is] synfulra stow on to eardienne The syntax seems idiomatic, literally 'this then [is] the sinfuls' place to live in'. 'on to eardienne' is the inflected form of, presumably, the infinitive 'oneardian'.

230 logeras The word is presumably that with attested spellings (BT and Supp.) 'leogere', 'legere', meaning 'liar'. It may be that the spelling with a back monophthong is an error. Fadda's emendation 'loge[pe]ras' is presumably based on the adjective 'logeær', 'plotting mischief', attested in BT s.v. 'logōör' only in glosses.

237-8 þa halgan. 7 þa soðfæstan mid. criste. mid byra godum wyrcum A verb, e.g. 'wuniað' or 'eardiað', of which 'þa halgan. 7 þa soðfæstan' would be the subject seems to be missing. Cp. lines 244-5, 'hie nu eardiað mid criste. for hyra godum weorcum', where 'for' instead of the second 'mid' in the present passage seems preferable. The proximity of the two nearly identical phrases 'mid criste ... wyrc-/weorcum' raises the possibility that the faulty reading at lines 237-8 originated in error due to eye skip on the part of a copyist.

245 willa ðæs leohes Either 'pleasure in, desire for' or perhaps better 'source of the light'.

266 ofer heofonas wolcnum 'heofonas' for '⁻es'; the Latin source (Cross, 'A Doomsday Passage', p.104) and scripture (Matt. 24: 30) have 'in nubibus coeli'.

281 gode Cross, ibid., p.106, fn. 14, is surely right that (accented) 'gode' refers to 'the good', contrasting with 'þa synfullan', line 282, and not to the deity as Fadda reads.

293 fram eallum ðam timbre 'timbre', 'building', seems an unexpected image of heaven, but it may belong to a compositional theme. In the first description of hell, lines 208-236, there seems to be an attempt to make a figure of hell as dwelling-place: at lines 215 and 227 hell is 'eardungstow' and 'gebunes', and at line 233 sinners are those who have entertained the devil 'on hiora eardungstowe'. This figurative theme occurs again at line 286, 'wa la þonne ðam synfullum ðe hyra gebunes. bid mid deoflum'. This sentence is drawn from the Latin source (whose beginning is marked by the Latin citation at lines 258-9) identified by Cross: 'Vae illis hominibus qui habebunt mansionem cum diabolo' (ibid., p.106). The sentence with 'timbre' falls within the passage which draws on the identified source, but is itself not represented in the Latin. The sentence can be read as anticipating the sentence at lines 299-300, where God 'asændæ. his þa gecorenan. of ðara arleasra. midle 7 sændæ hie ðonne on his b[e]rn ... seo heofonlice
gebunes', and which renders the identified Latin source, 'separabit Dominus sanctos suos de medio peccatorum et mittit eos in mansiones coelestes' (*ibid.*, p.107).

298 on his δας nyhstan yfle A plural possessive pronoun for singular 'his' might be expected, to refer back to the subject of the clause. On constructions involving a possessive pronoun plus a demonstrative, see Mitchell, *OE Syntax*, I, paras 103-12. Mitchell distinguishes three patterns for these constructions, and, if an emendation of 'his' to 'hiera' is accepted, gives the closest pattern to the present instance as 'possessive + demonstrative + noun', (para.106: a sub-type of his pattern (a)), an example of which is at line 299, 'his ḣa gecorenan'. In the present instance, the construction is complicated slightly by the noun, 'nyhstan', being genitive with another noun dependent, but one of Mitchell's examples has a genitive noun, though the dependent noun precedes the construction: 'past we ḣa mod abelge ussa paragus neahstena' (Miller, *Bede's Ecclesiastical History*, I, p.212, lines 30-1).

300 on his b[e]rn I emend the manuscript reading 'bearn' because the word is explained in the immediately following clause as 'seo heofonlice gebunes', and if 'bearn', 'children', were in apposition to preceding 'hie' ('pa gecorenan'), 'on' could not be construed. Fadda translates 'da suo figlio', '(home) to his son'. See note to line 293 above, and Cross, 'A Doomsday Passage', p.108 and fn.19.

304 ne bið næniges fleames fyrhto gemeted Literally 'fear of any flight is not experienced'; 'fleames fyrhto' may be paraphrased either as 'the (anticipatory) fear of having to flee' or as 'the fear one experiences when fleeing'. Absence of such fear is an unusual attribute of heaven. Fadda reads 'fleam' to mean 'fire', but 'fleam', 'flight', is a very well attested word in OE, and this would be a very early coinage of Modern English 'flame' (*Oxford English Dictionary* gives no instance before the fourteenth century).
HOMILY 4

GEHÉRAD NU mæn ðá léofestan. hwæt her sægb on ðissum bòcum. be manna teðungcéeapa.

sægb héron.

cwæð se godes láreow. þæt nu nealæcéþ ða dagas þæt we sculan ðre æhta. 7

ure wæstmas. gesamnian.(

dón we dønne géornlice ðam drihtnæ þancas ðe ús ða wæstmas (ge)scaldæ. 7

sien we gemynndige. þæt us crist selfa bebead on ðysum godspelle þæt we simble.

ymb. xii. monóð. drihtnæ agifan døne teðan dæl dæs ðe we on céapa habbað.

þæt ure drihten þæt getimode. þæt he us (ge)scaldæ cælle ða wæstmas. ðe
eorde ús forð (ge)bringað. deah ðe hie mannum mistlice dælde.

7 he // hwaþdære. bebead on bòcum. þæt we simle ymb. xii. monóð. gedældæ

for his naman eal þæt we on céapa hæfðdon.

7 ne bæd (he) na ðises forðon þæt him þæs ænig dærf ware. Ac forðon (ðe) he

wolde sægdæ ge ofer heofona ge ofer eordæ. ús his mîltsa gecýpan.

Ac ús is nydæarf þæt we gebúgen to him. 7 þæt we mótan brúcan his wuldres

fægernesse. swa drihten wæs selfa sprecende þurh þone witegan. 7 he cwæð.

"bringað ge to mé on mín béræn. eowerne teðan scéat."

hwylc beren mænæð he dønne elcora butan heofona rice.

7 he swá cwæð.

"gedoð ge þæt cew sic mete gearo on mínnum húse."

he dønne mænæð þæt we gefyllen þæs dærfan wanbe. // mid urum gódum. 7

dønne ne hingreð ús næfre on ecnesse. Ac he us ontynt heofonas ðeotan. 7 he us

seled his wæstma genihsumnesse.
7 on þiþ[um] ðingum callum. þu dysega man hwæt yfel a bead drihten ðefre.

hit is þonne gewritten on ðysum bocum þæt drihten sefla cwæde. þæt þis

mænnisce cyn(þ) ne scólde alatigean þæt hi scoldean hyra wæstma fruman agýfan.

7 gif ge þæs alatige[að] þonne wyrcæð ge eow synne on don 7 is eow gyþa

wyrsæ þæt ge eower ðing tyðigeaþan. gif ge willað syllan eower þæt wyrsæste gode.

7 hit cwæð on bocum be þysum cynne.

'weord[e] // ge eowerne drihten god mid gedæfnlicum ðingum. 7 onsecgap ge
him mid eowerne sodæstenesse wæstum. 7 þonne(þ) gefylde drihten eower bern

mid geniehtsumum wæstum.'

7 ne burfon ge wénan þæt ge þæt orceape sellan þæt ge under drihtnes born

mid getriewað(þ) ðeah ge hi (s)tapes þære mede ne onfón.

7 hit is þonne wén þæt fyła manna þence hwilcum edleane him eft gespówæ //

æt drihtne. òððe hu god him eft þæt forgýldan wille. þæt he ær for his naman

(ge)sealde þam éarman dearfan.

gif ge þonne gelyfað broðor mine þa leofestan(þ) þæt eow þæt to gðode gelimpe.

þæt ge her on mínum naman gesyllad. þonne biþ hit eow nyt gesæld. 7 hit arisad

eowre sawle to hundteontig(um) fealdum gódum.

gif ge þonne tweeogað be don ælmesse(þ) þe ge for godes naman (ge)sellaþ.

7 ge eow ondraedæð // þæt ge eow onfón to litlum léanum. þonne forléosað ge ða

ælmesan þe ge for gode gesellað. 7 hie eow to nænigre ære gelimpað.

swa hit on ðysum godspelle sægð þæt ðre teodân scéatas sien earmra manna
gafol. 7 wædþëndra;

24, 25, 28, 31 Letters in square brackets are supplied, being obscured in the
binding. I let the readings agree with those printed, without comment, by Willard,
'Tithing Homily', p.73. Willard worked from photostats (ibid., p.72, fn.38) and
probably did not see the obscured letters. 26 hit[þ] 'h' in left margin, but line below
begun in line with minim. 27 agýfan] initial 'a' written with ascender. 28 7 is]
'7' in left margin, but line below begun in line with descender. 35 hi tapes]
probable erasure of one or two letters between 'hi' and 'tapes', with 's' added, in ink
which appears to be that of the corrector, close to and with head stroke overhanging
't'. 
Agyfað ge teódan daél ealas þæs ceapes ðe ge hæbban. earmum mannum. 7 to
godes cyricum. 7 þam earmestum godes ðeowum. þe þa cyican mid godcundum
dréamum. // wyrtiðað(,) forðon syo cyrice sceal fedan ða ðe hire æt eardiað(,)
geseoð nu hu blide þa éarman beoð(,) þonne hie mon mid mete(,) 7 mid
hrægel reteð.
micle bliþre bið þonne syo sauwul þæs mannes þonne hire man þa ælmessan
foresælep(,) forðon þe hyo bi ðære ælmessan. 7 bi ðon fæstene lyfian scyl(,)
abutan ænde(,)
se butan ælmessan 7 fæstene lyfàð se bið on helle (ge)wylymed. // 7 he náfre
reste nafað(,)
Swa ðonne se micla larew. sanctus paulus cweðð(,) þæt god þa hête aswaþæm
æt héofona rices dura(,) ða ðe hyra cyricean forléten. 7 forhícgen þa godes dreamas
to gehéranne.

7 ne ðearf ðæs nænig man nan twœgiean þæt seó forlætenu cyrice sorgige
ymbe þa ðe æt hire on wædle lyfiðað(,)
7 forþon (ge)broðor(e) mine sellaþ ge eowre teódan sceattas // 7 ðær gode
daélan ðám ðe hyre háðas mid claénnosa (ge)healdað. 7 godes lôf mid rihte bégnæ
willað(,)
swa se láreow bebéad
þæt man godes æt. mid rihte reahte æt godes cyricean(,) 7 fæste trymedan(,
ge laéwedæ ge geháðode.
þa mæsepriostas. ðe godes cyricena láreowas beoð. þæt hyra scriftbéc mid
rihte táhton(,). 7 lærðon(,) swa swa hic ùre fæderas zér tahton(,) //
þæt se mæsep淫st ne wândige. ne for rices mannes ege. ne for æniges mannes
lufe. ne for feco(,.) þæt he simle him rihte déme gif he wille self godes dómas.
gedéghan(,)
57 Swa] 'S' in left margin. 61 y'm’be] superscript above cancelled 'n'. 68
s’c’riftbéc.
ne scyl he beon to géorn(;) déadra manna féos(;) ne to lýt þáncian hyra
ælmesena(;) forðon þe hie wénað þæt hie hyra synna alýsen(;)
swa her receð on(;) þæt ðam byscopum ðe her on worulde syndon gegångene.
gelice ðam biscopæ(;) ðe paulus on ðære fyrenan helle geseah(;) gif hie nyllað
håaldan godes æ. swa him hålilo // gewrito bebecoðañ(;) 47v
se byscop sceal se ðe wile onfôn godes mildheorthnesse. 7 his synna
forgåñæssa. þonne scyl he dråfan ða mæsæpryûtas. mid lufan. ge mid nûde. þæt
hie healdan godes æ. on riht. 7 ðone hyred. 7 ða læwede man þe hie caledær ofer
syndon. þæt hie ðam ne gedåfan(;) þæt hie here lif ðô on unriht liȝfêng. 7 þæt hie on
heom selftum onstællan(;) þam folce(;) gôde bisene.
48r
forðon se godes làreow // sæde þanne se mæsæpryût(;) 7 se byscop wære
gelaedæd on ðe forwyrd. þæt hie þonne ne méahton na hwaðer.(_) ne heom selftum
ne ðære hýrde ðe hie aþr gode healdan scéoldon. nænige gôde bêon.
hwane manað gôd màran gafoles þanne þane biscope. forðan se biscope bið
godes gingra. 7 he bið euenhålîg his apostolum 7 he euenhîete witegum(;) gif he
ne gedåfan þæt þæt godes folc hyra lif on wóð lîyfian.(_) 49v
swa hér receð // on ðysum trahtode(;) þæt crist selfa bebude móysce(;) þæt he
odrum larewum bebudu(;) gif hie þæt cristene folc. mid lufan ne meahtan
gecyrêan(;) þæt hie godes æ. mid rihte healden(;) þæt hit þonne manige yfele man
mid hyre fyre gebôthon. þonne gecyrde þæt oðer folc þe hraðor(;) on godes ðone
sodan ðeowdom.
Swa sanctus paulus cwæð(;) þæt se byscop 7 se cingc sceolden beon cristênra
fole hýrðas(;) 7 hie fram callum unrihtuum abâdedon.(_) 50r
gif man hie mid lufan. // ne méahte to rihte gecyrêan(;) þæt swa hyra wôn
daedum geswican woldan(;) þonne scyl gehwile byscop. 7 mæsæpryst gif hie mid
rihte willað gode ðêowigan 7 dênian(;) gelomlice opþe huru ymbe. vii. niht
mæsan gesingan. for cal cristen folc(;) ðe aþrê fram frýmðe middangeardes
acænnede wæran
7 godes willa sy(;) þæt hie forðependinga motan.
106 gode accent added by corrector. 117 ðe'o'wdom.
ponne onfchē he fram gode máran méde(;) ponne hie fram ánigum oðrum

lácum dón. forðon // gode is his folc swyðe lóco(;) gíf him yrlice máen mid
ánigum dálice ðingian willað. 7 mid ánigum árum gehýran willað.

7 sé onfchē ealra háligra gebedrædenn(;) þe ðísfr eðllice máen waþron. 7
forðy hie ðingiað. se ðe ðís ymbsáne gefylgeð.

7 hie beoð on ealra eðlícra gebedrædenn(;) de cristene ðísfr waþron oðde gét
beoð.

7 hie nǽfe on hyra synnum ne sweldað. 7 him bið gode mildhëortnesse ofer.

7 þat is godeð ágen beðod. // 7 eallum hálgum þat is alýfæd(;) þat yrlice
máen blissan eall crisenn folc(;) 7 him gelóme godcunde lác foré gebringan. forðon
hie syndon godeð béarn gecwedene. 7 hie syndon ealra háligrá mágss.

7 þís wyrc bið deoflum se máêsta técona(;) forðon de hie habbað manige sáule(;

on hyra gewéaldum. þe him wile god gemíllsian for hyra mága wyrðingum. 7
eordícrá manna gebedum. 7 ealra háligra. 7 for his miclan mildhëortnesse. //

ac ne ablinnen we manna bærn þat we gode (ge)cweman(;) 7 dèolle tynan
dæges. 7 nihtes(;) [7] mid cristes róðetácne(;) ús gebletsián.

þanne aflihð þat deofl fram manna bærnum. forðon him bið mára bróga fram
cristes róðetáncne. þonne ánigum máen sic(;) deah de hine man slea mid swyrde
wið þæs heafdes.

7 eallum cristenum mannum is beboden(;) þat hie hyra lichaman ealne syfen
siðum gebletsígen mid cristes róðetácne. árest on mórgene. oðre síde // on
underne. ðriddan síde on miñnedæg. fyrðan síde on non. síftan sípe on æuen.
syxtan síde on niht. seofðan síde on uhtan.

7 gif láreowas ðís yllað bebeódan(;) gode folce faéstlice(;) þonne beoð hie
wið gode scyldegyg.

þat þat gode folc wite hu hie hie sylfe scyldan sculan wið deofla.

140 ac] 'a' written with an ascender. 141 [7] supplied from B. 146
gebletsige'ñ'. ðere's't'. 148 seof'o'dan. 151 gode's'. 
7 ge beoð syðdan domes géorne(;) gif ge nyllað læran(;) þæt hie hyra synna
geswican. 7 godes bebodu héaldan.

Se bisceop scyl bébódan(;) mid ði mæstan bebode(;) ðam mæsseprystum // gif
se bysceop hine wile wið godes yrre gehealden. þæt hie béordan þam godes folce(;)

þæt hie sunnandagum(;) 7 mæssedagum(;) godes cyrican géorne (ge)secen. 7 ðær
ða coclundan láre géorne gehéran.
ne sculan ða lárewasagemeléasian þa láre. ne ðæt folc forhyçgan. hie to

gehyrranne. gif hie willað godes forgienesse habban hyra synna(;) forðon ðær man

þæt godspel segð(;) maniges mannes // hýrte bið abríyred. 7 god bið on hyra
midle(;) callum ðam mannum þe mid éadmodor hyortan to gelýfað(;)
\(\text{danne sculan þa bysceopas. 7 þa mæssepréostas gehwilces hádes mannan swide}
\(\text{ðréatigen. 7 bébódan þæt hie godes bebodu on riht gehéalden. þa godes ðeowas}
\(\text{hyra tídsángas. 7 hyra cyrican mid rihte gehéalden . 7 ða læwedan. swa heom mid}
\(\text{rihte to belimpeð.}

gif him mon ðonne hýran nelle(;) danne móttse mæsse//préost hit (ge)wrecan.
swa hit hér beboden is(;) þæt se godes ðeow ðe nylle ðære cyrican on riht
\(\text{ðeowian(;) þæt he ðonne mid læwedum mannum onfôn ðæs heardestan}
\(\text{ðeowdómes.}
\(\text{7 þis scyl se mæssepréost nýde béodan(;) oððe þæs godes ðeowes synna onfôn.}
\(\text{7 he bið ðanne syðdan ðam ánglum gelice ðe ðu gode wiðsócan. 7 ða wúrdan on}
\(\text{helle beséntce}

\(\text{ðonne cwæð se lárew. þæt be ði ilcan munoce þæt se bisceop // scéolde gelice}
\(\text{gefremman. ðæt hie ðore mine munecas be ðon læran méahton}
\(\text{7 se bisceop 7 se mæssepriost bið þonne wip god gehealden.}

Moyses onsfeng scinendum wuldorhelme. forðon ðe he símle ða genearwode ðe

god oferhogodan. forðon se oferhygeð god. se ðe godes sacerda bebodum
oførhyged. 7 se bið on hæðenra alnicnesse. 7 manig deofol éardæð mid him.

154 mæsta‘n’. 167 ðe‘ow. 173 Run of ornamental brackets, begun fol.36r,
ends fol.52v. 176 Moyses] most of ‘M’ in left margin. 177 forðon se] followed
by two cancelled letters, first perhaps ‘o’, second ‘y’.

162
Cwæð sanctus paulus //

Et quodcumque ligaueris super terram erit ligatum et in celis et quodcumque solueris super terram erit solutum et in celis.

Et quodcumque ligaueris super terram erit ligatum et in celis et quodcumque solueris super terram erit solutum et in celis.
butan synne bið þæt man ða niogan dælas on ðan men genime. þanne he ðæs.

x. // gode forwyrmad.'

207 7 swa hit is awritten on cristes bòcum. þæt drihten selfa swa cwæðe. þæt ða x.
scætats waðran on urum ágnum dómum(.) ge on lánðe(.) ge on oðrum gestréonum.
forðon þæt simle gegángeð(.) ðam þe his gode wyrmad(.) þæt him æt ðam

210 ytemestan dagæ(.) eal to téonan gewyrðað.

gif ge donné mid blipe. 7 mid run mode hie dælan willað. éarmum mannum.

banne ontíneð eow drihten hénofnas déotan. 7 he eow géoteð ufan // on his
bletsunge. 7 eower hwætë. 7 eowere wingeardes. 7 ealle eowre yrðanwæstmas(;
beoð gebletsode(;) gif ge beoð on riht dónde. 7 he eow éac gescylded(;) wið eallum
féoundum.

216 Hwæt æghwile man wile þæt him drihten selle his déarfe. 7 him ne lyste his
willan wyrcean. þæt he on his naman dæle(;) þæt he him ær séalde.

forhwan ne magon we gedæñcean. þæt godes is seo eorðe. 7 godes is þæt
yrfe(;) ðe we biglyfiað. 7 we syndan his. 7 an his an//wéalde is eal middangéard.
7 ða windas. 7 þa rénas. sindan his ðe ealla wæstmas gewecceð 7 ðara sunnan
hæto; ðe ða ésrdan hlywiað. 7 ealla gescæfta syndon his. 7 he hi ealla gewrohte.

222 7 on his anwéalde hafað.

7 he ðre drihten hwæðre is gemýndig ealra ðara gifenæð(;) þe he ðú tolaætæð. 7
we æt ðam ytemestan dagæ. eallum agéldan scylan ðæs þe he ðus [ær on eorþan
seálde 7 he ús] donné agyldeð swa wé nu hér doð. ge godes ge yfeles.

57r Mgn ða leofes//tan. forhwan ne magon we gedæñcean. gif we áne hwile beoð
on hwilcum éarfoduð(;) ðær we ðúes fyres ne wénað. þæt we þonng his áre biddan.

228 7 ús bip þanng léofre þanng eal eorðwela. gif he us gearian 7 gemiltsian wile.

forhwan ne magon we gedæñcean hwilc þæt wite bið(;) ðe náfre nænig ænde
ne bið.

205 ni'o'gan. 210 teona'n'. 224-5 ðær on ...he us] supplied from B. 228 'ge'arian.
'7 ic de þonne nu monige(;) godcundre stefne(;) cwæð se godes láreow(;) þæt ge eow álýsen of éowrum synnum(;) æt ðonne ge deade sweltan.'

fordon þe hit // nu swiðe nealæceð úrum ændedæge. 7 ús swiðe uncüþ is hwæt
us úre yrfeweardes. 7 lastweardas(;) getréowlice dón willen(;) æfter úrum lífe(;) gíf we hit selfe ær agémeleasiað. forðan hit swiðe féa ane sindan(;) de ðan déaden getréowe wyrðen. 7 hit ðanne geszélað oft þæt his æhta wyrðað(;) on ðæs
anwéalde(;) ðe he ær on his lífe wyrståest geúðe(;) hwilum ðurh wifes geweald.

hwilum ðurh weres.

7 man ðanne síðdan // nahtes wyrðe his saule ne déð. ne his gólðes. ne his
sylfres. ne his yròwelena. gíf he nyle ær þan sælestan dáél(;) gode for hine
gedælan(;) ða hwíle. ðe he hér on lífe sie.

ðanne ðæs mannnes saul út of his líchaman gángæð(;) ðe him wæs ær his æht
léofre(;) ðanne godes lufu to habbanne. ðanne ne gefultumáð ðære saule. ne ðære
gemma frætwednesse. ne ðara goldgearwo wíænco. þe he his líchaman
osferflownesse. // mid frætwað(;)
258 7 manna frýndscipe bið swíde hwílendlic. fórðan úre yldran swúlton. 7 swíde
oft ús fram gewended. // ac se ðe godes fréondscipe begiteð ne ðearf he nǽfre wénan
þæt he him ðéfre onwénded wyrðe ac he ða éce standéð.

261 Soð is þæt ic eow sécge. swa hwílce man swa nyle drihten lußian 7 his æhta for
his naman délan ðane teódan dæl. þonne gëniméð drihten hie mid témonan.

7 swa fëla éarmra manna. swa in ðæs rícan. 7 on ðæs welgan nǽawiste hungre

60r 264 (ge)sweleð. 7 he him nylce scellan his teódan sceat. he bið dánne // ealra ðara
manna deáðes scyldig 7 myrðra.(.) bëforan ðæs ecean déman háhsetle. fórðan ðe
he heold zêr his æhta him to wiæncum. 7 forwyrnde ðam driht[þ]nes dǽrfum.

267 se man se ðe wile þane hëofonlican geféan begytan. Agife he simle mid rihte
ðane teódan sceat gode. 7 dáile ðeah his ælmen sean forð of ðam nigon dǽðum. 7
selle éarmum mannum. his bëodláfå. 7 his éalda hrægel.

60v 270 nes hit naht ne // forhealde on unrihtne lust. dánne bið hit him eft tógænes
gehéalden on ðan hëofonlican goldhórde.

7 swa hwæt swa ús god selle mág(;) þonne we nýde brúcan scylan.(.) dælen we

273 þæt simle ðám ðe læsse hæbben.

dánne fórðan ne sæld he hit ús þæt we hit hýden(;.) oðde to gylpe syllen.

sømhwilcum mannum. ðe naht swíde god ne lúfígen. Ac þæt we hit to godes

276 cyricean dám éarmestum mannum dælen.

6l 279 þæt is þonne gód ge hér on // wyroldc. ge on ðære towéardan.

fórðan we welgan wísacægé dám éorólícæ. 7 þam léasan. 7 þam

oferflowendan welan.

hwæt syndan dæ léasan. 7 ða oferflowendan welan. butan þæt man máest to
gélp on unrihtne gitsiað. þæt hie máest ágen 7 þam éarmestan forwyrnan.

282 Ac wísacæg de dám léasum welum simle. 7 dám úngeléfedum gestréonum.

swa dæ halgan dydan ðe on ðysum lífe naht ne sohton(;.) ne ne gýrnndon to

259 'ge'wendo'n'. 261 Soð) 'S' mostly in left margin. lufia'n'. 263 'on'. 266
forwr'nde. driht[þ]nes superscript 't', marked with an inverted 'v', is probably
modern. 272 sw'a' us.
hæbben(,)

bútan þæt hie on // heofona héanessum gebró[h]ton. eal þæt hie on
eorðan begæston. þurh godes sultum.

Nis co[w] ðanne forboden þæt ge æhta hæbben 7 ðara mid rihte (ge)strynen. ac
on bocum is beboden þæt ge ða gedón éarmum mann[um] nytte. 7 mid eowrum

æhtum gedæarnían(;) þæt ge ðane éccean g[e]fæan begýten mægen(,;) ðe drihten on
[is mid] his halgum. 7 eallum ða[m] ðe his bebódu gehéaldan willañ. 7 gelaéstan.

dam d[rihtæ] sie lóf 7 wuldor. á on caíra

On fol. 61v letters in square brackets are supplied, loss being due to wear at binding edge; except following. 289 [is mid] scribal omission, mid-line, supplied from B. 300 d[rihtæ] top of ascender of 'h' is visible, with cross stroke as mark of abbreviation. on] retoucher wrote 'i' on the 'o'.

HOMILY 4. COMMENTARY

References to B readings are by page and line number to Morris, Blickling Homilies, but readings are quoted from Willard, Blickling Homilies, fols 22r-31v; references to the Latin source for the tithing portion of the homily are by page and line number to Morin, Sancti Caesarii Arelatensis Sermones, I.

9 *æt ure drihten *æt getimode  The reading in B is 'hwæt ure drihten hine gemedemode' (39/16-17), rendering the Latin 'deus enim noster dignatus est' (Morin, 143/9). The Latin source is similarly glossed in E.W. Rhodes, ed., Defensor's 'Liber Scintillarum', EETS, 93 (London, 1889), p.108, line 19, 'god soðlice ure se þe gemedemad', except that the verb is reflexive in B. The only way 'getimode' could be read with its usual sense 'happen', is if it were read transitively, 'bring to pass', but BT gives no such usage. There seems to be both corruption in copying and failure of sense here.

29 eower þæt wyrseste  For this construction, see Mitchell, OE Syntax, I, para.106; cp. Homily 3, Commentary, line 298.

11-12 bebead ... þæt we ... gedældon ... hæfdon  Mitchell, OE Syntax, I, paras 859-64, takes the view that a grammatical rule governing sequence of tenses (i.e. agreement, whatever the sense, of past or present tense in main and subordinate clauses) is not in evidence in OE, but here the choice of past tense for the verb in the clause dependent on the verb 'bebead' does not seem logical, though past tense 'hæfdon' is logical once the tense has been established in 'gedældon'. B has present tense 'gedælan' here (39/19; 'hæfdon' is not represented), but compare C, lines 7-8, 'sien we ... agifan', with the corresponding passage in B, 'syn we gemyndige þæs þe us crist sylfa bebead on þyssum godspelle he cwæþ þæt we symle emb twelf monæp ageafon' (39/13-16), where past tense 'ageafon' after 'bebead' may have survived despite introduction of 'he cwæþ þæt'. Note a comparable case at lines 65-9: 'bebead ... reahet ... trymedan ... tahton ... lærdon', where B has 'bebead ... heolde ... tremede' but 'scolan ... tecan 7 læran' (43/5-8); C has present tense 'wandige' at line 70, still dependent on 'bebead' (in B a new clause is begun, 'ne wandige ...'). At lines 113-4 'bebude ... bebude' (B 'bebude ... sægde', 45/20-1) the choice of past tense is logical.
But cp. 'cwæde ... wæran' at lines 207-8 (B 51/6-7), and at lines 26-7 'cwæde ... scolde alatigean ... scoldean ... agyfan' (B 'cwæde ... scolde agimelesian ... sealdon', 41/4-5). None of Mitchell's examples involves a command, as do all these examples from Homily 4.

35 hi (s)tapes B has 'sona instapes' (41/13), both words having the sense 'at once'; the Latin has 'cito'. The same tautological expression occurs in two other homilies in B (15/27 and 87/6).

In C, even if a nonce word 'stapes' (not in MCOE) is assumed, 'hi' cannot be construed and there is therefore a failure of sense here, despite the apparent attention of the corrector (see manuscript note).

40 on minum naman In a direct address by the preacher 'minum' is obviously wrong. B has 'cwæð drihten' (41/17) instead of 'broðor mine ða leofestan', at line 39, and 'minum' is therefore apt. The whole passage, lines 39-46, renders the Latin 'si credis, tibi proficit: si dubitas, perdidisti. Decimae enim, fratres carissimi, tributa sunt egentium animarum' (Morin, 144/2-4), and in C 'broðor mine ða leofestan' is therefore likely to be original, derived from 'fratres carissimi' at the slightly later point in the Latin. However, the Latin continues 'Redde ergo tributa pauperibus, offer libamina sacerdotibus', and this is reflected in lines 47-9 and 62-4, and the OE again has at C, line 62, '(ge)broðor(e) mine' (B, 43/2, 'broðor mine ða leofestan'). I would postulate that the OE homilist placed translated 'fratres carissimi' at beginning and end of his greatly expanded rendering of his principal Latin source, and that 'minum naman' is an original error, avoided in the B text by the substitution of 'cwæð drihten' for 'broðor mine ða leofestan'.

As will become in some measure apparent, there is abundant evidence that the text in B represents a revision of the text represented in C. Presumably the B text reviser considered the substitution of 'cwæð drihten' more effective than changing 'minum' to 'drihtnes/godes', although there is no exact gospel source for lines 39-41, the nearest scriptural text being Matt. 19: 29 (pertinent passage italicized): 'et omnis qui reliquerit [home and family] propter nomen meum centuplum accipiet et vitam aeternam possidebit' (cited by Pope, Homilies of Ælfric, II, p.509, commenting on Ælfric's statements concerning a hundredfold reward for alms).

40-1 hit arisað eowre sawle to hundteontig(um) fealdum godum B has 'hit ariseþ eowrum Saulum to hundteontigfealdre mede' (41/18-19), which BTSupp., s.v. 'arisan', sense III, translates it will come to be a hundredfold reward for your souls', but in C the sense of 'arisan' is more like
ibid., sense IV, where examples are given from the laws, e.g. 'ðē þæt angylde arise to xxx. scillingum', and 'come to' has the sense 'add up to'. However, the C reading remains awkward. For singular 'eowre sawle', cp. Homily 3, Commentary, lines 27-8.

43    ge eow onfon B does not have 'eow' (41/21), the presence of which in C may be due to dittography; 'onfon' is not usually reflexive, but 'eow' could perhaps be read as supplying emphasis here.

62    7 ðær B has 'pyder 7 ðær' (43/3); lack of 'pyder' makes for a slightly awkward reading.

65    swa se lærow bebead The clause is printed on its own, a departure from editorial practice, in order to facilitate recognition of the three 'þæt' clauses, also spatially distinguished and beginning at lines 66, 68 and 70, which are dependent upon it. For the past tense in the first two of these, see note to line 11 above. The following notes consider particular difficulties with the passage, lines 65-78.

66    trymedan If my reading, with lines 66-7 as a clausal unit, is correct, the verb should be singular, with subject 'man'. An alternative reading is with subject 'þa mæssepriostas' (line 68), in apposition, along with its relative clause, to 'man', but then the clause 'þæt hyra scriftbec ... lærdon' (lines 68-9) would require a pronoun. The verb 'trymman' commonly has the sense 'to impart moral/spiritual strength to', the most likely meaning here, and thus to read 'ge læwede ge gehadode' as subject of 'trymedan' with object 'þa mæssepriostas' does not make good sense. The whole passage, lines 65-85, is concerned with the duties of priests, and in a later passage there is a clear statement of their responsibility for the correct behaviour of those in orders, as well as of the laity, at lines 162-72. However, the variant in B does make 'ge læwede, etc.' subject of 'tremede' (with sense 'support') in apposition to 'man'; 'þæt man godes æwe mid rihte heolde, 7 godes cyrician fæste tremede. ge læwede men ge gehadode' (43/5-7), but here 'man' is commanded to keep ('heolde') God's law, not to expound it ('reahte') as in the C text, where 'man' must stand for 'mæssepriost'.

68    þa mæssepriostas Since as object of 'bebead', line 65, 'þa mæssepriostas', should be in dative case, the phrase is rather to be construed as subject of, though standing outside, the following 'þæt' clause, 'þæt hyra scriftbec ... lærdon'. As remarked in the preceding note, this clause lacks a pronoun. There is a comparable construction at lines 163-5; see note below. The
text in B has a new sentence in which subject 'pa mæssepreostas' is restated with a demonstrative: 'pa mæssepreostas þe gödes cyricena lærowas beop. þa sceolan heora scrifbec mid rihte tæcan 7 læran' (43/7-8).

69 swa swa hie ure fæderas ær tahton 'hie' is possibly ambiguous, referring either to 'mæssepriostas' or 'scrifbec'. The verb 'tahton', with sense 'taught', could make sense with either object. It is only the context, with 'tahton' used with object 'scrifbec' in the preceding clause, that indicates that 'scrifbec' is still the object here. The variant in B is not so ambiguous, having 'demdon' ('decreed') instead of 'tahton' (43/8-9).

73-5 ne scyl he beon ... þæt hie hyra synna alysen (;) 7 hie sculon The sentence begins with a singular pronoun subject, in keeping with 'se mæssepryst' at line 70, but plural 'hie ... alysen' also refers to the priestly role, and this switch from singular to plural is maintained at the beginning of the next sentence, '7 hie sculon ...'. The difficulty is not in the variant in B: 'ne sceal he eac beon ... þæt he heora senna alysan mæge; 7 þa lærowas sceolan ...' (43/12-14). In the sentence, lines 73-4, the confusion of singular and plural adds to the difficulty of sense not clearly expressed. The general sense of the latter part of the sentence ('ne to lyt þancian ...') seems to be that the priest should show gratitude for the giving of alms even when alms are given in a spirit of paying for the priestly service of absolving sins. It is uncertain whether by 'alms' here some kind of death-bed bequest or alms generally is meant.

83-4 þe eac wyrcð eal þæt her bufan receð Literally this does not make sense, because not all of what has gone before has referred to what the priest should not do. If the failure of duty mentioned at lines 82-3 were particularly meant as grounds for the punishment specified at lines 84-5, despite fulfilment of duties mentioned in the passage, lines 65-78, then 'hwædre', for example, might be expected instead of 'eac'. In Visio Pauli, the Latin source for the iron hook and the river of fire, the priest is punished for a different reason, because 'non consummavit ministerium suum bene; cum erat manducans et bibens et fornicans, offerebat hostiam domino ad sanctum altare eius' (James, Apocrypha Anecdota, pp.29-30; Silverstein, Visio Pauli, p.142). The text in B does not have '7 he eac ... receð', and thus does connect the punishment with the specified failure of duty (43/22-5); '7 he eac ... receð' may be reflected in the next sentence in the
B text, where a clause, 'þe we ær butfan emb spræcon', follows 'ðæs mæssepreostes sidan' at line 86 (43/26-7).

94 7 ðone ne geheold tæla ðe him þone naman forgæf  The Latin source, *Visio Pauli* (James, *Apocrypha Anecdotata*, p.30) has 'sed non est ingressus in sanctitatem eius qui dedit ei nomen'. In the Latin it is obvious enough that Christ or the deity is the giver of the name, but the OE is vague, and archbishop, or even pope or king, could be brought to mind for that role. The use of the verb 'gehealdan' particularly makes for a weak reading. Of the sixteen senses for this verb given in *BTSupp.* the nearest is sense XI, 'satisfy, content', but then 'tæla' (adverb 'well') seems redundant. The whole sentence, lines 93-5, is variant in the B text; for the present reading B has '7 þæt eal forheold. 7 his scyppend þe him þone noman forgæf' (43/35-6), which is also somewhat vague in that 'for eal' has no antecedent.

99-100 þæt ðam byscopum ðe her on worulde syndon gegangene. gelice ðam bisceope The relative clause is 'ðe her on worulded syndon'; 'gegangene' for 'gegange'. Instead of 'gegangene gelice' B has 'swyþe gelice gegange' (45/4). Another instance of this impersonal use of 'gegangan' is at line 209; there the B text does not have the construction (51/8).

102-3 se bysceop sceal ðeðe wile onfon ... þonne scyl he ðrafian ... Particularly because 'se ðe wile' could stand on its own as a relative clause (as often in Wulfstan homilies), the reading is potentially ambiguous. If 'sceal ... onfon' were construed together, it could appear that a new sentence begins at 'þonne scyl he ...', but it is preferable to read 'þonne scyl' as a restatement of 'sceal'. The variant in B is briefer and does not have the potential ambiguity, though 'sceal' likewise precedes the relative clause: 'se biseop sceal þe wile onfon ... þrafian ...' (45/6-8).

104 7 ðone hyred. 7 ða læwede mæn  Syntactically the phrase reads as if it were a second object (the first being 'ða mæssepystas') of ðrafian', line 103, or as if it were a second object of 'healdon', line 104 (the first being 'godes æ'), but the sense seems to require the phrase, though in accusative case, to be object of 'geðafian', line 105, in apposition to dative 'ðam'. The variant in B has the same apparent inconsistency (45/9-11).

111 he euenhliete  *BT* gives a verb 'hleotan', but a compound with 'efen-' only as noun or adjective, and there are no instances of such a verb in *MCOE*. B does not have 'he' (45/18).
However, the verb could be genuine, and subjunctive mood is appropriate: 'he may receive equal rank [or 'an equal share'] with'.

113-17 The passage is syntactically coherent, but, even when the anachronism associating Moses with Christian teachers is allowed, its exact meaning is elusive. I find nothing in scripture that could have prompted the passage, but perhaps chapter 48 of *Visio Pauli* (chapters 24 and 34-5 are a source at lines 57-9 and 84-98) contributed to it, especially Moses's words 'miror quia alienigine et non circumcisi et idola adorantes conuertentes ingressi sunt in repromissa dei, Israel autem non est ingressus' (*James, Apocrypha Anecdata*, p.39). The B text is substantially the same, except that the passage is introduced 'Swa sanctus paulus sægde . . . ' (45/19-20) instead of 'swa her receð on ðysum trahtoðe . . . ', and 'þe hraðor', line 116, is lacking.

123-4 ... mæsan gesingan. for eal cristen folc (;) ðe æfre fram frymðe middangearde 

acænnde wæran  Thus is introduced a confusing passage, lines 125-36, on the power of the Mass to bring all Christians, living, not yet living and dead, into communion. The sentence, lines 117-9, that concludes the passage and which has to do with the effect of the Mass on devils is, however, readily intelligible.

125  hie  might be expected to refer back to 'bysceop. 7 mæssepryst', line 121, but in view of the generality of what follows, 'hie' probably refers to 'eal cristen folc', line 123. B also has 'hi' (45/33).

126  onfehð he ... maran mede (;) þonne hie ... Assuming that bishop and priest are no longer being specified, it is possible that the singular 'onfehð he' anticipates the singular subject of the sentence, lines 129-30, namely the participant in the Mass. The B text does not have the mistake: 'onfoþ hi, etc.' (45/33-4).

127-8  mid ænigum dæle ... mid ænigum arum  I cannot suggest what might be meant here by 'dæle', or why 'arum' is plural where a meaning 'reverence' might be expected. The text in B (45/34) does not have lines 127-8, 'gif him ... gehyran willað'.

129-30 7 forðy hie ðingiað  The clause is parenthetical, seeming to mean that the saints (can) intercede because they used to be earthly themselves. B has simply, for the whole sentence, lines 129-30, '7 þa þe on heofonum syndon hi þingiaþ for þa þe ðysum sange fylgeþ' (45/34-5).
131 hie presumably refers back to 'calra haligra', line 129, with the following relative clause referring to 'calra yrôlicra', though this 'hie' could be read as antecedent of the relative clause. Alternatively, in view of the confusion of singular and plural at line 126, 'hie' could refer to the participant(s) in the Mass. B also has 'hi' (45/36).

133 hie presumably refers back to the earthly Christian community at lines 131-2, at least to those members who are and will be, or (cp. preceding note) to the participant in the Mass specified at line 129: there is scarcely a real distinction to be made by this stage. B also has 'hi' (47/1).

134 7 eallum halgum þæt is alyfed If the clause is to be translated 'and it is permitted to all saints', there is a failure of sense between it and the following þæt clause, which reads as if it is dependent upon it, as well as upon preceding þæt is godes agen bebob'. The clause seems quite misplaced, even when read parenthetically. I read it that saints are mentioned in order to maintain the theme that the Christian community is at once heavenly and earthly, and even perhaps to reflect this theme in the composition of the whole sentence, lines 134-6, by providing a mention of saints near the beginning of the sentence in order to balance that at the end. The apparent failure of sense is not in the variant in B, which begins after 'sweltað', line 133: '7 godes mildheortnesse bið ofer hi 7 ealra haligra 7 gód hafan alyfed eorplicum mannum þæt hi motan bletsian eal cristen folc [then as C (but 'gecegede' for C 'gecwedene') till the last clause of the sentence, line 136, '7 hie syndon ... magas'] 7 on ealra haligra gehoftiscipe' (47/1-5).

135 him ... fore gebringan There seems to be ambiguity here: either 'bring before God' or 'bring for them (=eall cristen folc)'. B has 'bringan' for 'gebringan' (47/4).

151 þæt godes folc wite Reading the first þæt as standing for the following 'hu' clause (the second being definite article with 'folc'), this use of the subjunctive 'wite' in a main clause instead of a modal, to give the sense 'should know', seems very unusual, but it seems preferable to read thus rather than to take the clause to be dependent upon 'beoð ... scyldige', line 150, in which case the verb 'wite' would lack negation. BT has no examples of 'scyldige þæt ...' and there are no examples in MCOE. The variant in B is 'forpon þæt godes folc sceal witon' (47/21-2). Subjunctive 'wite' may be a misplaced instance of the usage whereby the third person subjunctive carries imperative force (cp.; for example, 'Agifse ... dæle ... selle', lines 267-9).
This is the only point in the homily where the second person plural implies direct address to priests; the homily as a whole is a general exhortation to give tithes, and such direct address is inappropriate. B has '7 þa lareowas ... gif hi ...' (47/22-3).

domes georne It is difficult to read the phrase without an unexpected sense of irony: 'eager for (unfavourable) judgement'. BT gives an adjective 'domgeorn', but with no such pejorative sense as here. B has 'domes wyrpe' (47/23).

160-1 7 god bido on hyra midle. (,) eallum ðam mannum Though 'on hyra midle' fits the context of the preceding two clauses, 'forðon ðær man ... abyrded', the phrase cannot be construed with 'eallum ðam mannum', and there is a failure of sense here. B has 'god bip milde þæm monnum' (47/32), which fits the context of the whole sentence.

163-5 þa godes ðeowas hyra tidsangas ... gehealden. 7 ða læwedan swa heom ... belimpeð The construction is comparable to that at lines 68-9 (see note on 'þa læsspriostas'), in that 'þa godes ðeowas' could be construed as object of 'þreatigen. 7 bebeodan', with conjunction and pronoun absent ('þæt hie'; only pronoun absent at lines 68-9) from the following complement clause. However, in the present case 'ða godes ðeowas' may, more easily than 'þa læsspriostas' at line 68, be construed as subject of the following clause. In fact here the construction may be regarded as merely elliptical, with omission of 'þæt' (indicating dependence upon 'þreatigen. 7 bebeodan') before 'þa godes ðeowas' and before 'ða læwedan', and of a verb (e.g. 'doð') after 'ða læwedan'. The text in B is not variant here (47/36-49/1).

173-4 ðonne cwæð ... læran meahton In the context of the passage, lines 162-75, confusion arises in this sentence with the switch in terms, from 'godes ðeow' to 'munoc', which may or may not indicate a real distinction: 'ði ilcan munoce' suggests that no distinction is intended, but that 'se godes ðeow ðe nylle ðære cyricean on riht ðeowian' (lines 167-8) is meant. The plural pronoun 'hie' may be understood to refer to both priest and bishop. In the phrase 'oðre mine munecas', 'mine' is obviously inappropriate. It is unclear by what the 'oðre ... munecas' are to be taught. Presumably it is that 'se godes ðeow ... mid læwedum mannum onfon ðæs hearest ðeowdomes' (lines 167-9; 'ðeowdomes' (so also B, 49/5) for 'domes'?). The B text variant of this awkward sentence is little less vague: 'þonne sæde þæt se æpela læreow be þæm ilcan þæt hi óbre
men be þon lærorn mihton' (49/8-10). B has mention neither of 'munoc' nor of 'bisceop'; after 'ilcan' there is at least a six-letter space, a probable erasure (Willard, *Blicking Homilies*, fol.27r).

184-5 hwile ... hwyle The failure to inflect for accusative case is not in the B text (49/15-17).

191-2 ealra æhta ... idelhende BT gives only this instance (cited from B) of 'idelhende', 'empty-handed', with genitive, and there are no examples in MCOE. B has 'ealra his æhta' (49/25-6).

193-6 7 æghwilcum ... wæstmum the sense of these lines seems to be that everyone should be industrious (though this stretches the sense of 'craeftig') whatever his occupation, so that he is in a position to pay tithes. The homily takes up the Latin source again at this point, and the sense of the Latin is simply that tithes should be paid whatever the source of income: 'Quod si decimas non habes fructuum terrenorum, quod habet agricola, quodcumque te pascit ingenium dei est: inde decimas expetit, unde vivas. De militia, de negotio, de artificio tuo rede decimas' (Morin, 144/5-9). The B text is variant for lines 193-4: '7 æghwylcum men is beboden on ænigum þingum craeftig sy. òþþe on maran wisdome òþþe on læsson' (49/27-8).

195 agif for 'agife'.

198 rummode It would be unusual, I think, for an adverb to be formed by addition of '-e' to a compound adjective, and here 'rummode' may be for 'rumum mode'. B has 'rumlice' (49/32). Cp. line 211 and note. For formation of adverbs in OE, see Campbell, *OEG*, paras 661-9.

204 ealne is likely to be error for 'anne' in the B text (51/3).

211 mid bliþe. 7 mid rum mode apparently for 'mid bliþum. 7 mid rumum mode', but since this is the second instance of 'rummode' (see note to line 198 above) suspicion is increased that an adverb was intended. The two instances of 'mid' here could be additions to an original 'bliþe 7 rummode'. B has 'bliþe 7 rummodlice' (51/10).

224 eallum ageldan Dative of thing repaid or paid for is unusual. B has 'eall agyldan' (51/24).

224-5 The omission in the C text, due to eye skip, has led to a failure of sense.

235 hit swiþe fea æne sindan 'There are only very few'. The idiom seems unusual. B has simply 'syndon feawa' (53/1).
239 7 man ðanne síðan nahtes wyrðe his saule ne deð. ne his goldes ... Literal translation suggests that the sense is inappropriate: 'and one then makes his soul worthy of nothing, neither of his gold ...' The required sense might be expected to be that 'one's riches are of no help to his soul'. This is the sense of the next sentence, lines 242-5. The B text is not variant here (195/5-6).

244-5 þe he his lichaman oferflownesse. mid frætwað Preposition 'mid' presumably goes with relative 'þe', 'with which he adorns his body'. A preposition might be expected with 'oferflownesse': this example of an adverbial use of an inflected noun seems somehow unusual, perhaps because an adjective (e.g. 'micclum') does not accompany the noun (for the usage see Mitchell, OE Syntax, I, paras 1380 ff., and cp. examples at ibid., paras 1410-11 and 1414), or perhaps (similarly, because of the two nouns being next to each other) the reading seems infelicitous because of an expectation that 'lichaman' will be genitive, governed by the following noun, unless an adjective or preposition intervenes.

B has 'þe his lichoma ær mid oforflownessum gefrætwod wæs' (195/11-12). A preposition is not necessarily required with 'frætwian' for nouns specifying adornments (cp. examples in BT s.v. 'frættewian'), though examples in MCOE suggest that a preposition is usual in prose, but it might be expected that instrumentality would at least be expressed in the relative by 'þam ðe' instead of 'þe'. Past tense in B here is more logical than present tense 'frætwað' in C.

There is an analogue to C's reading in B, Homily X: 'hwær beoþ ðonne þa glengæs 7 þa mycclum gegeyrelan þe he þone lichoman ær mid frætwode', (111/35-6).

246 Though this line does not stand well on its own as a sentence, neither does it read easily at the end of the preceding sentence, where the sense of the 'þanne ... ðanne ...' construction is complete. The line does not fit the context of the next sentence, where the theme changes from love of riches to drunkenness and boasting, but it could fit within the preceding sentence after 'habbanne' at line 243, though with some duplication of sense. The variant reading in B, at the same point, seems no less disjointed: '7 þa eorþlican gestreon swiþor lufode þonne he his gast dyde, oppe urne drihten þe hine gesceop' (195/12-14).

270-1 næs hit naht ne forhealde on unrihtne lust. ðanne bið hit ... goldhorde 'forhealde' for 'forhealden'. The first clause of this sentence seems to be an 'inverted conditional clause', but
subjunctive 'nære' might be expected for indicative 'næs'; Mitchell, *OE Syntax*, II, paras 3678-83, is doubtful that a conditional clause with no conjunction and with initial verb was a genuine OE construction. To construe 'næs' as an adverb 'not', and 'forhealde' as a third person singular present subjunctive does not seem possible. Another syntactical difficulty with the sentence is that pronouns 'hit' have no referrent: it seems inappropriate that antecedent 'beodlafa' and 'ealda hrægel' (line 269) are 'gehealden on ðan heofonican goldhorde'; however the sentence may be read as a general statement.

The sentence renders the Latin 'ut ... non luxuriae reservetur, sed in thesau ro caelestì per elimosinam pauperum reponatur' (Morin, 146/9-10), where the subject is what is left over from the nine parts once a modest amount of food and clothing has been provided for. The OE renders this modest provision for the tithe payer's needs into 'left-overs and old clothes' for the poor (line 269). Despite the deviation from the sense of the Latin, the sentence, lines 270-1, is logical, but its meaning is vague and its orthodoxy even (no doubt unintentionally) suspect: it is not what is 'not withheld in wrongful pleasure', but what is actually given that earns reward, as the Latin makes clear with the phrase 'per elimosinam pauperum'.

The B text does not have 'næs hit naht ne forhealde on unrihtne lust', but otherwise is not variant here, except for 'nigeoðan' for 'nigon' at line 268 (53/12 and 13).

280-1 man ... gitsiā∂. þæt hie ... 'gitsiā∂' for 'gitsa∂'; the plural pronoun 'hie' referring back to indefinite 'man' is not exceptional (see Mitchell, *OE Syntax*, I, para.377).

287 þæt ge ða gedon earmum mannum nytte It might be suspected that the reading is 'to nytte', with 'to' lost to view, with '-um', in the binding, but there is probably not space for the preposition at the end of the line. With 'nytte' as an adjective, the clause may be translated 'that you make them useful to the poor'. The B text variant, which begins after 'hæbben', line 286, has 'þæt ge þa earmum mannum syllon' (53/28-9).

289 The C text omission of 'is mid' leaves an unsound reading.
HER we magon hwylcumhwega wórdum sécgan. be dære árwyrdan gebyrda. 7 be þam halgan life 7 forðfore dær éadigan weres. sanctus martínus. þe we nú on andweardnesse his tíð wyrðiað. 7 maérsiað. 

wæs ðæt gode swiðe geóren man on his dæðum. 

he wæs on pannania dære mægðæ ærest on wyrólde gecumen. in arrea dám túnæ. 

wæs he hwæðere in itália aféded. in ticinam dære byrig 

wæs he for wyrólde swiðe gódra gebyrda 7 ædelra. 

wæron his ylðran hwæðere. // faéder 7 moder butu hæðene. 

wæs his fador ærest cyninges dægen. 7 ða æt níhstan géðáh þæt he wæs cyninges dægna éaldorman. 

ða sceolde he sanctus martínus nyde bέon on his géogoðháde on dære geferralêdene ærest on constantínes dágum. 7 ða eft on iuliani ðæs kâseres. 

nálæs þæt he his willum on dám wyröldfolgoðe vàre. Ac he sóné on his géogoðe godes ðewðóm micle swiðor lúfode ðånne ða idlan dréamas óisse wyrólde. 

þa he wæs. x. wíntre. 7 hine his ylðran to wóruldfolgoðe // tyhton. 7 lærdon. 

ða fleah he to godes cyrcean. 7 bæd þæt hine man gecristnode. þæt se æresta dæl his onginnes. 7 lífes wæron to gélaðan gecyrred. 7 to fulwihte. 7 he ða sóna mid ealle his lif ye me godes ðeowdom abisgod wæs. 

ða he wæs fínténe wíntre ða nyddan hine his ylðran toðan þæt he sceolde 

woröldlicum wæðnum onfón. 7 on cyninges ðegna geférredena bέon. 

14 Ac] 'A' in left margin. 20 þæt] not abbreviated. 21 cyn'i'nges.
...da waron. iii. gær ær his fulwihte. þæt he wyroldwæpan. waeg. 7 he hine

hwædere wip eallum ðam healcicum waepnum // geheold ða ðe woruldman fremmæð

on menniscum ðingum.

he hæfde micle lúfan. 7 ealle wærnesse to ælcum mæn. 7 he wæs gebylig. 7
éaðmóð. 7 gemetfeast. on eallum his life.

ðæah ðe he ða gét on læwedum hæðe beon scolde hwædere he to ðæs
forwyrixnednesse hæfde. on eallum ðingum. þæt he éfne mnucliife gyþ swiðor lifde
þanne læwedes mannes.

wæs he for his árfestum dæcum eallum his ges[ér]um leóf. 7 wyrð. 7 andresne.
7 hie hine ealle synderlice mid lúfan wyrédan.

æah ðe // he ða gyþ wanæ fullice æfter orenre ændebyrðnesse gefullad. Ac he
wæs gecristnod. swa ic ær sæde. hwædere he þæt geréne ðare halgan fulwihte mid
godum dæcum geheold. 7 fullode.

he wolde ðam wynniendum gefultumien. 7 éarmre fréfrian. 7 hingrendum mete
sellan. 7 nacode scrydan. 7 eall þæt he on his folgoðe begéat eal he þæt for gódes
lúfan gedælde. nemne ðáne dæghwamlican ondlyfan anne. ðe he néde. biglyfian
scoeldæ.

39 gemunde he þæt drihten. bebéad on his godspelle //

De crastino non cogitáre.

Dæt se godes mán ne scólebi di ðan mærgendæge dæncean. ðy laes þæt wære
þæt he ðurh [þæt] ænig dára góda fórylde þæt he þanne ði dæge gedón méahte. 7
ðanne wéniga hwæder he eft ðæs méréngendæges gebidan moсте.

magon we dára áræstra dáda sune gehéran secgan. ðe he dés eadiga wer.

sanctus martínus. sóna on his cnihtháde gedyde. ðeah ðe [his] ðára gódra dáda má
wære. ðanne ænig man asecgan mæge.

29 forwy're'nédnesse. 30 ge[fer]um so AB, 'gerefum' MS. 36 sc'r'ydan] here
and at 29 superscript 'r' is caroline, not the copyist's usual insular form for OE. 37
'he'. 39 gemun'ðe'] 'gemun' at end line, 'de' added in left margin, not by copyist.
beb'e'ad. 41 Dæt] 'D' = enlarged 'o'. 42 [þæt] supplied from AB. gedon] 'g'
altered from 't'. 43 'ge'bidan. 45 [his] 'he his' MS; AB have neither 'he' nor 'his'.
...pæt gelamp sume side. pæt he gefyrde mid oðrum cyninges ðegenum on ða //

burh de ambinsenus hatte.
wæs on middum wintre. 7 wæs se winter ðy gære to ðæs grim pæt efnæ manig
man his fyrh for cyle geséalde.

ðá sæt þær sum ðearfa æt ðam burhglæte
sæt ðæc nacod
bæd him ða for gode his hraegles on ælmessan.

ða fyrdon hie ealle forð be him. 7 hyra nán him to gecyrran wólde. ne him
aðnige áre gedón.
ða ongeat se godes wer. sanctus martingis. þæt drihten him ðone ðearfan

geheold. þæt he him miltsian sceolde ða ðara oðera manna him // nán árian wolde.

nyste þeah hwæðere hwæt he him dón sceolde. forðan ðe he naht elles næfdæ
bútan his anscaldne ðyrelan. Ac eall þæt he ma hæfde. eall he þæt ær beforan on
gelic wyr ðæah. 7 for gode geséalde.

getéah ða his sex. 7 genam his sciccels ðe he him on hæfde. 7 ðosnað ða hine.
on twá. 7 ða healf geséalde ðam ðearfan. 7 mid héalfhe hine besweop.

ða waðron manige mægn. ðe þæt gesáwun. 7 hie hine on ðan tældon. 7

bismrodan. þæt he his swa an//féaldne ðyrelan tosnidan sceolde.

sume ðanne eft ða ðe beteran módes waðron. 7 aðnige lufan to gode hæfdon.

hie sélfe be þæt ongæton þæt hie swa ne dydan. 7 wistan þæt hie mete hæfdon.
þæt hie æghwæðer ge ðam ðearfan hraegel syllan mihtan. ge ðæc heom selfum
genóh hæfdon.

ða wæs sóna on ðære æfterfyldendan nihte. ða he se eadiga wer slép. ða
geseah he crist sélfnæ. mid ði ilcan hraegle. gegyrwðne. ðe he ær ðan þearfan
geséalde. //

ða wæs him beboden gýrnlicor þæt he hine ðune drihten ongæte. 7 þæt hraegel
ðe he ær ðam ðearfan geséalde.
Mox angelorum circumstantium multitudinem.

75 Da geseah he mycele maenigo angla ymbe hine drihten standan. Da gehyrde he drihten sealfne mid swa cuore stefne. To san anglum cwæd. 'martinus nu du eart gecristnod aer his fulwihte.

78 'mid disum hrægle. Du me gegyredes.' was on aere daede swide cuod. Pat ure drihten is swide gemynig das his

67r cwi/des de he selfa aer cwæd.

81 Quam diu fecisti.

'Swa hwæt swa ge hwilcum earmum man. to gode gedod. for minum naman esne ge dæt me selfum gedod.'

84 he da wolde daene cwide getryman on aere godcundan daeda 7 hine selfne to dan gecædmedde pæt he hine on das deaerfan gyrelan ætewde dam éadigan were. sancte martinen.

87 Quo uisv uir non in gloriam elatus est.

Da he se eadyga martinus. Da gesihpe geseah da nes he naht swide on

67v òferhydlig ahafen. on mannisc. wundor. ac he godes gód on aere. // his daeda

90 ongæt.

Da he da hæfde twam laes twentig wintra. Da gefullode hine man. on aere cyrican endebyrdnesse. 7 wæs he beforan aer dam. iii. gar. gecristnod swa ic aer

93 saede.

Da forlet he ealne daene wyroldfolgod ænne. Da gewat he to sancte hilärie dam bysceope. de in pictäue aere byríg wæs bysceop.

96 7 wæs ðæt swide foremære. man for gode. se bysceop. 7 his gód wæs swide gecyðe[d]. 7 he da disne ydígan war fulfrémedlice on godes æ. 7 on godes

68r ðëowdom // getyde. 7 gelærde. eac ðan da hine ggod sél[f] innan gemanode.

99 wæs he swide geðungen on his ðéawum. 7 stadalfaest on his wordum. 7 hlutter. 7 claene on his life. 7 he wæs árfæst. 7 gemétfaest. 7 mildhyrt on his

78 m'e'. 83 'ge'doð. ðære] 're' in bracket under 'bæ'. 91 Da] 'D' =enlarged 'Ø'. 95 bysc'e'ope. 97 gecyðe[d] 'êo' MS. 98 sel[f] 'selfne' MS, AB 'sylfa/sylf'.
dældum. 7 geornful. 7 be gewyrhtum. ymbe drihtnes làre. 7 on eallum gódum. for
gode fulfrémede.

7 da gelamp æfter dan þæt se eadiga wer sanctus martinus. sum mynster
getimbrede. 7 he on dan mánigra godes ðeowa gástic fæder gewéard

68v 7 da gelamp sume sîfe þæt ðær // com þum ungemcrisnod man. to him þæt he
wolde mid his làre. 7 mid his lifes bísene boon ingetimbred.

da ða he ðær wæs weal monige dagas. ða weard he úntrum on féferadle.

105 da gelám on da tid. þæt sanctus martinus wæs on sumre fôre. ealle. iii. gaér.

da he ða eft hám cóm. ða gemetthe ðâne man. förðférendræ. ðe ðær ær
úntrum wæs. 7 hine éfine swa færlice deað fornam. þæt he ungefullod forðférdæ.

111 da he ða sanctus martinus. þæt gesæah þæt ða ðære gebroðre ealle swa unróte
wæræn. ymbe þæt lic. ða weop he. 7 éode into // him 7 wæs him swiðe micle
wyrcæ þæt he swa ungefullod förðgeferan scéoldæ.

114 getrywde ðæ hweâdere mid ealle móde. on ælmihtiges godes miht. 7 his
mildhéortnesse. 7 éode on ða cýtan ðær se lichama inne wæs. 7 hé ða ðære mén.
útguðan. 7 ða ða duru beléac æfter him. 7 he him ða gebæd. 7 astréahet oser ða

122 léoma ðæs aswóltonan mannes.

ða he ða lânge hwile. on ðan gebede wæs. ða ongæt he þæt ðær wæs
godcundlic máegen ándweard. 7 he ðære mildheartnesse únforht // onbad.

117 da wæs ymbe hwile ðæ gefêlde he þæt se deada man his léoma. ealle astyrodan.

7 his éagan up ahóf. 7 fôrblócode.

ða he ða sanctus martinus. ðæt gesæah ða wæs he swiðe geféonde. 7 ða
clypode he hlúdre stéfne. 7 ealmihtigum gode ðære gife ðanc sæde.

123 ða ðæt ða ðære gebroðran. gehýrdan ðæ ðær úte wærón ða ðodon hie into him.

ða gesáwón hie wúndorlice gewýrd ðâne man lífyende ðâne hie ær déadne

126 forlétéon. 7 hine man ða sóna. gefullode. 7 he fela géra // æfter ðan lifde.

103 gelam'p'] 'p' squeezed in on line, ink less dark than copyist's, like that of
'–de' at 39. 105 'un'gemcrisnod] superscript not by copyist, probably as 39. 110 ðæð]
'd' altered from 'd' by erasure of cross stroke. 112 w'e'op. 113 wyr'e'c'e.
forð'ge'feran. 122 ðæ't'. 124 'ge'broðran. 125 gewyr'd'. 
wæs ðís ðære wundra ærst ðæ ðæs eadiga wær openlice. befóran oðrum
mannum. geworhte.

129 7 ða æfter ðísse dæde his nama wæs syðdan á wyrð. 7 mære gewórden. 7 hine
eall ðæt fòlc haligne. 7 mihtigne ongætan on his dædum.
wylce ðæc eft gelamp ðeðer wündor. ðísse anlicnesse.

132 he fyrde sume sìbe ðæs eadiga wær to ðæs mannes tûne. ðæ lupicinug wæs
geháten.

ða gehyrde he ðær on ðan tûne mycelne héaf. 7 wóp. 7 mánige cléopodan mid
miclare stéfne. //

70v ða gestóð he. 7 ñcsode hwæt syo clypung wære. ða sǽde him ðæt ðær
wære sum man éarmlice deåd geswolten. ðæt he hine selfne awyrge.

138 ða he ðá sanctus martínus. ðæs mannes deåd swa éarmlice gehyrde. ða wæs
him ðæt sóna swíde sár. 7 on mycle wyrce. 7 ða eode on ða cýten. ðær se lichama
inne læg. ðæs aswóltan mannes. 7 het ða ðóre mæn ealle útgangan. 7 ða duru
bêñyan 7 hine ðær ða on gebede astréahhte

ða he ðá hwile on ðon gebede wæs. ða færINGLE wearô se déada man cwyc 7 eft
forôloécód. 7 tyólode to arísanne. //

71r ða genam sanctus martínus hine be his hándan. 7 up heah araéðe. 7 hine
gelædde forô to ðan caúertûne ðæs húses. 7 hine eft ðám mannum halne. 7
gesúndne agéaf. ðe hie ær dáedne forléton.

147 ðæs wundor. 7 manig oðer æmihtígg god ðurh ðýsne éadigan wær gewrohte. ær
ðánne he æífre wære byscëop. ac syðdan he ðan byscëópháde onféng. in turna ðære
byríg Nis æníg man ðæt ða wundor eall aséçge. ða ðe god syððan ðurh hine

150 gewrohte.

7 ðeáeh ðe he ða máran had hæfde. 7 ðæc for wyrolde rícra béon scéoldé. ðánne

71v he ær wæs // hwædære he hæfde ða ilcan éadmódnèsse. an his hýrtan. 7 ða ilcan
forwyrnednesse on his lichaman. æghwædër ge on ñe[t]e ge on hraégle. ge on

130 mihtl'g'ne. 139 'on' mycle. 143 arísanne] 'ne' in bracket below 'an'. 145
't' gesúndne. 147 'ge'wrohte. 148 ac] 'a' written with an ascender. 149 Nis]
'N' in left margin. 153 me[t]e supplied from AB, letters obscured in binding.
æghwilcum ðinge efnæ swa he ær hæfde. 7 he his bysceophád swa gedéfelice
gehoeld for gode. swa he hwæðer næfre þæt máegen. 7 ða foresetenesse his
munuchádes án ne forlét.

_Omnes namque unanimi[ter] cupiebant._

7 ealle mæn ða de feor ge néah ðyse ðádigan wéres l[i]f cuðan oðde gehýrían.

ealle he þæt ánmdóllice wilnodan þæt h[i(e)] // his word geheran mostán. 7 his larum
gelyfan. forðan he swutolice on him ongæðon godes lyfæ 7 his blisse.
waes he forðan swíde mætre geond middangéard.

7 he manig temþl 7 déofolgyld tobræc 7 gefelde ðæt hæðene mæn ær déoflum
onguldun. 7 ðanne ðær he þæt déofolgyld gefelde. ðanne asette he ðær godes
cyrícan. oðde fullice münster getimbrede.

Þæt gelamp sume sìde þæt he ongan bærnan sum déofolgyld. þæt mid

_hæðenum mannúm swíde wyrd. 7 mære // wæs._

þa stóð ðáer sum nytwyrde hús be ðan gelde ðe he ðær bærnan ongan.

ða sloh se wind ðáne lég on þæt ðær hús. 7 him dũhte þæt hit eall forbyrnan
sceolde.

ða he ða sanctus martinus þæt geseah ða arn he sóna up on þæt hús. 7 ða

gestóð ongæn ðam légte.

ða gelamp wúndorlic gewyrð þæt se légte ongán slean. 7 brecan ongæn ðane
wind. 7 éfnæ swa se wind swíðor sloh on ðáne légte. swa bræc he swíðor ongæn ðam

ewnde. 7 éfnæ on ða gelícnesse swa ða gescæfta twá be heom tvýonum gefyhton //

_sceoldan._

7 swa se légte wæs geðréatod ðurh sancte martines gebyde. þæt he nánegum

odrum ær scádian ne méahte. éfnæ. ðam déofolgyld ánnum ðe he ðær bærnan
ongan.

Swylce gelamp eft ðær wundor ðysum gelic.

180 he com to sumen túne de librassa wæs gehátén.

158 l[i]f so B, letters obscured in binding. 'lif' added in outer margin by retoucher.
159 hi[e] letter obscured in binding. 179 Swylce] 'S' in left margin.
ða wæs ðær sum geld de ða hæðenan swiðe wyrðedan.

ða wolde he sanctus martinus aelce ðinga þæt geld abrécan. 7 gefyllan. ða

183 wîdöstódan him ða hæðenan mæn. 7 hine mid tónan on weg adrifon.

73v ða ðode he ðær rihte big on sume stôwe // 7 hine ða geyrede mid hærenu[m] hrægele swîðe hearde. 7 unwynsume. 7 gefӕste. iii. dagas. 7 ælmihtigne. god
gææd. þæt he ðurh his godcundan gemiht. þæt déofolgyld gebæcæ. 7 gefelde. ða
he hit for manna tónan gebrecan ne moste.

ða cóman ðær sæmninga. ii. ænglas to him gescyldode. 7 gespyrde. 7 mid

189 heregeatwum geyrede éfne swylce hie to campe féran woldan. 7 cwædan þæt hie
god self gesæðne þæt hie sceoldan þæt hædene werod geflýman. 7 martine on

74r fulturne bœon. // þæt he þæt déofolgyld gebrecan meahte. 7 gefyllan.

192 ða eodan hie eft to ðan túne. 7 þæt geld gebææcon a ðð ðone grúnd.

7 ða hæðenun mæn. to lócodan. ac hie hwæðere wæron mid doccunde
mægene. gefyrhte. 7 hyra nán him wîdöstandan ne dorste. ac hie ealle to drihtenes
gelæsån gecyrdon. 7 hie cwædan to him. þæt se wære ánå sóð god se ðe martinus
gæyrde. 7 þæt hyra hæðengyld wærond ealle ðele. 7 unnytte 7 þæt hie na hwæðere

77v ne heom selfum gedæncan ne méahtan. // ne ænies þara gehelpan de to hi[m]

198 ænigre are wilnodon.

swylce gelamp sume side þæt he sum gyld tobrec. þæt ðær gearn mycele
mǽngeo to him ðara hæðenra manna. 7 ealle wæron swiðe yrre.

201 ða wæs hyra sum hræðra 7 hátheortra ðanne ða oðre.

gebraed ða his swyrde. 7 gemynte hine to sléanne.

204 swýran 7 léat ford ðo ðam mæn. ðe hine sléan mynte.

184 hærenu[m] 'm' is worn away. From here readings either side of the top of the
gutter in the gathering, fols 72-81, are affected by damage to the membrane,
whereby the surface layer or layers is crumbled away. 185 'gefäeste' superscript
not certainly by copyist. 193 and 194 ac 'a' written with an ascender. 197 hi[m]
'm' supplied, damage to membrane; a superscript marker under 'i'. 200 h'i'm.
da he da se haedena man up areahte mid dære swiðran hánd. 7 hine síean

mynte. da feol he færinga on bæcling. 7 ne ahte his // lichaman nán gewéald ac he

wæs mid godcunde mægne gebréad. 7 he him da ðane édigan wer forgysenesse
gebraed.

Swylce wæs eft oðer wundor dæs ánlicnesse. þæt gelamp sume side ðær he sum
deosolged tobræc. 7 gefylde.

da gebræd ðara haedena manna sum his séaxe

he he hine da stingan mynte. þa nyste he færinga hwær þæt seax becom. þæt

he ðær on hánða hæfte.

gelmolici þæt dælle was þæt he da haedenan gyld gebræc. 7 him da haedenan

menn widerwéarde wæron þæt hie ðurh his lare. 7 ðurh his drihtnes // gífe hyra

hyortan to godes ge[lea]fan gecyrde. þæt hie ætnyhstan selfe éac mid hyra hándum

da idlan gyld gebræcan 7 gefyldan.

7 to dæs mihtig he dælle wæs ælce untrumnesse to hælanne. 7 to dæs mycel
gyfe he dæs æt gode onfeng þæt næs æníg to dæs untrum ðe hine gesóhte þæt he

sóna hælo ne begæste.

ge þæt oft á gelamp dælle mæn hwilcne dafl his hreæges to untruman mann

gebrahte þæt he dælle ðurh ðæt sóna wæs hál gewórdan

76r 7 dæs he was þælle éalra swiðast // [to] herianne þæt he náfre næningum

worldlicum mæn ne cyninge selsefum ðurh lease olæcunge swiðor onbúgan wolde.

 þælle hit riht wære. 7 éac he a æghwilcum mann sód 7 riht sprecan wolde 7 dón.

Vere beatus vir. In quo dolug.

his was soðlice eadig wer

ne wæs æffre fácn ne inwid on his hyortan ne he ænígne man unrihtlice ne
gedemde. ne he wite ne nam ne æníg yfel mid yfele ne geald. ne hine æníg man

206 æc 'a' written with an ascender.
212 'be' superscript not by copyist, as 39; AB 'cwom / com'. 216 ge[lea]fan
damage to membrane, supplied from AB. 217 'gebræcan' superscript not by
copyist, as 39. 217-8 '7' gefyldan. '7'. 222 geworde'a'. 223 [to] damage to
membrane, supplied from AB. 224 wor[ld]icum superscript 'l', marked with an
inverted 'v', is probably modern.
yrne. ne grammmodne geræhte. ac he wæs á in ánun mode 7 efne // heofonlicne

blis. 7 geféan man [moh]te á on his andwitan angytan.

ne gehýrde ænig man aht elles of his muóðe nemne crístes lof. 7 nytte spræçe.

ne aht elles on his hyortan. nemne árfæstnesse. 7 mildhyortnesse. 7 sibbe.

swylce éac þes eadiga wer mycle ær beforan ðone ðag wiste his forþfærnesse. 7

him diíhten gecýded hæfde. 7 he ðam his gebroðrum sæðe þæt hit ða ryhte wæfre.

þæt he of ðisse werolde sceolde.

ða wiste he sumne hýrd on his byscopscýre ða ðe unówaere 7 ungesibbe heom

betweónum // [wa:íran.

ða gefýrde he ðider mid his discipulum ðeah ðe he wiste. þæt [he] ða æt his
daga ænde wæfre.

þæt he huru wolde þæt hie ealle on sibbe waeran ær he of werolde gefýrde.

Dæ he ða háfde ðane hýred gesibbod ðe he ðær to gefýrde. 7 ðær wel manige
dagas wæs ða he ða æft gemynnte mid his discipulum to his mynstre féran.

ða wearð he faerínga swiðe untrum
dða gehet he him ealle his discipulas to. 7 heom sæðe þæt he ða forðferan
sceolde.

ða wéopan hie sóna ealle. 7 sólice gebérdan. 7 ðis cwǽdan to him. //

forhwæn forlætsttu fader us [nu] gyt. ðode gif ðu gewíttew hwam bebódest ðu

us.'

Cui nos pater deseris cui nos desolátus.

'Cumað risende wulfas. 7 todrífað ðine hýorde.

\hwa forståndeð hie gif ðu hie ne scyldest.'
we ðæt witon ðæt ðæt is ðînes modes willa. ðæt ðu móte ðæs wyrold forlætan 7
crist geséon. ac gemiltsa ðu hwædere ús. 7 gemune úra déarfa. 

ða he ða ðás word gespræc. 7 ðís gehyrde. 7 he ealle wépende gesæh. ða
wéop he éac selfa. 7 his mod wæs onstyred. mid ðam hera wórđum.

swa he wæs manna mildhéortast // 7 he efne mid wéprendre stéfne ðús to drihtne

cwæð.

Domine si ad[hu]c populo tuo sum necessarius.
'Drihten' cwæð he 'gif ic nu gét sic ðinum folce déarflic. hér on wórulde to
habbanne. ðanne ne wíðsæc ic ðam gewinne. ac sic ðæs ðin willa. 

wæs he to ðæs árfast ðæt him wæs æghwæðer on wyrce ge ðæt he ða gebroðran
forlete. ge ðanne huru éac ðæt he læng fram cristes onsýne wære ðæt he ðane

gesáwe.

he ða forðan drihtnes willa sohte. 7 ðús cwæð 

imin drihten længe ic nu wæs on ðan héardan câmpé her on wyrolde. ac ðanne
hwædere ne wíðsæc ic ðan ðæt ic on ðan câmpé // læng sic gif hit ðín willa swíðor
[bíd] ac ic mid ðinum waþpnum getrymed on ðinum fædan fæste stánde. 7 for ðe
cámpige ða hwlé ðe ðín willa bíd. 

wæs him æghwæðer ðam éadigan were ge syo godes lufu to ðæs hátt. ge to ðæs
byrht. on his lýortan. ði he forðan deáðe. ne förhtode. ac him ðæs héardost
lán gode hwanne he of ðisse wyrolde moste.

7 him ðanne wæs éac manna lufu to ðæs mycel. ðæt him nǽñig gewín hér on
wyrolde to læng. ne to héard ne ðuhte. ðæs ðe hýra sáulum to hælo. 7 to ræðè
gewinnan meahte

ða wæs he wel manige dagas mid // [ð]am fæßeradle swíðe gestánden. ac he
hwædere næfre gódes wýrces ne blon. ac he hwilum ealle niht ðúrhwacode on
halgum gebedum.

254 ac] 'a' written with a short ascender.
259 ad[h]u]c 'ad huic' MS. 261 ac] 'a' written with a short ascender. 267 [bíd]
supplied, damage to membrane; B 'bit' with 't' expunged and 'ő' superscript. 268
and 271 ac] 'a' written with an ascender. 276 [ð]am] 'ő' supplied, damage
7 ðeah ðe se lichama wære mid ðære untrumnesse swiðe geswænced hwæðere
his mód wæs ða hærd. 7 gefsonde on drihten.
7 ðanne he reste. ðanne wæs his seo ædeleste rest on his [hæran]. öðe elcora
on nacodre eorð[an].
ða bædan hine ða his discipulos. ðæt hie mostan hwilcehwega uncyrne
strætnesssa him under gedón for his untrumnesse ða cwæð he
285 'bearn ne biddað ge ðæs
7a.º 'ne gedáfenað cristan men // ðæt he elcora swa he efne on acsan 7 on dúste.
'gife ic ðow oðres ðinges biosene. onstelle. ðanne agyhte ic'
288 7 á ðær he læg. ða he hæfde his háná upweardes. 7 mid his ðágnnum up to
héofonum lócode. ðider his módgedanc ðasæd wæs.
ða bædan hine ða godes ðéowas ða ðe ðider to him cóman ðæt hie hine mústan
on ðóre sidan oncyrran. 7 ða cwæð he to heom.
Sinite fratres sinite celum potius respicere.
'Forlætæð gebroðra' he cwæð ða spræce. 'forlætæð me héofon. swiðor geséon
8Or 294 ðanne eorðæan ðæt minum gáste siao to drihtne wég // [pyder] ic feran scyl.'
ða he ða ðús [spræ]c. ða geseah he ðane awergedan gást dócefol ðær únfeor
standan
297 ða cwæð he to him.
Quid adstas cruenda [bestia] nihil in [me] finiste rep[er]i[es].
' Hvæt stándest ðú wælgrim. wildeor
300 'nafast ðu. méde aht æt me. ac me scyl abrahámés béarm þæt is seo éce rés
donfón.'

---

279 7 ðeah ðe se lichama wære mid ðære untrumnesse swiðe geswænced hwæðere
his mód wæs ða hærd. 7 gefsonde on drihten.
7 ðanne he reste. ðanne wæs his seo ædeleste rest on his [hæran]. öðe elcora
282 on nacodre eorð[an].
ða bædan hine ða his discipulos. ðæt hie mostan hwilcehwega uncyrne
strætnesssa him under gedón for his untrumnesse ða cwæð he
285 'bearn ne biddað ge ðæs
7a.º 'ne gedáfenað cristan men // ðæt he elcora swa he efne on acsan 7 on dúste.
'gife ic ðow oðres ðinges biosene. onstelle. ðanne agyhte ic'
288 7 á ðær he læg. ða he hæfde his háná upweardes. 7 mid his ðágnnum up to
héofonum lócode. ðider his módgedanc ðasæd wæs.
ða bædan hine ða godes ðéowas ða ðe ðider to him cóman ðæt hie hine mústan
291 on ðóre sidan oncyrran. 7 ða cwæð he to heom.
Sinite fratres sinite celum potius respicere.
'Forlætæð gebroðra' he cwæð ða spræce. 'forlætæð me héofon. swiðor geséon
8Or 294 ðanne eorðæan ðæt minum gáste siao to drihtne wég // [pyder] ic feran scyl.'
ða he ða ðús [spræ]c. ða geseah he ðane awergedan gást dócefol ðær únfeor
standan
297 ða cwæð he to him.
Quid adstas cruenda [bestia] nihil in [me] finiste rep[er]i[es].
' Hvæt stándest ðú wælgrim. wildeor
300 'nafast ðu. méde aht æt me. ac me scyl abrahámés béarm þæt is seo éce rés
donfón.'

---

281 [hæran] 'earan' MS; see Commentary. 282 on] 'nihtne' added(?) above by
retoucher: uncertain traces of original 'hte'. eorð[an] 'eorðan' MS. 294
[pyder] five letter space, supplied from B, damage to membrane. 295 [spræ]c
'spræ' supplied from B; retoucher has added the word at the end of the top line of
the page; there is space for the word at the beginning of the second line, where the
membrane is damaged, and final 'c' is visible. 298 [bestia] supplied from B, 'uram'
MS. [me] supplied. reperies] 'reperres' MS; see Commentary. 300 ac] 'a'
written with an ascender.
ða he ða ðis cwæð ða weard his andwīta swa bliðelic. 7 his mód swa gefēonde. 303 þæt hie éfne méahtan on ðan gærre ongytan þæt he gástlicne geféan geseah. 7 þæt hine hēofonic wered gefēode. 80v 7 he ða swa ge/feonde þas sarlican [:::::::] ofogelet. 7 hine ða úre dri[hten] to 306 his ðam hēofonlican rice [ge]nam. 7 hwæt wé nu gehérað hu eaðmodlice ðes éadiga wer his lif for gode gelýfode. ða hwile ðe he her on wurolde wæs. 7 hu fraðer edlean he æt urum drihtne onféng. 309 7 nu ða hwile ðe ðecos wúrold stándeð his god mæn mærsið geond éalne ðísne middangéard. on godes cyricean. 7 hé nu mid eallum halgum to widan féore 8\r on heofona rice for drihtnes // [onsyne] gefehð. 7 blissad. 312 ac utan [we la] tyligan þæt we ðyses eadigan weres lif. 7 his dæda onhyrigan ðæs ðe úre gemet sige. 7 utan hine biddan ðæt he us si[gle] on heofonum ðingere wið úrne drihten. nu we her on eordan his gemynd wróðið. 315 to ðan ús gefúltumige ure drihten. se leofað. 7 ricsað. a butan ænде. AMEN:-

305 [::::] damage to membrane, see Commentary. dri[hten] 'hten' supplied, damage to membrane. 306 [ge]nam 'ge' supplied from A, space for two letters at end line, membrane partly intact, but no letters visible, 'nam' at beginning next line. 311 [onsyne] seven letter space, supplied from A, damage to membrane. 312 ac] 'a' written with an ascender. [we la] four letter space, supplied from A, damage to membrane. 313 si[gle] retoucher has written 'site', 'g' not visible. 315 a] written with an ascender.
References to A readings are by page and line number to Scragg, *Vercelli Homilies*, but readings are quoted from the facsimile edition, Celia Sisam, ed., *The Vercelli Book: a Late Tenth-Century Manuscript Containing Prose and Verse*, EEMF, 19 (Copenhagen, 1976); references to B readings are by page and line number to Morris, *Blickling Homilies*, but readings are quoted from Willard, *Blickling Homilies*; references to the Latin source are by page and line number to Jacques Fontaine, ed., *Sulpice Sévère. Vie de Saint Martin*, 3 vols, Sources Chrétienes, 133 (Paris, 1967), I, pp.248-344.

13 iuliani The name, printed here as correctly inflected for the genitive, appears to have been copied as 'iuliam', as Scagg prints in his collation (Scragg, 292/13, but 'I' is not added as there indicated); A has 'iulianus', B has 'iulius. At line 2, 'martinus' is not inflected for genitive case, but B has 'martines' (A has a variant reading), and, as also with 'constantines' at line 13, it seems usual to apply OE inflections to Latin names in this text; cp. e.g. line 86, 'sancte martine' (dative, ABC), line 176, 'sancte martines' (genitive, ABC, 'sancte' for 'sancti'?). The Latin is 'sub rege Constantio, deinde sub Iuliano Caesere' (Fontaine, 254/8-9).

17-18 se æresta dæl his onginnen. 7 lifes *BT* s.v. 'onginn', sense IV, cites this reading from B (Morris, 211/29-30) as an example of a sense 'activity, active life'. Thus the reading has sense, but there is underlying tautology between 'æresta dæl' and 'onginnen' (with sense 'beginning') and between 'onginnen' (with sense 'active life') and 'lifes', all of which perhaps makes for an infelicitous reading. A and BC have variant readings here: in A 'onginnen' is a noun (nominative feminine) meaning 'beginning' and occurs in a parenthetical explanation of preceding 'gecristnode' ('catechumenenum fieri', Fontaine, 254/12-13): 'þæt bi ðio onginnen 7 se æresta dæl þære fulwithe' (Scragg, 292/19-20).

18 wæron for 'wære' (B 'wære', Morris, 211/30).

23 wæpnum The Latin is 'uittis' (Fontaine, 256/3); A has 'synnum' (Scragg, 292/25); B has 'wæpnum' (Morris, 213/5): the BC reading can only be regarded as error, resulting in loss of
sense. The only apparent explanation of the error is eye skip from 'healicum' back to 'woroldlicum' (not in A) at line 21.

25 hæfde micle lufan. 7 ealle wærnesse The Latin is 'multa ... benignitas, mira caritas' (Fontaine, 256/3-4), and 'wærnesse' therefore stands for 'benignitas'. *BT* s.v. 'wærnness' cites B (Morris, 213/7) and paraphrases 'was very considerate', but this stretches the sense 'caution', given by *BT*. A has 'swettesse' (Scragg, 292/26) which is closer to 'benignitas' (*BT* sense II), although it may be that some other word (e.g. 'pwærnnes', with sense 'agreeableness', or some compound with 'wel') lies behind both A and BC readings. At line 29 where A has 'forhæfndnesse' (Scragg, 293/2) and C has 'forwyrnednesse' for Latin 'frugalitatem' (Fontaine, 256/6), B has 'wærnesse' (Morris, 213/10). Perhaps the BC reading in the present case carries the sense 'restraint', but this still seems a forced reading of the OE and is little closer than the sense 'caution' to Latin 'benignitas'.

32 wære for 'ne wære' in A (Scragg, 293/33) or 'nære' in B (Morris, 213/14).

orenre A has 'clerican' (Scragg, 293/33), B has 'öperre' (Morris, 213/14). The clause '7 ðeah ðe ... gefullad' renders Latin 'necdum tamen regeneratus in Christo' (Fontaine, 256/9-10). The reading in A seems best, though B's reading is tenable, recalling the reading in the A text at lines 17-18 (see note above): if to become a catechumen (to be 'gecristnod') is 'se æresta dæl' then to be baptized ('gefullad') could be the 'öperre', the second part. *BTSupp.* s.v. 'endebyrdnes' sense IXa, 'a stated form of rite', accepts the reading in B. *Cp.* lines 91-3, 'on dære cyrican endebyrdnesse', where ABC agree, except that A has 'eðfer' for BC 'on dære'. *BTSupp.* s.v. 'orne' gives only a pejorative sense 'excessive'. Only if a non-pejorative sense (e.g. 'bounteous') is proposed can C's 'orenre' be other than nonsense, unless Scragg's suggestion in his glossary that 'oren' could be an adjective meaning 'earlier' can be accepted. Sense has already been lost in C due to failure to negate the verb (see preceding note).

35 earmre for AB 'earme'.

43 7 ðaorne weninga 'weninga' here seems to be an adverb, giving the sense 'and then he may await the morrow expectantly (not knowing what it may bring)', but *BT* s.v. 'wenunga' gives only the sense 'by chance'. B has '7 ða weninge' (Morris, 213/24), where 'weninge' also seems to be an adverb (it does not give good sense as a noun: *cp.* Morris's translation). A has 'in weninge', and
the adverbial phrase is unambiguous, though lack of ‘7 danne’ or ‘7 doa’ weakens the reading in A (Scragg, 293/42).

54-55 ne him nænge are gedon In A, ‘woldon’ follows ‘gedon’, and ‘nænge’ then seems to be subject of ‘woldon’ (Scragg, 294/53, and see his Commentary note). In C ‘nænge’ is unambiguously an adjective qualifying ‘are’; comparable uses of adjective ‘næg’ are at lines 65 and 198. B has ‘ne him nængre are gedon’ (Morris, 213/35): it would perhaps be to force the sense of the reading to propose a translation such as ‘nor treat him with any mercy’, and B’s ‘-re’ inflection is probably error.

57 ða ... wolde A has ‘pe ...’, making a relative clause as might be expected (Scragg’ 294/55). B has ‘ða’ with C (Morris, 215/1-2): an adverb clause, ‘when ...’, makes an acceptable reading, which represents, perhaps more closely than the relative clause in A, the Latin ablative absolute construction, ‘aliis misericordiam non praestentibus’ (Fontaine, 256/22-3).

66 ongæton for ‘oncudon’, the AB reading; BT s.v. ‘oncunnan’ gives only the sense ‘accuse’, and it is hard to believe that ‘ongæton’ and ‘oncudon’ were considered synonymous; ‘hie sylfe ... oncudon’ renders Latin ‘gemere’, which Fontaine translates ‘regrettènt’ (Fontaine, 258/3).

Þæt hie mete hæfdon ‘mete’ for A ‘ma’, B ‘mare’ (Scragg, 294/64, Morris, 215/12-13); in C the failure of logic between this clause and the following pair of correlative clauses can only be avoided if the latter is read as being dependent, along with the former, on preceding ‘wistan’.

72 wæs ... beboden translating ‘iubetur’ in the Latin (Fontaine, 258/9), which, like the OE, does not specify the agent.

gyrnicor B also has the comparative (‘geornlicor’, Morris, 215/17). A has ‘geornlice’ (Scragg, 295/69). The Latin has superlative ‘diligentissime’ (Fontaine, 258/8). The use of the comparative form to intensify an adverb seems unusual in OE.

76 mid swa cuðre stefne The Latin is ‘clara uoce’ (Fontaine, 258/10). B shares C’s reading (Morris, 215/21. A has ‘mid switlore stefne’ (Scragg, 295/72). Although BT gives an instance of ‘cubre stefne’, s.v. ‘cub’ sense III, in that case the OE translates Latin ‘familiari ... uoce’. Though ‘cub’ can have the Modern English equivalent ‘clear’, it seems that usually the sense is ‘evident, manifest’, and the present use of ‘cub’ to refer to clarity of sound is unusual. DOE gives no separate entry for an adjective ‘cub’, treating the word as only past participle of ‘cunnan’; s.v.
'gecūþ' DOE gives only sense 'known. famous', and gives one queried instance of an adverb 'cuþe', 'clearly', but with the sense 'clearly to the intelligence'. Of the several instances of 'cuþe' in B, there is one instance where the word is used of the physical senses, but there it is of sight not hearing: 'heora eagum aa se weg wær up to heofonum cuþ to locienne' (Morris, Homily XI, 125/28-9). Again at line 79 BC have 'sviðe cuþ' and A has 'sweotol', but there the words are more certainly synonymous (no equivalent in the Latin). At line 160, where BC have 'hie svutolice ... ongeatón' (Morris, 219/36, 'sweotolice ... ongeaton') A has a corrupt reading 'he swu cuþe' (Scragg, 299/152), behind which, it is possible, may lie an unusual use of adverb 'cuþe'.

77 nu ðu eart gecristnod ær his fulwihte 'gecristnod ær his fulwihte' renders the Latin 'adhuc catechumenus' (Fontaine, 258/11). In the Latin and in A Christ's speech is in the third person (Scragg, 295/73-4). Like C, B has the speech addressed to Martin, and for C 'his' B has 'þinum' (Morris, 215/22).

89 on oferhydãg ahafe. on mannisc. wundor The Latin is '[non] in gloriam est elatus humanum' (Fontaine, 258/18-19). A has '... ne in mennisc wuldore' (Scragg, 296/81-2), and the conjunction seems to be required. B lacks the conjunction: 'on mennisc wuldor' (Morris, 215/33). Though AB 'wuldor' translates Latin 'gloria' more exactly than does 'wundor' in C, C's reading is perhaps less difficult than AB's. One might wonder whether 'on oferhydãg', was meant to replace 'on mennisc wuldor'. I follow Scragg in accepting the form 'oferydãg' (AB 'oferydãg') as a noun: see Vercelli Homily II, Scragg, 60/71 and Commentary note.

92 beforan ær ðam. iii. gær. gecristnod The abbreviation mark for 'm' of 'ðam' may be added. 'ðam' is presumably to be read as a neuter demonstrative pronoun, referring to the occasion of Martin's baptism, with 'iii. gær' an example of the accusative of extent of time (see Mitchell, OE Syntax, para.1383). In A and B 'ðam' appears as 'þa': 'beforan ær (A ær beforan) þa þreo gear', and 'beforan ær' appears to be an adverbial phrase, with 'þa þreo gear' the accusative of extent of time (Scragg, 296/84, Morris, 215/35-6). The C reading seems to resolve an ambiguity whereby either 'beforan' or 'ær' wants, as it were, to be a preposition before the demonstrative adjective 'þa'.

94 forlet he ealne ðane wyroldfolgœ sænne A has 'forlet ... an' (Scragg, 296/85). B has 'forlet ...' (Morris, 215/36-217/1). The reading in A is presumably based on the infinitive
'anforlætan', and the separated intensifying prefix takes on an adverbial function (cp. Mitchell, *OE Syntax*, I, paras 1060-80). In none of the examples in *BT* and *Supp.* s.v. 'anforlætan' is 'an-' separated. The Latin is simply 'relictæ militia' (Fontaine, 262/3). In the C reading the verb 'anforlætan' seems not to have been recognized and 'an' is perceived as an adjective, possibly analogously to e.g. 'deadne forleton' at line 146. See also line 156 and note below.

98  eac ðan ða ... A has '7 eac þan þæt eaðdæde wæs þa ...' (Scragg, 296/89-90). B has 'to eacan þon þe ...' (Morris, 217/5). The C reading appears to preserve the state of the text with omission of 'þæt eaðdæde wæs', which is required for full sense. The omission error is also in the B text, and I cannot see that the B reading is quite successful in restoring sense. The C reading is further corrupted by the error 'selfne' for 'self'. There is no equivalent in the Latin.

101  be gewyrhtum. ymbe drihtnes lare There may be a sense 'true to the Lord's teaching in his deeds', but if so the expression seems very unclear. B has the same reading (Morris, 217/9). A has 'biwyrdre in drihtnes lare' (Scragg, 296/93); 'biwyrdre' is not a word otherwise recorded, but it seems possible that there was some such word meaning 'eloquent' (see Scragg's note and glossary entry, and cp. the note in Szarmach, *Vercelli Homilies IX-XXIII*, p.64). There is no equivalent in the Latin.

108  ealle. iii. gær The Latin is 'triduum' (Fontaine, 266/26). The error is not in B, which has 'ealle þry dagas' (Morris, 217/17). A has 'ealle dogor' (Scragg, 297/100).

109  ða gemette he ðane man. forðerendne The Latin is 'examine corpus inuenit' (Fontaine, 266/26). A and B have '... forðerendne' (Scragg, 297/101, Morris, 217/18). In C present for past participle is certainly error, but the reading still has sense, that Martin found the man dying, who then suddenly ('fierlice') died unbaptized, though of course it is not proper that a saint should have permitted such a thing to happen.

111-12  swa unrote wæran. ymbe þæt lic 'ymbe' is ambiguous, either local 'around the body', or figurative 'about the body'. A has 'swa unrote leton ymbe þæt lic, 7 hie utan stodon' (Scragg, 297/103-4). B has 'swa unrote ymb þæt lic utan stodon' (Morris, 217/20-1). The brothers are inside the dead man's cell, as is clear from lines 116-17, and 'utan' in the A reading is
inappropriate. Confusion may have arisen if there were an original preposition 'ymbutan', which may have been divided, as in the B reading, which may then be original in this particular.

113-14 was him ... wyrce 'was painful to him'. At lines 139 and 261 the usage includes the preposition 'on': at line 139 'on' is a superscript addition, seemingly by the copyist. A and B have the preposition only in the last instance, where in A 'on' is superscript. (Scragg, 306/260, Morris, 225/28). See Mitchell, *OE Syntax*, I, para.1409.

119 A has 'para dryhtnes mildheortnesse' (Scragg, 297/112) for Latin 'misericordiae Domini' (Fontaine, 268/9). B shares the C text omission of 'dryhtnes'.

unforht A has 'unforhtlice' and the adverb seems preferable to the adjective in C. However, C's reading probably represents the Latin, where the adjective is 'intrepidus'. B has 'unsorh' (Morris, 217/29).

120 astyrodan for 'astyrode'.

125 lyfiende The participle is inflected in B, 'lifgendne' (Morris, 217/36). Cp. note to line 109, above.

131 oðer wundor. ðisse anlicnesse 'ðisse anlicnesse' is presumably genitive, and the Modern English translation suggests itself 'another miracle of the same kind'. On the difficulties of classifying descriptive and partitive genitives, see Mitchell, *OE Syntax*, I, paras 1288-1303. I take the reading in C, be grammatically sound, though A and B have instead 'oðer wundor ðisum onlic' (Scragg, 298/124, Morris, 219/7). Similar sentences are at lines 179 and 209 (Scragg, 300/168 and 302/200, Morris, 221/18 and 223/13-14). In the first of these the C reading agrees with that in A and B, 'ðisum onlic', except that C has 'gelic'. At line 209, A has 'þyssum onlic' again, but B has 'ðæm onlic, and C has 'ðæs anlicnesse'. There is an appearance that the adjective 'onlic' has been rejected in the tradition represented by C, and that the variation of the reading in B at line 209 has been imperfectly executed ('ðæs' for 'ðære').

137 ðærlice deað geswolten. þæt ... B has '...deaðe ... swa þæt ...' (Scragg, 298/129; A lacks a leaf). I find both readings difficult.

awyrde B has 'awyrde', 'destroyed', but the C reading is correct: *BT* and *Supp.* attest a verb 'awyrgan', 'to strangle', and the Latin is 'laqueo [with a noose] sibi uitam extorsisse' (Fontaine, 270/5-6).
138 earmlice B has 'earmlicne', agreeing with 'dead', which is preferable to the adverb in C.

155 foresetnesse The Latin is 'propositum' which Fontaine translates 'profession' (Fontaine, 274/2).

156 an ne forlet In view of the separated prefix 'an' in the verb 'anforlætan' in the A reading at line 94 (see note above), I print 'an ne', though 'anne' could be read for adjective 'ane', accusative plural agreeing with 'þæt lægen. 7 ða foresetenesse' in line 155. B has 'anforlet' (Scragg, 299/148: A lacks a leaf).

159-60 his larum gelyfan The reading in B is perhaps more apt: 'his larum fylgean', 'follow his teaching' (Morris, 219/36). A has 'his lare lufian' (Scragg, 299/151-2). There is no corresponding Latin.

168, 171, 172, 173, 176 legt A 'lig', B 'leg'. BT s.v. 'liget' gives only the meaning 'lightning' for the form in C.

209 ðæs for 'ðære' or ðísse'; see note to line 131 above.

229 ne he ... gedemde. ne he wite ne nam The sense of the latter clause seems to be 'nor did he (wrongfully) exact any penalty'. A has 'ne ne witnode', 'nor punished' (Scragg, 303/217), which seems preferable. B has nothing corresponding (Morris, 223/32), and has 'fordemde' for 'gedemde' in C,'demde' in A. The Latin is 'neminem iudicans, neminem damnans' (Fontaine, 314/6-7).

230 geraehte It can hardly be ascertained whether 'gereccan' or 'geræcan' is the verb here. Neither verb suggests an obvious translation, but both are attested in a range of senses, the nearest being BTSupp. s.v. 'gereccan' sense VI, 'to reprove, reproach', but one wonders whether this sense is merely incidental to context. Thus BTSupp., ibid., gives the example 'æfter þæm þe þa wif hie swa scondlice geraeht hæfdon' (now Bately, OE Orosius, p.33, lines 23-4), but BT gives the same example s.v. 'geræcan', and translates 'geraeht' as 'addressed'. The Latin is 'uidit' (Fontaine, 314/13). A has 'geseh', B has 'fund' (Scragg, 303/218, Morris, 223/34). It may be that C preserves an error 'geræhte' for 'geseh', but sense may not have been altogether lost in the error: a translation, no less awkward than the OE may have been, could be 'no one accounted him angry ...'
230-1 heofonlicne blis for AB 'heofonliche blisse'. _MCOE_ shows only one instance of masculine 'blis', 'se lytla blis' in Vercelli Homily IV, but this is probably due to copyist error (Scragg, 91/9 and Commentary note). At line 160 'blisse' is accusative feminine.

235 gecyðed hæfde so also in A, but in B the verb is used transitively, 'þæt gecyðed hæfde' (Scragg, 304/224, Morris, 225/3-4).

247 sarlice geberdan B has '... gebærdon', A has '... gebærdon for heora hlaforde' (Scragg, 305/247, Morris, 225/14). Scragg glosses 'gebærnan' 'weep', though _BT_ gives only sense 'bear oneself, behave' (_Supp.._ cites the _B_ reading). The reading with 'for heora hlaforde' in A seems to require the sense 'grieve', but the reading in _BC_ could have the sense 'behaved sorrowfully'. For preceding 'weoplan' in _A_ and _C_, _B_ has 'waran ... unrote', suggesting that 'weoplan' has been avoided because 'wepan' and 'gebærnan' could be exactly synonymous. The sentence, line 247, renders the Latin 'tum uero maeror et luctus omnium et uox una plangentium', with three words with sense 'grieve, lament'.

250 In _B_ the Latin (not in _A_) does not interrupt the OE and correctly cites the source, 'Cur nos, pater, deseris? aut cui nos desolatos relinquis?' (Morris, 225/15-16, Fontaine, 338/18-19).

252 gif du hie ne scyldest All three copies have 'hie' here, where 'us' would avoid ambiguity. The Latin has 'nos' (Fontaine, 338/20).

255 ða he ða ðas word gespréæ. 7 ðis gehyrde The only way this reading can fit the context is if 'ðas word' is understood to refer back to 'heom sæde ðæt he ða forðeran scolde' at lines 245-6. _A_ 's reading is more apt: 'ða he ða heora sprec thylicce gehyrde' (Scragg, 305/254). _B_ shares _C_ 's reading, but lacks '7 ðis gehyrde' (Morris, 225/21).

263-4 ðæt he ðane gesawe Whether 'ðane' is read 'ða ne', as it may be in _A_ (Scragg, 306/262), or as an accusative masculine demonstrative as it appears in _B_ ('þone', Morris,225/29), or even as a mispepping of 'ðanne', there seems to be a failure of sense here. Napier, 'Notes on the _Blickling Homilies_',' _Modern Philology_, 1 (1903-4), p.307, suggested that 'ða' in _A_ and _C_ is a feminine demonstrative referring to 'onsyne', while Szarmach, _Vercelli Homilies IX-XXIII_, p.66, seems to favour _B_ 's reading, with 'þone' referring to Christ and with lack of negation, but both these seem forced readings. The first part of the sentence, lines 261-3, 'wæs ... wyrce', loosely renders the Latin 'nimirum inter spem maeroremquœ positus dubitaut pæt quid mallet', while
the 'ge ... ge ...' clauses (the first of which is lacking in B) render the sense of the rest of the Latin sentence completely: 'quia nec hos deserere nec a Christo uolebat diutius separari' (Fontaine, 340/3-5). A participle (e.g. 'gedeled') might be expected after 'wære', but 'þæt he ðane gesawe' is too long to be a corruption of a single word.

274-5 ðæs ðe ... gewinnan meahte B has 'þæs þe he ...' (Scragg, 306/272; A lacks a leaf), but 'gewin', line 273, could serve as subject of 'gewinnan meahte' through the relative 'ðæs ðe'.

However, I find 'ðæs ðe' syntactically difficult in both B and C readings.

281-2 7 ðanne he reste ... The sentence renders the Latin 'nobili illo strato suo in cinere et cilicio recubans' (Fontaine, 340/23-4). B also has 'earan' for 'hæræn' (= 'cilicio'; Scragg, 307/279; A lacks a leaf).

283 discipulos B has the same spelling.

284 strætnessas B has 'streownesse' (Scragg, 307/280; A lacks a leaf). The Latin is 'stramenta' (Fontaine, 340/25). BT gives two instances of a feminine noun 'stræt' meaning 'bed', noting 'from Latin' ('stratus'). 'Strætness' could, therefore, be a genuine word meaning 'bedding'.

286 ðæt he elcora swa he efne ... In B the reading is 'ðæt he elles do butan swa he efne ... lige' (Scragg, 307/282-3; A lacks a leaf). The whole sentence, line 285, renders the Latin 'non deket ... christianum nisi in cinere mori' (Fontaine, 340/26) and it may not therefore be postulated that the B reading, with 'lige', lies behind C's reading, though the latter certainly lacks an original verb rendering 'mori'. An elliptical expression, without the B text 'do butan', may not be exceptional.

298 [bestia] The manuscript reading 'ura', with abbreviation mark mistakenly placed over '-a', probably stands for 'uestra', as Szarmach, Vercelli Homilies IX-XXIII, p.67, suggests, misread from 'bestia'. The Latin source has 'bestia', and continues 'nihil in me, funeste, reperies' (Fontaine, 342/9. B, like C, has 'repperes', but lacks 'funeste' (C 'finiste'), which Fontaine translates 'maudit'; 'funeste' is not represented in the OE.

305 [:::::::] Scragg supplies 'wyrold' (308/298), but other spellings are, of course, possible.

ofoget It seems impossible to account for this form, and I cannot improve on Scragg's suggestion that the 'ge-' prefix has intruded into an otherwise unrecorded verb, infinitive 'ofalætan' (see Scragg's Commentary note to his line 298). 'ofo' is at the beginning of a
manuscript line and the end of the preceding line is lost due to membrane damage. Napier,
'Notes on the Blickling Homilies', p.308, notes 'read "hofo"?', but without comment.
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Fol. 13v Hand A

Die Handschrift enthält lateinischen Text, der durch die Schreibweise und die Aufteilung in einzelne Bedeutungsgruppen charakterisiert ist. Der Text scheint aus einer religiösen Quelle stammen zu können, möglicherweise aus einer liturgischen oder theologischen Schrift.

natrum quoniam s. repulgenda
sicut hic ac bumpede repud
Caladu aplierna papul hyate
acredid ardum pare al
butan acebre mundwopinx.
Seovapul himse anuypide
etad negyng ode ic natlyh
dhuhten repulgenda pmhur
seperid repide ylle frondulan dehio
Jeepad. darchho natlye neprngode
epulhi ten hipt optad. nytetyn
pauryse orpybole. repadu ip
parpe Atcopen elek. hih onopun
pnnynna rhionyddan gysta
dyrrnflanon manftr.
panne heo opdam lichaman zanget.
seopon sedum heobid beyo hip re pann
sinne: phalagan zodes anglas: hic
læred toparadysium : pann epyd se
saul: todam anglam: phe she læred
sala mycel is deos bliss per ongela
dad cam. Ond pann e andspergead.
hirp: phænglas: zepedad mære bliss
per is onheoponum: segeappad. Ond
panne seo saul eft cewd micel is pe
byrim pene on hyman: pann e and-
speread hirpe phænglas: zepedad
pycymest palae tonyman pyn
ne: oad pann epyd se saul: pyd
danside: mycel is hyf leocht pere on
cam. Ond pann e andspergead hirpe
phænglas: hirsped: zepemest mæ
pe leocht mære: oad pann e phæ
phalagan anglas: hyde: zastelinz ne.
quod inflammabilis, maduecitapud
be epid, eala inalecceptam, hi eop
ip, nonipunadanc ne, pedaz pede dph
ren oncomed, co eop, mid epe, lizum
he don sopbagined, ealle hys rapidep
peapad yhon pepad ypyde brecphic
ealle sade nudod, um phit pyr neppe.
yhon mazone elle eopulice man zp
peon ealha cyninga, cyning cumende
apei heaponap, polcun, mid hys dam
mclan spym me, yhon bead ealle
zepcarpe ypide onkipnede beap
pan him, heapon bid zepaldan
onda yd yppappa boc, yeap bid
advipgod, ycell zepcarpe bead on
kipned grunne bid zepipned
ond ecpo ymonanepel.