Anglo-Saxon England

<http://journals.cambridge.org/ASE>

Additional services for **Anglo-Saxon England**:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

The Homiliary of Angers in tenth-century England

Winfried Rudolf

Anglo-Saxon England / Volume 39 / December 2010, pp 163 - 192

DOI: 10.1017/S0263675110000098, Published online: 22 March 2011

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0263675110000098

How to cite this article:

Winfried Rudolf (2010). The Homiliary of Angers in tenth-century England. Anglo-Saxon England, 39, pp 163-192 doi:10.1017/S0263675110000098

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

The Homiliary of Angers in tenth-century England

WINFRIED RUDOLF

ABSTRACT

Latin manuscripts used for preaching the Anglo-Saxon laity in the tenth century survive in relatively rare numbers. This paper contributes a new text to the known preaching resources from that century in identifying the Homiliary of Angers as the text preserved on the flyleaves of London, British Library, MS Sloane 280. While these fragments, made in Kent and edited here for the first time, cast new light on the importance of this plain and unadorned Latin collection for the composition of Old English *temporale* homilies before Ælfric, they also represent the oldest surviving manuscript evidence of the text.

The surviving manuscript evidence for exegetical preaching to the Anglo-Saxon laity before the turn of the millennium is fairly limited. Of the important Carolingian *temporale* collections probably addressed to the common public, neither the homiliary of St-Père de Chartres nor the collections of Hrabanus Maurus and of Landpertus of Mondsee are witnessed by tenth-century Latin manuscripts written in England.¹ Instead, our best supporting proof for the potential preaching to lay congregations in the tenth century is provided by Old English homilies contained in the well known collections of the Blickling and Vercelli manuscripts.² Both vernacular collections reveal the availability of

¹ The earliest known English copy of the St-Père homiliary is Canterbury, Cathedral Library and Archives, Add. 127/12; see H. Gneuss, *Handlist of Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts: a List of Manuscripts and Manuscript Fragments Written or Owned in England up to 1100* (Tempe, AZ, 2001), no. 210, dated s. xi^m. This fragment is, however, dated to s. x^{3/3} by R. Gameson, *The Earliest Books of Canterbury Cathedral: Manuscripts and Fragments to c. 1200* (London, 2008), pp. 79–83. A description of these three homiliaries is given by H. Barré, *Les homéliaires Carolingiens de l'école d'Auxerre* (Vatican, 1962), pp. 1–30. For a discussion of the audiences, see the seminal paper by M. Clayton, 'Homiliaries and Preaching in Anglo-Saxon England', *Peritia* 4 (1985), 207–42, at 213–16. She distinguishes three types of Carolingian collections: those used in the Night Office; those for private devotional reading by all literate people; and those for preaching to the ordinary laity (p. 216). She also notes the limited manuscript evidence for preaching to the laity (p. 217).

² The editions are *The Blickling Homilies of the Tenth Century*, ed. R. Morris, EETS os 57 and 59 (London, 1880), and *The Vercelli Homilies and Related Texts*, ed. D. G. Scragg, EETS os 300 (Oxford, 1992). The audiences of the Blickling homilies remain unidentified (see M. McC. Gatch, 'The Unknowable Audience of the Blickling Homilies', *ASE* 18 (1989), 99–115), but this does not generally exclude their preaching *ad populum* (cf. Clayton, 'Homiliaries and

a wide variety of source materials, among them the St-Père collection, but their exegetical homilies seem to be restricted to those important liturgical feasts which were fixed in the capitula *De festiuitatibus* of the early ninth century.³ The extent to which the laity was addressed at other occasions of the liturgical calendar, the possible contexts for such addresses and the languages used in delivery in the different parts of the Carolingian empire continue to be questions hotly debated.⁴ It was deemed possible by some scholars in the past that a consolidation of preaching in the course of the Benedictine reform improved the theological comprehension of the gospels by the Anglo-Saxon laity.⁵ Many of those claims, however, lacked more supportive evidence from manuscript sources, as it was solely the homiliary of St-Père which could be traced in English copies before the year 1100.⁶

Among the achievements of more recent years in shedding new light on Anglo-Saxon preaching resources, the discovery of four folios now known to scholars as 'The Taunton Fragments' (Taunton, Somerset County Record

Preaching', p. 225). For some Vercelli homilies lay audiences were most recently proposed by S. Zacher, *Preaching the Converted: The Style and Rhetoric of the Vercelli Book Homilies*, Toronto AS Ser. 1 (Toronto, 2006), 39.

³ The St-Père collection was first identified as a source of certain Vercelli homilies by J. E. Cross, *Cambridge, Pembroke College MS 25: a Carolingian Sermonary Used by Anglo-Saxon Preachers*, King's College London Med. Stud. 1 (Exeter, 1987), and H. Spencer, 'Vernacular and Latin Versions of a Sermon for Lent: "A Lost Penitential Homily" Found', *MS 44* (1982), 271–305. Other homilies in both collections draw on authors as diverse as Caesarius of Arles, Sulpicius Severus, Ephrem Syrus and John Chrysostom, alongside a number of canonical and apocryphal sources, all of which they make available to a non-monastic audience. I refrain from giving a full list of publications on the sources here and refer instead to the entries in *Fontes Anglo-Saxonici: a Register of Written Sources Used by Anglo-Saxon Authors [CD-ROM Version 1.1]* (Oxford, 2002) and *Sources of Anglo-Saxon Literary Culture: a Trial Version*, ed. F. M. Biggs, T. D. Hill and P. E. Szarmach (Binghamton, 1990) and following volumes, as well as the valuable contribution by C. Wright, 'Old English Homilies and Latin Sources', *The Old English Homily: Precedent, Practice and Appropriation*, ed. A. J. Kleist, Stud. in the Early Middle Ages 17 (Turnhout, 2007), 15–66, esp. the bibliographical orientation at 60–6. The compliance of the *temporale* material in both collections with the capitula *De festiuitatibus* has been thoroughly discussed by N. M. Thompson, 'The Carolingian *De festiuitatibus* and the Blickling Book', *The Old English Homily*, ed. Kleist, pp. 97–119.

⁴ See esp. M. McC. Gatch, *Preaching and Theology in Anglo-Saxon England: Ælfric and Wulfstan* (Toronto, 1977), p. 37. Gatch remains sceptical concerning the use of exegetical material for lay audiences. Thompson is undecided on the matter ('*De festiuitatibus*', p. 108), whereas Rosamond McKitterick argues strongly in favour of a wider tradition of public preaching, including the expounding of the gospel (see her *The Frankish Church and the Carolingian Reforms, 789–895* (London, 1977), pp. 80–114). Her claim is based on the *Admonitio generalis* of 789, a text strengthening the parishes and the pastoral rights of their priests.

⁵ See McKitterick, *The Frankish Church*, esp. pp. 81–4; Clayton, 'Homilies and Preaching', pp. 225–6, and above, n. 5.

⁶ See Gneuss, *Handlist*, nos. 131, 210 and 461e.

Office, DD/SAS C/1193/77) must be considered a true landmark.⁷ These pages, written in the middle of or late in the eleventh century, contain a bilingual expansion of a portion of a homiliary which Helmut Gneuss first identified as the one also contained in the late-twelfth-century Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 343.⁸ Thanks to the work of Aidan Conti, both texts – Taunton and Bodley 343 – can be shown to represent the text of a collection that Raymond Étaix has described and termed the Homiliary of Angers (HA).⁹ The textual transmission of this homiliary is clearly remarkable, as it survives in at least fourteen more or less complete manuscripts and five fragments, the oldest among those being of Spanish, English, French and perhaps Italian origin. Below I give Étaix's list with supplements and corrections by Conti and myself.¹⁰

- A Angers, Bibliothèque municipale, 236 (provenance St Aubin, Angers, s. xi²);
- B Budapest, Országos Széchényi Könyvtár, Clmae 481 (provenance Northern Italy, s. xi²);¹¹
- C Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, lat. oct. 359 (perhaps Spain, s. xii^{mid});¹²
- E Engelberg, Stiftsbibliothek, Cod. 44 (? , s. xiii^{im});¹³
- G Grenoble, Bibliothèque municipale, 278 (provenance Chartreuse of Pierre-Châtel (Grand-Chartreuse), s. xii);
- J Cambridge, St John's College, C. 12 (probably England, s. xiii);

⁷ The fragment was first noted by Dr Nigel Ramsey in the Taunton archives in the middle of the 1990s and subsequently brought to the attention of Anglo-Saxonists by Prof. Simon Keynes in 2002. The text was then recorded in H. Gneuss, 'Addenda and Corrigenda to the *Handlist of Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts*', *ASE* 32 (2003), 293–305, no. *756.8 (p. 303). An edition with detailed commentary, translation, partial facsimile and discussion was provided by M. Gretsche, 'The Taunton Fragment: a New Text from Anglo-Saxon England', *ASE* 33 (2004), 145–93.

⁸ H. Gneuss, 'The Homiliary of the Taunton Fragments', *Neuq* ns 52.4 (2005), 440–2.

⁹ A. Conti, 'The Taunton Fragment and the Homiliary of Angers: Context for New Old English', *RES*, ns 60 (2008), 1–33. R. Étaix, 'L'homélaire carolingien d'Angers', *RB* 104 (1994), 148–90.

¹⁰ Étaix, 'Angers', p. 149 and the descriptions on pp. 158–74, and Conti, 'Taunton', pp. 8–10, where valuable details on the dating are given in the footnotes.

¹¹ My emendation of the dating relies on the recently published catalogue of A. Vizkelely, *Mittelalterliche Handschriften der Széchényi Nationalbibliothek* (cod. lat. 405–556) (Budapest, 2007), p. 69. I am grateful to András Németh for bringing this publication to my notice. The dating is also backed by S. Janner and R. Jurot, *Die handschriftliche Überlieferung der Werke des heiligen Augustinus*, vol. IX/2 Schweiz, Verzeichnis nach Bibliotheken, Veröffentlichungen der Kommission zur Herausgabe des Corpus der lateinischen Kirchenväter, ed. Kurt Smolak, no. XX, Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-Historische Klasse, Sitzungsberichte, vol. 688 (Vienna, 2001), 101.

¹² A Spanish entry 'esta in todo' of the sixteenth century at the top of 1r may confirm some Spanish provenance, but some doubts about the script remain.

¹³ In adding this manuscript of HA to the list I rely on Vizkelely's correct identification as given in his catalogue (*Mittelalterliche Handschriften*, pp. 70–81).

- K Klosterneuburg, Stiftsbibliothek, CCl 888 (? , s. xiii);
- L Linz, Bundesstaatliche Studienbibliothek, 222 (provenance Augustinian canons of Waldhausen, Austria, s. xiv);
- M Madrid, Biblioteca de la Real Academia de la Historia, Aem. 39 (Spain, s. xi¹);
- O Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 343 (West Midlands, England, s. xii²);
- R Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 12664 (provenance regular canons of St Pancras, Redshofen, Austria, s. xii);
- T Toledo, Archivo y Biblioteca Capitular, 33–1 (Spain, s. xii);
- U Uppsala, Universitetsbibliotek, C 60 (partly English, s. xii and xiii);
- V Uppsala, Universitetsbibliotek, C 148 (? , s. xii²);
- X_a Albi, Bibliothèque municipale, 15, 157v (? , s. xi);
- X_b Benevento, Biblioteca Capitolare, 20, fols. 35v–36r (? , s. xii);
- X_d San Daniele del Friuli, Biblioteca Civica Guarneriana, Cod. 4, fols. 113 and 115 (? , s. xii–xiii?);
- X_g Graz, Universitätsbibliothek, Cod. 829, fols. 4v–5r (? , s. xiii);
- X_o Saint Omer, Bibliothèque municipale, 794, fols. 67r–69r and 70v–71r (Saint-Bertin, s. xii);
- f_T Taunton, Somerset County Record Office, DD/SAS C/1193/77 (England, s. xi^{2mid}, ?2, ?3/3).

Conti indicates that this list cannot be exhaustive,¹⁴ and apart from my supplementing it with the Engelberg manuscript (E), we may add to it two fragments of another HA manuscript, which can be found as flyleaves, fols. 1 and 286 of London, British Library, Sloane 280 (see Plates II and III).¹⁵ These fragments, around which the following discussion centres, are certainly of no little importance to Anglo-Saxon preaching before the turn of the first millennium and the dissemination of HA throughout Europe. They were written in England some time during the second half of the tenth century, probably in Kent, and thus represent, according to our present knowledge, the earliest textual witness of HA.¹⁶

¹⁴ Conti, 'Taunton', p. 10.

¹⁵ *Catalogus librorum manuscriptorum bibliothecae Sloanianae* (London: Privately printed, n.d.) [Printed catalogue of Sloane MSS 1–1091; two copies in the manuscripts room at the British Library, but neither has a proper title page, nor was a bibliographical description to be found in the library catalogue], p. 42. The second fragment is also mentioned as 'Omelia in xiii. cap. Matthæi, 12th cent.' in E. J. L. Scott, *Index to the Sloane Manuscripts in the British Museum* (London, 1904), p. 261. Following the system of sigla introduced by Étaix I assign the abbreviation f_s to this fragment. See also Plates II (fol. 1v) and III (fol. 286v).

¹⁶ For dating and localization, see the argument below. Gneuss lists the leaves as being the fragment of an unknown Latin homiliary, s. x?. See his *Handlist*, no. 498.0.

quando mirabilia dñs fecit quanta nos
relinquit quanta pronos sustinuit; Deſte
angustia nos liberauit. Dequale tenebre
nos eripuit; Sic faciamus utadeum pex
emplum suum ueniamus. ipse pñs dñs
dignetur nos mluinaye quicum :-

In illo tempore. Dixit ihs discipulis suis.
Beati oculi qui uident que uos uidetis ante
aduentum dñi fñs km̃i. Multi prophete
et reges cupiebant uidere dñm; Cupie
bat rex dauid. Cupiebat esaias ppheta.
et heremias; Tamen et non uiderunt eū
ambulantem sup tñam et predicantem
sicut apti fecerunt. Sed post modum
uident in spū. Inde dñx. Beati qui ui
dent que uos uidetis. Et alit̃ potest
intelligi de ista parabola; Apti habe
bant oculos spiritales uolebant tñna
respicere. sed celestia; Similiter et au
res quia uolebant uerba uana audire.
Sed semp uerba diuina audiebant
et predicebant. exemplum monstra
bant. habemus in nos fñs oculos spi
ritales ut non respiciamus terrena.

et eternam ipso adiuvante

Nullo tempore; Dixit ih̄s discipulis
suis; Simile est regnum caelorum
thes̄ auro abscondito. magro. et̄t.
Thes̄ auros iste f̄s̄ km̄ quem dñs
adsimilante intellegitur. sapientia
di. Ager significat mundum. Sicut
thes̄ auros crescit in edificatione agro
in abscondito. Ita sapientia xp̄i lucrat
hominem in vitam eternam agrū
relinquit omnia iudicia mundi.
Em̄t regnum celorum ieiunando
penitendo. orando. Vigilando. eli
mosinis faciendo; Leuius em̄tus cū
post ea capus possideatur; Simile
margarita preciosa. sapientiam
di demonstrat p̄pse debemus eme
re p̄ bona opa et amare et custodire.
Iterum simile est regnum caelorum
sagena missa in mare. Sagena quos
inveniret bonos et malos. ad lucus
trahit; Mare istum sc̄m demonstrat.
Sagena. uerbum predicationis osten
dit. Lucus intellegitur. finis mun
di. Ibi ueniunt et caperebunt quales

THE MATERIAL CONTEXT

The two flyleaves in question were used to protect a composite codex of the fifteenth century, the main part of which holds the famous medical text known as *Rosa Anglica* by John of Gaddesden (c. 1280–1360), followed by three anonymous tracts on urine.¹⁷ The manuscript belonged to William Romsey (d. 1501), principal of St Alban Hall, Oxford, as an ownership entry on 2v reveals.¹⁸ After his death the codex was kept in the library of All Souls College, Oxford, before it entered the collection of Sir Hans Sloane (1660–1753).¹⁹ The catalogue of Sloane Manuscripts in the British Library Manuscript Reading Room mentions the flyleaves as ‘Homiliarum duarum fragmentum, seculo, ut videtur, duodecimo descriptum.’²⁰

THE FRAGMENTS

When exactly the original manuscript containing our fragments was dismembered is uncertain. The leaves could have been part of just a booklet, but it seems more plausible that they were taken from a codex that held substantial parts, if not the full cycle, of HA. This may become clearer when we look in detail at the contents of the fragments and the related manuscript tradition. The flyleaves do not share any wormholes with their adjacent folios in Sloane 280, nor is there any correspondence in holes between the *Rosa Anglica* and any of the quires holding the texts on urine. It seems possible therefore that the fragments were added at the very time when the medical texts were united in what is now Sloane 280.²¹ This may have happened in the late fifteenth or

¹⁷ John of Gadesden, *Rosa Anglica practica medicine a capita ad pedes* (Pavia, 1492). The *Rosa Anglica* was compiled around 1314 and circulated widely before it became the first printed book on practical medicine in the English language in 1492. In Sloane 280, it comprises fols. 9–261. The tracts on urine were written on fols. 262–85 in different hands of the late fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. Cf. *Catalogus librorum manuscriptorum bibliothecae Sloanianae*, p. 42. See also S. Ayscough, *A Catalogue of the Manuscripts preserved in the British Museum hitherto undescribed*, 2 vols. (London, 1782) II, 609.

¹⁸ N. R. Ker, *Records of All Souls College Library 1437–1600*, The Oxford Bibliog. Soc. (Oxford, 1971), p. 165. Romsey is listed as principal of St Alban Hall in 1452 in A. Chalmers, *A History of the Colleges, Halls and Public Buildings attached to the University of Oxford, including the Lives of the Founders*, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1810) II, p. 483. The entry reads: ‘Liber Willelmi Romesey quem fecit scribi.’ An electronic image of 2v with the ownership entry is offered by the British Library on <http://www.bl.uk/onlinegallery/onlineex/illmanus/slomanucoll/o/011slo000000280u00002v00.html> (accessed 28-07-2009). Romsey’s ownership entry, added some time during the second half of the fifteenth century, might only have concerned the *Rosa Anglica* and the first two tracts on urine, because that part of the manuscript is consistent in parchment quality and ruling.

¹⁹ See the upper *ex libris* at 2v and Ker, *Records*, p. 165.

²⁰ *Catalogus librorum manuscriptorum bibliothecae Sloanianae*, p. 42.

²¹ The final tract on urine (fols. 270–85) is written in a different booklet, on a different type of parchment with separate ruling. It was also heavily trimmed for binding.

early sixteenth centuries, as some scribbles of that date with names of famous doctors of medicine on 286r suggest. According to Ker the entire manuscript was rebound in the nineteenth century.²²

We are fortunate that the two fragments in Sloane 280 show two typical *In illo tempore* incipits, followed by the first sentence of the pericope (one on 1v, the other on 286v). It is thus possible to identify portions of not just two, but four HA homilies: nos. 39 and 40 on fol. 1, for the thirteenth and fourteenth Sunday after Pentecost, and nos. 43 and 59 on fol. 286, for the seventeenth Sunday after Pentecost and an unknown feast day.²³ The sequence of each of these two pairs matches the order of items in manuscripts L, M, O, T, U and perhaps others.²⁴ It differs, however, from the order in manuscripts B, G, K and the manuscript from Angers itself (A), where no. 43 is followed by no. 44 and no. 59 is commonly placed outside the *temporale* at the end of the cycle. In all manuscripts matching the sequence of the Sloane fragments, homilies nos. 41 and 42 invariably fill the gap between nos. 40 and 43.

<i>Sloane 280 (f.)</i>		<i>Madrid, Aem. 39 (M)/Bodley 343 (O)</i>	
1r	no. 39 end	no. 39	(13th Sunday after Pentecost)
1v	no. 40 beginning	no. 40	(14th Sunday after Pentecost)
	[. . .]	no. 41	(15th Sunday after Pentecost)
	[. . .]	no. 42	(16th Sunday after Pentecost)
286r	no. 43 end	no. 43	(17th Sunday after Pentecost)
286v	no. 59 beginning	no. 59	(unknown, Virgin?)

If we assume the same order of homilies for the codex that originally held our fragments, the portion of text missing between what are now 1v and 286r would comprise the end of homily no. 40, the full text of nos. 41 and 42, and finally the beginning of no. 43. I count *c.* 1170–1200 words in manuscripts M and O for this section. Since our two fragments contain *c.* 150 words per

²² Ker, *Records*, p. 165.

²³ I follow the numeration of homilies introduced by Étaix, 'Angers', pp. 149–57.

²⁴ See especially Étaix, 'Angers', pp. 158–73. MSS C and R are short of the entire section in question due to a loss of leaves. I further assume here that fol. 1 preceded fol. 286 in the original carrier manuscript of the Sloane fragments, as there is little reason to assume that a compiler would have changed the order of Sundays after Pentecost. A somewhat unusual sequence is, nonetheless, found in Bodley 343, possibly due to a confusion of booklets. On this problem, see Conti's discussion in his 'The Circulation of the Old English Homily in the Twelfth Century: New Evidence from Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Bodley 343', *Precedence, Practice and Appropriation: the Old English Homily*, ed. A.J. Kleist, Stud. in the Early Middle Ages 17 (Turnhout, 2007), 365–402, at 373, and *Ælfric's Catholic Homilies: the Second Series Text*, ed. M. Godden, EETS ss 5 (London, 1979), xxxvii, and *Old English Homilies from MS Bodley 343*, ed. S. Irvine, EETS os 302 (Oxford, 1993), xxiv–xxviii. The sequence, however, does not lead to a complete inversion of items within the *temporale*.

page, a rough estimate yields a possible gap of eight pages, which would equal two bifolia.²⁵ The two flyleaves share one wormhole²⁶ and were written on in inverse flesh-hair/hair-flesh order, giving sufficient cause to consider the fragments as a disjointed bifolium of the same quire. Yet as textual expansions or reductions are frequent in HA homilies, it is necessary to retain some caution.

Such reservations at the back of our minds, we should nonetheless consider that the cutting of bifolia at the fold was common practice in the (re-)binding process of later centuries, as was the subsequent resizing of the parchment to adapt the flyleaves to the size of the codex. This is also true for our two fragments, which were both trimmed in the lower margins to a size of *c.* 23.1cm × 16.0 cm, damaging the single-column text portion on fol. 1 by one line each on the bottom of the recto and the verso side. Ascenders of trimmed letters are still visible on both sides of fol. 1. The textual parallels in other manuscripts suggest that the single column body of text on fol. 286 remains fully intact and covers twenty-six ruled lines of an area of *c.* 22.1cm × 12.2 cm. Smaller tears at the edges of the leaves were mended. Given their function as flyleaves the folios are otherwise in reasonably good condition.

SCRIBE, SCRIPT AND DATE

Both *In illo tempore* incipits show a rubricated and exposed capital I of two lines in height,²⁷ succeeded by a capital N of the main scribe. This scribe writes in an Anglo-Caroline minuscule that resembles what T. A. M. Bishop described as Style II.²⁸ David Dumville has suggested that instead of a firmly fixed script type, this Style II should rather be seen as an 'attitude' and 'a willingness to admit an admixture of Insular elements'.²⁹ He further argues, with the help of 'The Leofric Missal' (Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 579) that 'a mature Style-II Anglo-Caroline had been developed at Christ Church, Canterbury by the 980s'.³⁰ Indeed, the hand of the Sloane fragments shows features of Style-II hybridity, reinforced by a somewhat square aspect of the script, suggesting that the scribe was possibly more used to writing Anglo-Saxon square minuscule. His **a** sometimes shows a very straight and high back (*angustia*,

²⁵ This calculation assumes that the layout and degree of abbreviation in the text missing remained more or less constant.

²⁶ Other holes in the leaves may well be the result of the expected damage that flyleaves suffer over time.

²⁷ The layout shows a gap of a single line before the beginning of each homily, giving the initials even more prominence. Unlike other manuscripts, no titles were added in these spaces.

²⁸ See T. A. M. Bishop, *English Caroline Minuscule* (Oxford, 1971), p. xxii.

²⁹ D. Dumville, *English Caroline Minuscule and Monastic History: Studies in Benedictinism, A.D. 950–1030*, (Cambridge, 1993), p. 101. He further mentions Style II as representing 'a tendency . . . rather than a tightly defined and artistically exclusive script-form' (p. 87).

³⁰ *Ibid.* p. 103.

1v.3),³¹ but in a few cases it is round and virtually open at the top (*illuminavit*, 1r.16; *tacere*, 286r.3). The **bs**, **ds** and **ps** were often written with a square belly (*dominum*, 1v.6; *cupiebant*, 1v.10). The always straight ascenders of **b**, **d**, **h** and **l** are often round rather than spatulate on top (*uidere*, 1v.10). Occasionally, **c** (*cecus*, 1r.15) and **e** (*sep[ar]avit*, 1r.14; *emitus*, 286v.14) are prominently horned. In its ligatures **e** is usually raised, such as in **ea** (*ea*, 286v.15), **ec** (*fecit*, 1r.23; *cecidit*, 286r.8), **em** (*plebem*, 286r.20), **en** (*sapientiam*, 286v.17), **er** (*uerba*, 1r.17), **et** (*et*, 1v.10, 286v.19), and **eu** (*eum*, 286r.24). There is only a single instance of the ampersand (1r.3, before *uenerabant*), **et** is otherwise spelled out. Another point for a relation of the fragments to Canterbury may be made from the occurrence of the s-shaped abbreviation mark (*ihesus*, 1v.7; *fratres*, 1v.24). To express the phonemes /e(:), ɛ(:)/ three graphemes were used: **æ** (*liberavit*, 1r.1; *aeternam*, 286v.10, where **e** is distinctively raised), **ae** (*caelorum*, 286v.3) and **e-caudata** (*ecclesiam*, 286r.11), which shows an extravagant descender. The **ct**-ligature is notable for a gap between the letters (*electos*, 1r.1 and 1r.15), the slope being quite restrained. It is used habitually in the fragments, but we cannot tell if this was true for the entire manuscript. Minims of **m** (*semper*, 1v.22) and **n** (*audiebant*, 1v.22) are sometimes round, showing no serifs. The scribe avoids using the round Caroline minuscule **s**, the only exception being *litus* (286v.22) at the end of the line.

The script's most distinctive characteristic may be the shape of the letter **r**, which the scribe consistently writes with a prominent, pointed descender (*possidetur*, 286v.15). This feature is generally considered to be typical of manuscripts connected with the Canterbury scriptoria and the origin of our fragments may gravitate towards this scribal centre.³² The long **r** is sometimes arched rather than hooked on top; in such cases it closely resembles the Anglo-Saxon lower minuscule **s**. In fact, at times the scribe has confused the letter **r** with **s** while copying, writing *nosse* for *nos re(suscitauit)* (286r.22) and *emitur* for *emetur* (286v.14). This confusion indicates that he had some problems with Latin endings and word division. Further evidence for his limited command of Latin might be deduced from the text's muddling of relative pronouns and conjunctions beginning with **q**, which could be the result of the scribe's misunderstanding of abbreviations in the exemplar.³³ That he failed to recognize abbreviations at times is evident from the erroneous form *sepanit* (1r.14).³⁴ It is

³¹ The examples given in brackets are not exhaustive.

³² See for example T. A. M. Bishop, *English Caroline Minuscule*, p. 6 (no. 8). The style is described as predominant at Canterbury by David Dumville, *Caroline Minuscule*, p. 18. I am much indebted to Dr Peter Stokes for discussing some of these details with me and for confirming my assumptions on the date of the fragments.

³³ For deviations in these parts of speech, see the apparatus to the edition.

³⁴ See Bodley 343, where the abbreviation occurs in exactly the same place.

difficult to ascertain how accustomed he was to writing the long **r**, but it was certainly not an entirely unestablished and unacceptable letterform in his scriptorium. If our scribe was only in the early stages of learning to write the **r** with descender, he may well have modelled it upon a letter-form he was accustomed to write, namely Anglo-Saxon lower **s**. It is not surprising that such a practice would result in occasional confusion, considering that the rigid alphabetic segregation between Latin and Old English that would later become customary was not yet established by the late tenth century.

To assign the fragments to the scriptoria of Canterbury on account of the features analysed seems an attractive option. However, a final attribution to either St Augustine's or Christ Church would be fraught with complexity, as the split **r** might favour the former, the square aspect and closed **a** the latter place of origin.³⁵ It may be possible, following David Dumville's suggestion, to observe in the fragments one of several 'experiments with Caroline minuscule' carried out in both Canterbury scriptoria 'early in Dunstan's pontificate'.³⁶ An alternative could be to assign the fragments to a minor centre, where some of the features of Style II arrived somewhat later in the tenth century. This could, of course, include Kent as much as the West country, a place of origin that has been suggested for the Taunton Fragments.³⁷ For the present discussion I shall assume a date of s. x² and a probable Kentish origin.

PUNCTUATION, ACCENTUATION, SPACING AND CORRECTIONS

The scribe seems to be struggling to separate Insular features from an ideally purged Caroline minuscule; he also seems to have had difficulties separating words themselves. Possibly relating the syllable *auro* to 'gold', he separates *thes/auro(s)* (286v.4 and 5). Reflecting oral delivery, the preposition *in* is often combined with the succeeding word (*in/edificatione*, 286v.8, *in/mare* 286v.21). The same is true for the conjunction *et* (*et/predicantem* 1v.14; *et/amare*; *et/custodire*, 286v.19; *et/malos* 286v.21), reminiscent of the 'prefixed' tironian note often found in samples of Anglo-Saxon minuscule. In some cases a wider gap or punctuation suggests a conscious marking of the clausula at the end of syntactic units. Finally, scribal insecurities about the nature of Latin word-classes and grammatical endings are possibly evidenced by the conglomerated *ut/ad/eum* (1v.4). The scribe mainly uses simple punctus and punctus versus.³⁸

³⁵ I rely here on those key features of script outlined by Dumville (*Caroline Minuscule*, p. 102) and the samples he refers to in Bishop (*English Caroline Minuscule*, pp. 4–7, plates no. 5 and 6).

³⁶ Dumville, *Caroline Minuscule*, pp. 97–8.

³⁷ Cf. Michael Gullick's opinion quoted in Gretsch, 'Taunton Fragment', p. 193. Bishop conjectures on a possible Glastonbury provenance for some of the manuscripts that carry features similar to the Sloane fragments (cf. *English Caroline Minuscule*, plates nos. 1, 2).

³⁸ One of the puncti versi (1v/24) might be by a later hand.

Both types of punctuation are common before capitals, but in this position the punctus elevatus is also used once (286r.25). The simple punctus is rarely used rhetorically (e.g. before *sed celestia*, 1v.19), but when employed thus it structures enumerations. A positura concludes each homily at the end of the last line. Accent marks have been placed over the monosyllabics *nós* (1v.1), *uós* (1v.17), *bóc* (286r.9) and *síc* (286r.20). Occasionally, *nós* (1r.3 and 6) is preceded by a notable gap, probably to avoid misinterpretation as a Latin o-declension accusative-plural-ending of the preceding word. A corrector of the eleventh century has made interlinear insertions of single letters in a neat Anglo-Saxon minuscule in three instances, correcting *elimosinis* into *elimosin\ a/s* (286v.13) and emending *Dequ\ a/le* (1v.2) and *re\ d/dit* (286r.9).

THE TEXT

The Homiliary of Angers is a collection covering the *temporale anni* with homilies for the Sundays and feast days.³⁹ In some manuscripts, it is accompanied by homilies from similar Carolingian collections, such as the so-called Bavarian or the Italian homiliaries (B) or the Homiliary of St-Père de Chartres (A, G, V).⁴⁰ This last homiliary was identified by James Cross as an important source for several homilies in Old English, notably some of those contained in the Vercelli Book.⁴¹ What is most peculiar about HA, however, is its relative originality of composition, despite its often noted limitations of style and its rather plain and terse exegesis.⁴² According to Étaix, the tenth-century composer of HA almost never used the traditional biblical commentaries of Ambrosius, Augustine, Jerome or Bede (unlike the compilers of the homiliaries mentioned above).⁴³ Rather, the homilies reveal analogues to the works of Caesarius of

³⁹ For the structure and order of pericopes of HA, see Étaix, 'Angers', pp. 149–57. A very useful table of contents of the Latin homilies in manuscript O and their correspondence to the items in manuscript A is printed by Conti, 'Circulation', pp. 400–2. The order of pericopes is in accordance with Chavasse's type 3B (A. Chavasse, 'Les plus anciens types du lectionnaire et de l'antiphonaire romains de la messe', *RB* 62 (1952), 3–94). This is confirmed by Étaix, 'Angers', p. 175, and Conti, 'Taunton', p. 3.

⁴⁰ See Étaix, 'Angers', pp. 149–73. The homiliaries are described in H. Barré, *Les Homéliaires Carolingiens*, pp. 1–30.

⁴¹ Cross, *Cambridge, Pembroke College MS 25*, pp. 232–5. For a parallel edition of homilies and their St-Père source see *The Vercelli Homilies*, ed. Scragg. Other such homilies can be found in the editions of Assmann and Tristram (cf. *Angelsächsische Homilien und Heiligenleben*, ed. B. Assmann, Bibliothek der angelsächsischen Prosa 3 (Kassel, 1889), repr. P. Clemoes (Darmstadt, 1964), homilies no. 11 and 12, pp. 138–50, and *Vier altenglische Predigten aus der heterodoxen Tradition, mit Kommentar, Übersetzung und Glossar sowie drei weiteren Texten im Anhang*, ed. H. L. C. Tristram (Kassel, 1970), homily no. 3, pp. 162–72).

⁴² Étaix, 'Angers', p. 175; Conti, 'Circulation', p. 376.

⁴³ For a summary of sources, see Étaix, 'Angers', pp. 175–6. The date of composition is mentioned on p. 177.

Arles and Eusebius Gallicanus, but also, more importantly, some continental Irish influence in the use of works of Pseudo-Jerome and abridged quotations from Pelagius. In some cases Gregory's *Homeliae in Evangelia* can be identified as a guiding influence, but their topics occur mostly in recycled form.⁴⁴ As a result, HA homilies are concise in their syntax, repetitive in pericopal paraphrase, selective and disjointed in exegetical thought, but they also contain paraenetic and enumerative sections. Indeed, many items in HA are almost too short to have constituted a homiletic reading of suitable length and they occasionally lack close argumentative cohesion. Étaix's suggestion of the texts representing a framework or blueprint (*canevas*) for preaching therefore deserves much support.⁴⁵ On this basic canvas of an HA homily, longer deliveries could easily be sketched out, coloured in and ornamented, either in oral performance or whenever a new manuscript version was copied.

There is plenty of evidence for substantial textual instability in the variant versions of HA. While the known manuscripts occasionally vary in their sequence of items, although they generally adhere to the Proper of the Season, they also show deviations in length and ample reworking of formulations which are notable in a Latin text, but perhaps not so atypical of the homiletic genre as such. Regrettably, as HA is not yet available in a complete edition, my discussion mainly focuses on the relation of the Sloane text to the eleventh-century witnesses in manuscripts A, B and M.⁴⁶ Under the fortunate circumstances described above, it would have been a miraculous coincidence if the leaves had also shown a textual overlap with the Taunton Fragments. Unfortunately, this is not the case. There is also no correspondence to the text of the thirteenth-century English manuscript J, which contains only the full versions of homilies nos. 5–10 and 14 of HA.⁴⁷ The twelfth-century manuscript Bodley 343 (O), however, offers a complete textual

⁴⁴ Conti, 'Circulation', pp. 378–80.

⁴⁵ Étaix, 'Angers', p. 177. Such a model function has also been suggested for the St-Père homiliary by Barré (*Les homéliaires Carolingiens*, pp. 17–24).

⁴⁶ Two homilies were published by J. F. Rivera Recio, 'El «homiliarium gothicum» de la Biblioteca Capitular de Toledo, homiliario romano del siglo IX/X', *Hispania Sacra* 4 (1951), 147–67 at 162–3. Étaix published nine of his attributed sixty homilies in 'Angers', pp. 148–90, among them the homily for the 13th Sunday after Pentecost (pp. 183–4). To my knowledge no full edition is currently in the making. A complete transcript of MS O is available in A. Conti, 'Preaching Scripture and Apocrypha: a Previously Unidentified Homiliary in an Old English Manuscript, Oxford Bodleian Library, MS Bodley 343' (unpubl. PhD dissertation, Univ. of Toronto), pp. 228–346. For the edition of the fragments, I have worked from microfilms of MSS A and O and digital images of MSS B and M. I owe special thanks to the Bibliothèque Municipale d'Angers, to András Németh at the National Széchényi Library, Budapest and to Esther González-Ibarra at the library of the Real Academia de la Historia, Madrid for providing these images.

⁴⁷ See M. R. James, *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Library of St John's College, Cambridge* (Cambridge, 1913), no. 62.

parallel and even shares, as we have seen, the same sequence of items as the fragments. In adding O to manuscripts A, B and M in the apparatus I hope to elucidate the sizeable textual variation and shed some light on possible interdependencies and transmissions of the single versions.

As an exegetical text HA deserves to be acknowledged as an attempt at original exegesis. Any such effort by any medieval author, no matter how hapless or haphazard, deserves our deep respect and empathy as an expression of humility and praise of God. Admittedly, however, the text of HA remains quite plain in many places and is not short of the occasional (however unintentionally) comic expression. These are largely caused by some pedestrian, tautological or far-fetched allegorical significations, reinforced at times by the influence of vulgar Latin varieties in the manuscripts and some scribes' limited command of church Latin when copying.⁴⁸

One telling example can be found in homily 39, on the pericope in Mark VII.31–7, the healing of a deaf and mute man. In clear-cut exegesis the preacher matches the name of the city of Tyrus with the apocalyptic angst of his contemporary audience, Sidon with the veneration of idols and the Dekapolis⁴⁹ (by numerology) with the Ten Commandments. The sudden appearance of a blind man (*Ille cecus*. . . , 1v.15), who is entirely absent from the biblical pericope, seems bizarre at first glance. We must ask therefore, if the reading of the pericope was intended, and if so, if it was always read out in full in performance.⁵⁰ In theory, the composer of HA could have remembered the pericope incorrectly, or simply mixed up the Latin word for 'deaf' with 'blind'. Yet the latter seems unlikely considering the frequent and correct use of 'mutus' in the text. To excuse the composer by assuming he understood 'cecus' as a more general term for 'limited in perception' is also difficult. The confusion has left its mark in other manuscript versions. Where the fragments have *qui antea in ciuitate erat* (1r.18), manuscripts A, B, M and O show *cecitate* instead of *civitate*, which makes more sense in correspondence to the earlier *cecus* but reinforces the variation from the pericope. The answer could be that exegetical signifiers of other similar pericopes were freely associated and, being accumulated, were then muddled up in the interpretation. This would seem

⁴⁸ I have refrained from recording all these deviations in the critical apparatus. For the quality of the Latin text, see, for example, Gretsche, 'Taunton Fragment', pp. 182–3.

⁴⁹ It is further clear that the scribe here, like all other copyists, was ignorant of Greek, as 'Dekapoleos' would be a genitive. Later in the text 'thesauros' is considered as a nominative as well.

⁵⁰ Most manuscripts show only the initial sentence of the pericope, finished by the typical *et reliqua*. Notably, in the Madrid manuscript a much smaller font is used for the gospel text. We must, however, take into account that pericopes could be read from separate gospel lectionaries. For early English lectionaries, see Gneuss, *Handlist*, nos. 502f, 522 and 942.

probable as the occurrence of the blind man is not the only case where an HA homily adds exegetical thought that would make more sense in relation to another pericope, as Mechthild Gretsch has convincingly demonstrated.⁵¹ We may then have some doubts as to whether the homilies, thus concocted, could actually be plausibly performed following a full gospel reading. I shall return to this matter shortly.

We might next take a closer look at the Sloane text and its early parallels. Defining the exact relationship of the fragments to other HA manuscripts and their transmission is a complicated matter that exemplifies the problems so often posed by homiletic texts. As shown above, simply in their sequence of homilies, the Sloane fragments (henceforth f_s) stand closer to the Madrid (M) manuscript than to those of Angers (A) and Budapest (B), which could in fact both be pre-dated by the Madrid copy.⁵² This close relationship is evident from the conspicuous placing of homily no. 59 after homily no. 43, evidence that – regarding the limited text portion preserved by f_s – has reached us by auspicious chance alone. No. 59 is a homily for an unknown feast day and expounds the pericope of the treasure hidden in a field (Matthew XIII.44). Both Étaix and Conti deem it possible that the text could have been used for the common of a virgin.⁵³ Given the homily's placement in the *temporale*, the feast for which homily 59 was intended must have been celebrated between 6 September (the earliest possible date for the seventeenth Sunday after Pentecost) and 17 October (the latest possible date for the eighteenth Sunday after Pentecost). The most likely feast of more than just regional importance that springs to mind is the nativity of the virgin Mary on 8 September. Although this would be an early date within the interval outlined, it is the feast for which we find a homily on the same pericope in the Italian homiliary, in the collection of Smaragdus and some versions of Haymo's homiliary.⁵⁴ If indeed homily 59 was bound to this fixed feast, we would face here the classical case of a homily for an unchanging feast day inserted in the *temporale* cycle of movable feasts and Sundays. This proved to be an unwieldy arrangement for some users, so that it is understandable that the homiliaries in A, B, G and K placed no. 59 at the end of the cycle, outside the *proprium de tempore*. This singling out of homilies

⁵¹ Gretsch also notes such confusions of pericopal signifiers in the Taunton fragments ('Taunton Fragment', pp. 188–9).

⁵² The manuscript is best described in E. R. Garcia, *Catálogo de la sección de códices de la Real Academia de la Historia* (Madrid, 1997), pp. 257–64. She dates it to s. xi. A closer look at the hand of M suggests a scribe of the first half of that century (see Étaix, 'Angers', p. 165). I have consulted the criteria of Visigothic script outlined by E. A. Lowe, 'An Unedited Fragment of Irish Exegesis in Visigothic Script', *Palaeographical Papers 1907–1965*, ed. Ludwig Bieler. 2 vols. (Oxford, 1972), II, pp. 459–65, + 4 plates.

⁵³ Étaix, 'Angers', p. 159, Conti, 'Circulation', p. 401.

⁵⁴ H. Barré, *Les homéliaires Carolingiens*, p. 223.

for the common of saints might have been a later development in the history of HA, in line with the stricter separation of *temporale* and *sanctorale* found in some manuscripts of later centuries.

In its first three items (parts of nos. 39, 40 and 43) f_s is textually close to A and M to about the same degree. At times, B shows some markedly independent variants and expansions, extending for example the expounding of the blind and deaf in no. 39. O revises frequently, as might be expected after two centuries, but longer additions are relatively rare. The picture changes with homily 59, where manuscript A not only places the homily at the end of the cycle but also shows substantial extensions and independent wording. The pericope in Matthew XIII.44 compares the heavenly kingdom to a treasure hidden in a field, then to a merchant seeking goodly pearls and finally to a net cast into the sea. In the exegesis of these three comparisons the close relation to Pseudo-Jerome becomes visible. His *Expositio Evangeliorum* reads:

Simile est regnum coelorum thesauro abscondito, thesaurus, id est, Christus vel sapientia: in agro, id est Ecclesia, sive in Scripturis divinis. Vendidit omnia, id est, reliquit villa, seu res terrenas: emit agrum, id est, regnum coelorum. Homo negotians, qui quaerit doctrinam divinam, invenit unam margaritam, id est, sapientiam Christi; vendidit omnia, id est, vitia. Simile est regnum coelorum sagenae missae in mare, per sagenam, verbum praedicationis ostenditur; in mare, id est, in mundo; ex omni genere piscium congreganti, id est, omne genus humanum. Audit verbum Dei secus littus, id est, prope finem mundi.⁵⁵

HA freely alters and adds to this antecedent source; the field also signifies the world here (*Ager significat mundum*. 286v.7), an interpretation commonly found in other HA homilies. However, a conspicuous difference occurs in the expounding of the precious pearl. The fragments and manuscripts B, M and O quite concisely link the pearl to God's wisdom (286v.16). Conversely, the version in A inserts the full repetition of a pericopal sentence, mentioning the merchants (entirely absent in B, M, O and f_s) who will reach the heavenly riches (as symbolized by the pearl), if they sell all their goods (that is, to avoid all vices). What follows then is a long-winded exhortation on greed as the root of all evil. Quite unexpectedly (in the context of HA), this lengthy interpolation in A is not without stylistic attraction, as it employs some elegant wordplay in formulations such as *uicia et terrena mundi cupiditate despiciunt. et caelestia diuicia acceperunt* (107r.13–15).

Similar textual differences appear in the reading of the image of the net cast into the sea. All versions follow Pseudo-Jerome in declaring that both good and bad things (that is, signifying humans) are carried to the shore (signifying

⁵⁵ *Patrologia Latina*, ed. J.-P. Migne, XXX, col. 552C-D.

the end of the world). Likewise, the net itself denotes the word of preaching, resembling the roughly woven text(ile) that HA offers to the reader.⁵⁶ But again, A is more extensive, comparing the net to Christ too, possibly inspired by the image of him as a fisher of men when gathering the disciples and asking them to act as the same.

The overall impression is of A as slightly more faithful to Pseudo-Jerome in this passage, but this should not be taken as solid evidence for the manuscript attesting an earlier version of HA than that in B or M. Manuscript A also extends the source here, so that we are probably dealing with a profound revision of no. 59, in the course of which the homily, alongside others for the common of saints, was finally placed at the end, outside the *temporale* cycle.

Further notable variations between *f*_s and its parallels can be found in the final doxologies of homilies 39 and 43, which show the textual ‘fringing’ which is a characteristic phenomenon of medieval homilies.⁵⁷ The text of *f*_s remains by far the shortest of all versions in its conclusions. Equally characteristic is the variance in a list of sins in homily 43 (286r.13).⁵⁸ Manuscripts A, M and O all agree in adding the sins of avarice, gluttony, lust and deceitfulness and their remedies, which is reminiscent of similarly opulent catalogues in the vernacular corpus.⁵⁹ The list, thus increased to seven sins (albeit not exclusively deadly ones), could reflect the ornamentation of the aforementioned blueprint that a preacher could easily extemporize. For example, manuscript B is equally elaborate, exchanges bad speech and deceitfulness with pride and discord, varies the order of sins, and mentions alternative variants (*adulterium aut luxuria uel fornicationem*, 73r.6).

It is also possible that the catalogue in *f*_s was shortened intentionally, which could indicate that its users did accept its incomplete state, since they were satisfied with the overall guiding structure of the text, not necessarily expecting it to be a fully fledged and deliverable homily. We must, however, take into consideration that it is usually in enumerative sections that homilists exercise maximum freedom of textual intervention. These sections were often memorized for their encyclopaedic contents, so the abridged list of sins in *f*_s could be read as a signal that would trigger the full catalogue when reading the text. Conspicuously, manuscript B adds the word *sequitur* (73r.12) at the end of its

⁵⁶ A similar signification occurs in the homily for the sixth Sunday after Pentecost (cf. Gretsch, ‘Taunton Fragment’, p. 155, lines 7–12).

⁵⁷ By ‘fringing’ I intend to denote a generally higher degree of textual variation at the beginnings and ends of parallel versions of medieval homilies.

⁵⁸ The address of sins and their remedies in this catalogue responds to the exhortatory command of the *Admonitio generalis* (cf. McKitterick, *The Frankish Church*, p. 82).

⁵⁹ See for example Vercelli homily 19 (*Vercelli Homilies*, ed. Scragg, pp. 318–9, lines 71–6) or Wulfstan homily 10c (D. Bethurum, *The Homilies of Wulfstan* (Oxford, 1975), p. 203, lines 63–5).

catalogue of sins, indicating impromptu extensions. Practically then, just as in the conclusions, the f_s text might have been shortened in order to save precious parchment.

While the confusion of **i** and **e** in some endings (for example, *omnipotentim*, 1r.6 or *leges*, 1r.9) is not rare in Latin manuscripts of that date, especially in those showing the touch of vulgar Latin that is typical for HA, some grammatical inconsistencies, though characteristic of the time, cannot be overlooked in their syntactic context. The fragment's insecure use and mixing up of relative pronouns (*quem*, 1r.16) and conjunctions (*qui* for *quia*, 1r.21) may be a tolerable flaw, but the confusion of singular and plural forms poses certain problems. The fragments read:

Iste mortuos quem resuscitauit per ueram confessionem quia mali sunt in lingua corporis. (286r.4–6)

The subject of this sentence (*mortuos*), though an accusative plural, seems to have been intended in the singular, emphasized by the use of *iste* and the singular accusative of the relative pronoun *quem*. Hence it is difficult to see how the plural of the causal subclause (*quia mali sunt*) would relate to it.

Manuscript A, turning this subclause into a relative clause (by changing *quia* into *qui*), retains the confusion of singular and plural:

Iste mortuum qui resuscitat per ueram confessionem. qui mali sunt in linguam corporis. (A, 86v.7–9)

In both cases the succeeding text does not throw any light on the matter.

It may be too simple to defend these sentences as being spiked with vulgar Latin forms, many of which can doubtlessly be traced in all manuscripts of HA.⁶⁰ This is because manuscripts B, M and O show a correct sentence at this point:

Iste mortuus quem *resuscitauit* in portam ciuitatis. significat homines quos *resuscitauit* per ueram confessionem qui mali sunt per linguam corporis. (M, 37v.1–5)⁶¹

The example raises a number of questions concerning the transmission of the text. Manuscripts B, M and (particularly) O mend some of the linguistic deficiencies found in f_s and A, but with regard to this specific sentence the repetition of *resuscitauit* in B, M and O is crucial as it may point to a possible eye-skip that led to the confusion in A and f_s . If both cases of *resuscitauit* stood very close to each other in an early exemplar, say one on top of the other in

⁶⁰ Suffice it to mention here the recurrent forms 'abent' in MS A or 'adiubet' and 'uibere' in MS M. This important fact is addressed briefly by Conti ('Taunton', p. 16).

⁶¹ Despite some slight variation MS B essentially shows the same complete and correct sentence here (my italics).

succeeding lines, a lacuna could have occurred during the copying of a version on which A and f_s could both depend. Their congruency at this point indeed makes them look as they are related to the same textual ancestor. Yet, as shown above, where f_s remains as concise as other early witnesses such as M, manuscript A contains a re-ordered and occasionally more extended version of HA.

Stemmata are, of course, always methodologically problematic, not only in their dubious pursuit of an urtext and often dichotomic branching, but also in their over-simplified suggestions of textual affiliations that hardly ever manage to describe the exact degree of closeness between versions. The evidence in our case is so limited and puzzling that I refrain from attempting to chart one here. It seems possible, however, that the Sloane fragments are related to the same textual predecessor as the Angers manuscript; they could, in theory, even represent a direct ancestor of the Angers copy. If we rely on Conti's evaluation of manuscript A holding a version comparatively close to the Taunton fragments, the original homiliary containing the Sloane fragments could thus be considered a possible relative to Taunton too.⁶² Concerning the other English witness, the Sloane fragments' relation to the English manuscript O remains more opaque. Despite similarities in overall structure, the two centuries and possibly numerous unknown intermediate versions that lie between the two manuscripts' productions make the identification of any direct filiation difficult. Nonetheless, on the basis of the evidence of the Sloane fragments we may affirm the existence of a full text of HA in tenth-century England. From this manuscript (or these manuscripts) the Sloane fragments were copied and perhaps slightly abridged, but they were certainly part of a complete HA codex that interspersed feasts for the common of saints in the *temporale*.

THE STATUS OF THE HOMILIARY OF ANGERS IN
TENTH-CENTURY ENGLAND

The identification of the Sloane fragments as the earliest known textual witness of the Homiliary of Angers, undoubtedly written in England, poses a number of fundamental questions concerning our understanding of the origin, the method of composition, the dissemination and the use of this homiliary. First, we may assume that Étaix's conjectural tenth-century composer of the collection must have worked rather early in that century (if not before) for HA to be disseminated as widely as England, France, Italy and Spain by the eleventh century. Likewise, Étaix's title 'Homiliary of Angers' needs some critical reassessment, but we must recall his own reservations in the promotion of this designation. He proposed it in order to disambiguate the collection from the less distinctive coinage 'gothic homiliary', rather than hint at the actual place

⁶² See Conti, 'Taunton', p. 17.

or area of HA's origin.⁶³ In choosing the title, Étaix no doubt also appreciated certain qualities and the completeness of the Angers text.⁶⁴ Whether intended by him or not, the title conveys the idea of an Angers origin of the homiliary to the uninformed scholar. We must acknowledge, however, that the Sloane and Taunton fragments represent a remarkable amount of early evidence for an English dissemination of HA, but in spite of such proof it would be entirely unsuitable to start a discussion on the origins and authorship of HA here. Such discussions could easily take the shape of the ill-starred ideological debates on the cultural appropriation of Old English literature in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.⁶⁵ We must tread especially carefully on this ground, since further new manuscript witnesses of HA (similar to the contributions made in this paper) may surface any time soon.⁶⁶

What *is* safe to assume in our case is that the fragments were copied from an exemplar, probably in Kent, and can thus be placed at a geographically and intellectually significant interface between Anglo-Saxon England and the continent. Taking into account the preaching materials adopted from the School of Auxerre, but also the collections of Paulus Diaconus, Hrabanus Maurus, Smaragdus and (with restrictions) St-Père de Chartres, we may be tempted to place HA in this tradition, namely as a collection from France that reached England in the course of the Benedictine reform.⁶⁷ Some of the non-English HA manuscripts seem to point towards such a solution, as HA often occurs in the context of material from St-Père de Chartres and Smaragdus. However, the Carolingian tradition shows that similar homiliaries for the *temporale*

⁶³ Étaix, 'Angers', p. 148–9. The title was deduced from the Toledo manuscript (cf. Rivera Recio, 'Homiliarium gothicum'). Hence it was also referred to as the 'Homiliary of Toledo' by its students (cf. R. Grégoire, *Homéliaires liturgiques médiévaux: analyse des manuscrits*, Biblioteca degli studi medievali 12 (Spoleto, 1980), pp. 293–319), but the re-dating and resituation of this manuscript called for a new title for the collection (see A. M. Mundó, 'La datación de los códices liturgicos visigóticos toledanos', *Hispania Sacra* 18 (1965), 1–25, at 18).

⁶⁴ He nonetheless points out that the Madrid manuscript (M), which probably predates A, is one of the most complete.

⁶⁵ The work which clearly suffered most from such useless efforts of cultural monopolization is *Beowulf*. See, for example, the poem's first edition in G. J. Thorkelin, *De Danorum rebus gestis secul[is] iii et iv: poema danicum dialecto Anglosaxonica* (Copenhagen, 1815). An English translation of the openly nationalistic preface is printed in T. A. Shippey and A. Haarder, *Beowulf: the Critical Heritage* (London, 1998), pp. 91–8. Another such attempt can be found in K. Simrock, *Beowulf. Das älteste deutsche Epos* (Stuttgart and Augsburg, 1859), p. iii.

⁶⁶ We may pin our hopes on the numerous digitization projects of manuscript fragments being carried out world-wide at this moment, which might bring to light more new examples of HA.

⁶⁷ The earliest English manuscript of the homiliaries of Paul the Deacon with Canterbury connections is Canterbury, Cathedral Library and Archives, Add. 127/1 (Gneuss, *Handlist*, no. 209, s. xi^l). The origin of the homiliary of St-Père, which takes its name from the earliest surviving manuscript in Chartres, Bibliothèque Municipale, 25 (44), remains uncertain (cf. Cross, *Cambridge, Pembroke College MS 25*, p. 89).

originated in various areas of Europe from the late eighth century onwards. Prominent among these are those of Northern Italy and Bavaria, which (albeit in thirteenth-century copies) accompany an eleventh-century version of HA in the Budapest manuscript (B). Such early Caroline collections would frequently mix items from various homiliaries, often covering up the tracks of their transmission completely. It is possible therefore that HA could have originated anywhere in central or western Europe, including, of course, England.⁶⁸ It is equally possible that (parts of) other known or as yet unidentified Carolingian homiliaries travelled to and from England in the material context of HA manuscripts in the tenth century or earlier. More research should be directed to the detection of such preaching materials.

Speculations on an English origin of HA may exaggerate the interpretation of our nonetheless significant find. They can only be seriously addressed when an appropriate edition, careful linguistic analysis and, perhaps, the identification of HA material as a direct source for Old English liturgical texts have been provided. For the present, we may at least rely on the fact that this homiliary was disseminated and used in Anglo-Saxon England from the late tenth century on, if not earlier. It has been pointed out that HA appears to be an ideal collection for priests with a limited training in Latin and so must be considered as one of probably various attempts to establish an accessible Latin *temporale* homiliary for the use of the secular clergy.⁶⁹ How widely this collection had spread in England before Ælfric embarked upon his composition of the *Catholic Homilies*, and how actively and in which contexts⁷⁰ it was used, deserves further scrutiny, but with all the manuscripts, including the new evidence, we may reasonably doubt previous suspicions that the text was never widely circulated.⁷¹

As a late-tenth-century liturgical cycle mixing exegesis with catechetical instruction, HA would have competed with the other Carolingian homiliaries mentioned above, and possibly inspired Old English cycles comparable to the Blickling homilies and others whose existence are only hinted at by the anonymous *temporale* items in the Vercelli Book or manuscript CCC 41.⁷² There is

⁶⁸ Conti hints at this last option ('Taunton', p. 17).

⁶⁹ For text-immanent evidence on the users and audiences of HA see esp. Conti, 'Taunton', pp. 4–7 and 'Circulation', p. 384. Étaix assumes that the homiliary was not used in the Night Office ('Angers', p. 117). Gretsch plausibly suggests the homiliary as 'tak[ing] care of the unlearned parish in an unparalleled way' ('Taunton Fragment', p. 193).

⁷⁰ For the Carolingian empire M. McC. Gatch proposes the Prone, a vernacular Office succeeding the gospel as a possible context (see his *Preaching and Theology*, pp. 36–7). He holds that 'the Prone was not integral to the Mass and that its elements may have been used *extra* as well as *intra Missam*'.

⁷¹ Gretsch, 'Taunton Fragment', p. 191 and Conti, 'Taunton', p. 33.

⁷² For these items, see N. R. Ker, *A Catalogue of Manuscripts containing Anglo-Saxon* (Oxford, 1957), no. 32, arts. 11, 17 and 18; no. 394, arts. 1, 5, 13–15 and 24–26.

indeed a certain similarity between the composition of HA and especially the anonymous vernacular homilies with a pericope, alongside its general affinity to less canonical sources. For example, Blickling Homily 3, after a rendition of the pericope of Jesus's temptations in the desert, quickly falls into admonitory statements that disregard any form of exegesis on an allegorical level.⁷³ Instead this homily stresses the importance of fasting and warns of the approaching end of the world. There is also a shared interest in some Irish sources between HA and the early anonymous homilies in Old English. As we have seen, traces of Pelagius's commentary to the epistles and the commentary on the gospels by Pseudo-Jerome exist in several HA homilies, the latter particularly in nos. 57–60. Alas, these pseudonymous texts of Irish origin throw little light on the transmission of HA, as they were widely circulated in Europe in pre-Carolingian times and could have reached the Anglo-Saxons from the continental Irish monasteries as much as directly from Ireland itself. Bernhard Bischoff has reminded us of the early presence of such Irish commentaries and their vernacular versions in Europe, which were available from the early eighth century on.⁷⁴ The influences of Pseudo-Jerome can also be made out in the Old English Vercelli homily V and Irvine homily V.⁷⁵ Intriguingly, the latter text occurs in manuscript O.

Within the limitations that the lack of an edition of HA imposes, I have so far been able to identify only one direct correspondence between Vercelli homily VIII (lines 1–8) and the opening of no. 56 in HA, but the parallel is a commonplace taken from the first of Gregory's *Homeliae in Euangelia*.⁷⁶ A textual correspondence between a catalogue of the seven pains of hell in HA no. 22 and two Old English homilies has recently been discovered by Stephen Pelle, suggesting the translation of HA into Old English early in the eleventh century if not before.⁷⁷ Identification of further relations between HA and Old English homilies – not just in occasional wording or exegetical motif, but comprehensive compositional structure – will be a task for future research.

⁷³ *The Blickling Homilies*, ed. Morris, pp. 27–39.

⁷⁴ B. Bischoff, 'Wendepunkte in der Geschichte der lateinischen Exegese im Frühmittelalter', *Sacris Erudiri* 6 (1964), 189–279, repr. in his *Mittelalterliche Studien: ausgewählte Aufsätze zur Schriftkunde und zur Literaturgeschichte*, 3 vols. (Stuttgart, 1966–81) I, 206–73, esp. 210–25.

⁷⁵ Scragg, *Vercelli Homilies*, pp. 108–25, esp. lines 59–61, 141 and 194–5. Irvine, *Bodley 343*, pp. 116–45, esp. lines 133–4.

⁷⁶ *Gregory the Great: Homeliae in Evangelia*, ed. R. Étaix, CCS 141 (Turnhout, 1999), 5.

⁷⁷ The end of HA no. 22 (Conti, 'Bodley 343', 265:25–31) is paralleled by HomU 15.1 (cf. Scragg, *Vercelli Homilies*, p. 159:13–161:17) and Hom M 17 (ed. F. Wenisch, 'Nu biðde we eow for Gods lufon: a hitherto Unpublished Old English Homiletic Text in CCC 162', *Words, Texts and Manuscripts: Festschrift for Helmut Gneuss*, eds. M. Korhammer, K. Reichl, and Hans Sauer (Cambridge, 1992), pp. 43–52, at pp. 50–1, lines 1–16). I would like to thank Stephen Pelle for providing me with a draft of his forthcoming publication on the matter.

The dominant source for the exegesis of HA, however, remains the Bible itself. In HA's accumulation of pericopal elements and their spiritual significations, which sometimes defy coherent expounding, we are reminded of a handbook for preaching, an exegetical primer, that would provide the cornerstones for constructing a sound deliverable text. In character HA thus somewhat resembles a collection of *sententiae*, like those of Isidore or of Defensor in his *Liber scintillarum* (the work accompanying HA in manuscript V).⁷⁸ With such embers as source material, the homilist could then spark his own rhetorical fireworks. Assuming this inspirational and enlightening role of HA, it would explain why the homilist did not always exclusively follow the given pericope, but accumulated the various, sometimes unrelated, options of general exegesis and added to this some memorable erratic units of exhortation.

At the same time the rough flow of the HA text consequently raises the question of whether these pastoral addresses were ever preached in the way they were written down in their manuscripts. That some homilies were perhaps never meant to be delivered publicly, but rather intended for devotional or educational purposes has been brought to our attention by previous scholarship.⁷⁹ Given the state of text in HA, we could be tempted to reduce the homiliary's function to that of a didactic compositorial manual rather than of a preaching book used in active delivery. However, we should also note with Conti that HA sporadically indicates an intended audience.⁸⁰ Further signs of active delivery could be seen in the obvious revision and extension of the HA text. If this, together with the completeness of the HA cycle and the traces of vulgar Latin, is sufficient evidence for public performances of HA homilies on the continent, how can we relate this to the situation in late-tenth-century Anglo-Saxon England?

Ælfric famously complains about the sorry state of the clergy's latinity in his own day in his first Old English letter to Wulfstan, and he also admits in the preface to his translation of *Genesis* that he was taught by a *massepreost* who had a restricted knowledge of Latin.⁸¹ Ælfric's statements, if taken at face value, seem to contradict a wider public use of HA as a Latin text, but he does not generally exclude the possibility that some priests in fact had a command of Latin sufficient to use such homiliaries. Where those priests were to be found,

⁷⁸ Cf. M. Andersson-Schmitt and M. Hedlund, *Mittelalterliche Handschriften der Universitätsbibliothek Uppsala*, 2 vols. (Stockholm, 1989) II, 183.

⁷⁹ See McKitterick, *The Frankish Church*, p. 92, Mary Clayton's second type (see above n. 1) and Wright, 'Old English Homilies', p. 39.

⁸⁰ Conti, 'Taunton', pp. 4–7 and 'Circulation', p. 383.

⁸¹ See B. Fehr, *Die Hirtenbriefe Ælfrics*, Bibliothek der angelsächsischen Prosa 9 (Hamburg, 1914), repr. with supplement by P. Clemoes (Darmstadt 1966), pp. 68, 2, and J. Wilcox, *Ælfric's Prefaces*, Durham Medi. Texts 9 (Durham, 1994), 116.

if in the vicinity of larger centres or at random in any rural part of England, remains hard to judge.⁸² With HA as a relatively concise and undemanding core text at their disposal, those having a basic command could have preached in this simple Latin, but would they have found a receptive tenth-century Anglo-Saxon audience? An educated priest of a *hyrness* would more plausibly have given direct translations or extensions in the vernacular, as McKitterick argues at least with regard to parishes in the German-speaking areas of the Carolingian empire.⁸³ Given the traces of Anglo-Saxon vernacular script in the fragments (in the use of the letter *æ* and the interlinear round *a* and *d*) we may deduce that the homiliary had a relationship to scribes, readers and preachers of Old English. Corresponding in scribal and linguistic oddities and adding the sentence-by-sentence translation, the Taunton fragments provide the matching eleventh-century evidence for this bilingual milieu and the transition of HA towards the vernacular.⁸⁴ It seems further possible that HA, much like the St-Père de Chartres material in the Vercelli homilies, was translated into Old English as early as the tenth century, or that it circulated, like Bodley 343 two hundred years later, in the context of vernacular homilies.⁸⁵

I would argue therefore that if HA ever directly rivalled vernacular homiliaries such as the ones traceable in the Blickling and Vercelli manuscripts, with regard to Anglo-Saxon lay audiences, it would have done so only in a vernacular version. The fact that vernacular preaching to the laity was common in late-tenth-century England may have limited the use of HA in Anglo-Saxon England to that of a compositional source and private devotional reading, in the sense of Mary Clayton's second type of homiliary. Whether it is a continental import or English (Kentish?) product, in the context of the Benedictine Reform, we may nonetheless see in HA an important attempt to rectify the dearth of latinity among priests and at the same time to provide a guidebook for homiletic composition.

The English dissemination of HA, like that of the homiliary of St-Père de Chartres, could have started at Canterbury, perhaps in the generation of the

⁸² See especially C. P. Wormald, 'The Uses of Literacy in Anglo-Saxon England and Its Neighbours', *TRHS* 27 (1977), 95–114, esp. 108–10.

⁸³ A definition of *hyrness* (in absence of contemporary evidence for the term 'parish') is given by J. Blair, *The Church in Anglo-Saxon Society* (Oxford, 2005), pp. 428–9. McKitterick, *The Frankish Church*, pp. 84–7. Earliest manuscript evidence for bilingual homilies is provided by the Mondsee fragments in Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, cod. 3093 and Hanover, Niedersächsische Landesbibliothek, I 20b. Cf. E. Krotz, *Auf den Spuren des althochdeutschen Isidor – Studien zur Pariser Handschrift, den Monseer Fragmenten und zum Codex Junius 25. Mit einer Neuedition des Glossars Jc* (Heidelberg, 2002), pp. 107–57.

⁸⁴ For a discussion of the language of the Taunton fragments, see Gretsch, 'Taunton Fragment', pp. 160–83.

⁸⁵ Conti also thinks it possible that other translations existed ('Taunton', p. 32).

great reformers before Ælfric, perhaps with the idealistic aim of re-establishing a lost standard of Latin learning in the sub-diocesan communities. In the major cathedral centres and in a monastic context HA would hardly have prevailed against the canonical collections as an active preaching text, because the Night Office commonly required homilies which were markedly influenced by Church Fathers or popes. We cannot exclude, however, that some monks or cathedral clerics would have preferred HA to a Latin copy of the homilies by Paul the Deacon or Haymo in certain preaching contexts. The copying of HA could, nonetheless, have been consigned to the minor centres, whose scriptoria would no doubt have appreciated the linguistic accessibility, the compositional strategies and exegetical directness that HA offered to the secular clergy.⁸⁶ These assets, even if they might not have led to active public deliveries of the Latin version of HA in Anglo-Saxon England, may nonetheless have prompted the dissemination of the text among local communities, and may possibly have encouraged translations in numbers larger than hitherto expected. In a *hyrnesse*, however, HA manuscripts were neither as well preserved from destruction, nor as likely to be copied, as in a major monastic centre. This could explain the relatively limited number of early surviving copies of HA in comparison with the major Carolingian collections. While vulgar Latin preaching to the laity would only gradually have gained new ground in England in the late eleventh and twelfth centuries, active delivery on the Continent may have caused the production of extended and more prestigious new copies of HA that many of the later manuscripts contain.⁸⁷ As much as the probable mixed audience of this homiliary stimulates the revision of many of our opinions about Carolingian and particularly Anglo-Saxon preaching, it is this very hybrid and accessible nature of the text which secured its extensive use for centuries to come.⁸⁸

EDITION

In order to approximate the edited text to the material shape of the fragments I have decided on a diplomatic line-by-line presentation as on the manuscript folios. All abbreviations – with the exception of the ampersand – have been expanded but are italicized in the main text. Neither grammatical forms nor wording have been emended, the exception being the reconstruction of the text in the last lines of fol. 1, which has been carried out by comparing the legible ascenders of the trimmed text to parallel manuscripts. The spelling has

⁸⁶ Such context has been suggested by Conti, 'Taunton', p. 33 and Gullick (oral communication as quoted in Gretsch, 'Taunton Fragment', p. 193).

⁸⁷ Conti references the layout of MSS B and V as being of such quality ('Taunton', p. 16). MS M may certainly be.

⁸⁸ Clayton hints at a profound reassessment of our views with regard to a possible mixed audience of the homiliary of Landpertus of Mondsee ('Homiliaries and Preaching', pp. 215–16).

been corrected in two cases, with the manuscript variant given in the apparatus. Capitalization and punctuation have been retained and hyphenation supplemented. The apparatus gives all variants apart from those slight differences in spelling that have no morphological or semantic implications.⁸⁹

⁸⁹ I acknowledge with thanks the many helpful suggestions for this paper by Aidan Conti, Malcolm Godden, Gerlinde Huber-Rebenich, Susan Irvine, Richard North, Jane Roberts, Peter Rudolf and Peter Stokes. The reproduction of the images was made possible through the generous financial support of the Lincoln College Michael Zilkha Fund. This paper is dedicated with gratitude to Hildegard L. C. Tristram and Aidan Conti.

/1r/

[. . .]

[No. 39; 13th Sunday after Pent., Mark VII.31]

et lib̄rauit electos suos de angustia in
ferni sidone significat ueneratio idolorum.
Et *tunc* adorabant aliquando & uenera-
bant idola diaboli. et *dominus* fecit illos eiece-
re idola. Et *tunc* congregauit *sanctam* *ædesiam* 5
ut adorasset *deum* *omnipotentem* qui creauit.
Decapoleos .x. ciuitates sunt ad *hierusalem* subi-
ecte. Istas ciuitates significant .x. uerba
leges. et *per* .x. uerba legis debemus uenire
ad *hierusalem* hoc est uisio pacis regna cęlestia. 10
Mare galileę significat mundum quem
dominus calcauit; Turba illa unde *dominus* sepa-
rauit surdum et mutum intellegitur
populus infidelis unde *dominus* sepa[ra]uit
electos suos. Ille cecus significat genus 15
humanum quem *dominus* illuminauit *per* bap-
tismum et fecit audire uerba diuina
qui antea in ciuitate erat nec *dominum* ado-
rare uolebant. Sed *dominus* qui cuncta
bona fecit surdis fecit audire et mu- 20
tos loqui. Qui ante aduentum suum
non respiciebat *ędesiam* celestem neque
audiebat in auris corde; Fecit nŉs au-
dire uerba diuina *super ipsa* diuina
uerba iluminauit nos; Ecce iam 25
[audiuimus fratres dilectissimi cotidie (A)]

Variants taken from A (81v–82v, 86v–87r & 106v–107v), B (57rv, 66rv, 72v–73r, 103r), M (34rv & 37r–38r) and O (fols. xxvii–xxviii & xxviii). 2 inferiorum B. sydon A, sidonem M, sindon O. sidone . . . idolorum] *om.* B. ueneratio] uenerationem M, generationem O. 3 et] quia BO. aliquando] ydola AO, *om.* B. aliquanti M. 4 idola diab.] *om.* A. simulacrum diaboli O. et] et tunc eiecit B, sed O. fecit] *om.* B. illos] eos AMO, illa B. eiecere idola] *om.* B. 5 tunc] *om.* AMO. in sanctam O. 6 adorasset AMO. patrem omnipotentem A, omnipotentem MO, omnipotentem in unitate spiritus sancti B. creauit eos ABMO. 7 ad] quae B, in M. subiecte] subiectas A, subiecte sunt B, *om.* M. 8 Istas . . . hierusalem] *om.* M. iste BO. decem ciuitates AB. 9 legis ABO. 10 hoc est] que interpretatur B, subiectam O. ad uisionem A. uisioni O. pacis] *om.* A. after pacis: quem significat B. celestem regnorum O. 11 significant B. istum mundum ABMO. quem] in quo B. 12 calcauit] ambulauit B. Turba illa] per illam turbam B. 13 interpretatur A, intellegimus B, significat O. 14 populum fidelem A, populum peccatorem B, populum infidelem O. 16 quos B, quod MO. iluminauit AM. after per: spiritum sanctum in baptismo B. 17 et fecit eos AM, fectisque eos O. audire. . . uolebant] illum conuerture ad uiam ueritatis per sua uerba diuina. et per uerba predicationis; nam ante aduentum domini ceci et surdi erant. qui non respiciebant celestia sed terestria. et non adorabant deum omnipotentem que eos creauit; et non audiebant. uerba diuina. nec uerbum predicationis. sed adorabant idola et sectabant uerba uana uel turpia B. 18 qui . . . erat] quia antea in cecitate erant AM, nam anna in cecitate magna erant quod O. 19 ualebant M, non ualebant O. dominus] *om.* O. 20 b. f. s. f.] bona fecit bene omnia fecit surdos fecit AM, creauit et bene omnia fecit surdos fecit B, bona facit. bona opera fecit surdos O. 21 quia AMO. Qui . . . nos] *om.* B. 22 non] nullus AMO. respiciebant M. eccl. cel.] ad cęlestia AMO. 23 audiebant AM. aure cordis M, auribus cordis O. sed postmodum fecit O. 24 super] et per AM. super . . . nos] illis uerbisque diuinis nos illuminauit O. uerba diuina AM. iluminauit M.

/1v/

quando mirabilia *dominus* fecit quanta nós
relinquid quanta pro nobis sustinuit; De qua le
angustia nós liberauit. De quale tenebre
nós eripuit; Sic faciamus ut ad eum *per* ex-
emplum suum ueniamus. ipse pius *dominus* 5
dignetur nós inluminare quicum :-

IN illo tempore. Dixit *ihesus* discipulis suis; [No. 40; 14th Sunday after Pent.,
Beati oculi qui uident quę uos uidetis ante Luke X.23]
aduentum domini *fratres karissimi*. Multi prophete
et reges cupiebant uidere *dominum*; Cupie- 10
bat rex dauid. Cupiebat *esaias propheta*.
et *heremias*; Tamen et non uiderunt eum
ambulantem *super terram* et predicantem
sicut *apostoli* fecerunt. Sed postmodum
uident in *spiritu*. Inde dixit. Beati qui ui- 15
dent quę uos uidetis. Et aliter potest
intellegi de ista parabola; *Apostoli* habe-
bant oculos spirituales nolebant *terrena*
respicere. sed *celestia*; Similiter et au-
res quia nolebant uerba uana audire. 20
Sed semper uerba diuina audiebant
et predicabant. [:]exemplum monstra-
bant; Habemus in nós *fratres* oculos spi-
ritales ut non respiciamus *terrena*
[mundi sed *celestia*. Habeamus aures (M). . .]

1 quanta ABMO. fecit dominus BM. quanta exempla B. nobis BMO. 2 quanta . . . sustinuit] *om.* B. 3 De . . . eripuit] de quali angustia et de qualibus tenebris nos liberauit. postquam uenit in hunc mundum. et inluminauit nos per baptismum et uerba diuina sancti euangelii; sequamur uestigia et exemplum illius B. qualis A, quales M, quibus O. tenebris AO, tenebras M. 5 suum] eius O. *after* uenire: ualeamus A, faciamus M, possimus O. ut ipse ABM, et ut ipse O. pius dominus] pius et misericors B. *after* dominus: nos dignetur (dignetur BMO) inluminare et aperire aures (os et aures B) cordis nostri (uestri O) et (ut B) liberet (liberare M) nos de angustia (*om.* B) et de potestate diaboli (B *adds and ends* et perducatur nos ad uitam eternam amen.). (O *continues here* Qui uiuit et . . .) Ipse nos adiuuet (adiubat M) et confortet et perducatur nos in (ad M) uitam eternam qui regnat sine fine cum patre et spiritu sancto (M *ends here*) in unitate in saecula saeculorum amen. ABMO. 7 *no rubric in MS and O, a rubric* LUCAM A, *a rubric* DOMINICA. XIII; LECTIO SANCTI EUANGELII SECUNDUM LUCAM BM. quem uos M. *after* uidetis: dico autem uobis quod multi prophete et reges uoluerunt uidere quę uos uidetis et rel. A, et cetera. *fratres karissimi* B, et reliqua. *followed by the red rubric* HOMELIA M. 8 ante ad. dom. f. k.] dico .N. uobis quod O. 10 uoluerunt uidere B. dominum] *ihesus* O. 11 cupiebat uidere AM, uolebat eum uidere B, cupiebat eum uidere rex O. cupiebat uidere *esaias* A, uolebant uidere *isaac* et alii prophetae multi B. prophete M. 12 et non] et *om.* ABO. predicantem corporaliter B. 14 sicut] ut O. Sed] et O. 15 uiderent eum spiritaliter B. in] *om.* O. dominus dixit B. beati oculi ABMO. 16 quem BM. Et . . . parabola] *om.* B. 17 de ista] hanc O. illi apostoli B. abent A, habent MO. 18 nol.] quia nolebant AM, qui nolebant O. nolebant . . . aures] *om.* B. 19 respirare A. 20 uana et turpia huius saeculi audire B. 21 uerba] *om.* AO. et audiebant AM. audiebant . . . predicabant] sancti euangelii. illi uero et predicabant et docebant et B. 22 et exemplum bonum A, et exemplum MO. 23 Hab. i. n. f.] habeamus ista fratres in nos. habeamus AM, fratres similiter et nos habeamus B, habeamus fratres talia nobiscum. habemus O. oculos] aures A. 24 ut non] unde B. terrena] celestia B. resp. ter. m.] audiamus detractationes uel (nec M) uana mundi AM. recipiamus O.

/286r/

[. . .]

Demonēs eiecit paraliticos erexit. Mul-
tos fecit loqui. Surdos fecit audire.

[No. 43; 17th Sunday after Pent., Luke
VII.11]

Mare et uentos fecit tacere. remittit
multa talia signa fecit *dominus*. Iste mortuos
quem resuscitauit *per* ueram confessionem 5
quia mali sunt in lingua corporis. Unde
dominus ait. Tibi dico surge. Hóc significat
qui cecidit *per* mala *opera* in morte peccati
surgit *per* bona ad uitam. et *post* hóc re\d/dit eum
matri sue id est. postquam reuersus de uia 10
mala reddidit ad ecclesiam matri suę; Ad-
tendite fratres *karissimī* quicumque ceciderit
per malam locutionem surgat *per* bonam.
Qui ceciderit *per* iram surgat *per* patientiam.
Qui ceciderit *per* ebrietatem. surgat *per* so- 15
brietatem. Et quomodo uidit populus
illa mirabilia. Ceperunt laudare et mag-
nificare. *deum* dicentem. Quia propheta
magnus surrexit in nobis et quia
deus uisitauit plebem suam; Sic et nós 20
fratres karissimī. postquam uidimus misericor-
diam *dēi* qui fecit in nós quando nos [r]e-
suscitauit de uia mala ad bona *opera*
laudemus et magnificemus eum qui nós
uocauit: ut ipse dominus dignetur nós resusci- 25
tare de morte pessima ad uitam

1 mutos ABM. mortuos loqui fecit O. 2 fecit? om. O. 3 uenti A, uentum BO. fecit] om. O. tacere et silere A. Mare. . . tacere] om. M. peccata remisit BM, peccata remittit O. 4 et multa AMO. et alia multas uirtutes fecit B. talia] alia AMO. ihesus A. istum B. mortuum AB, mortuus MO. 5 qui resuscitat A. resusc. . . ait] suscitauit dominus in porta ciuitatis significat illos homines qui mali et prauī sunt in lingua corporis; et resuscitauit *per* ueram confessionem; ait ei dominus B. *after* qu. res.] in portam ciuitatis significat illos homines quos resuscitat MO. 6 qui AMO. linguam A, per linguam O. 7 Hoc significat] id est prius B. significat] signum O. 8 ceciderit B. per] in M. opera diaboli B. peccato A. 9 surget A, tunc resurgat B, surgat MO. bona opera B, bonum M. uitam eternam B. reddidit illum A, reddidit BM. illum B. 10 matris A. id est] om. O. de uia. . . suę] homo peccator de uia mala et de opere diaboli ad uiam dei; per bona opera reddidit illum ad ecclesiam que est mater sua B. 11 sua mala ad bona reddidit A. matrem suam A. 12 hoc quicumque B. ceciderit] cecidit A, cadit O. Adtendite. . . bonam] id est postquam reuersus est de uia mala ad bonam M. 13 mala. . . sobriet.] adulterium aut luxuriam uel fornicationem. resurgat *per* castitatem. qui cecidit *per* gulam resurgat *per* abstinētiā. qui cecidit *per* ebrietatem. resurgat *per* sobrietatem. qui cecidit *per* auaritiā. resurgat *per* caritatem. qui cecidit *per* mendacium resurgat *per* ueritatem. qui cecidit *per* superbiam resurgat *per* humilitatem. qui cecidit *per* iram resurgat *per* patientiam. qui cecidit *per* discordiam resurgat *per* ueram concordiam. sequitur. B. mala AO. locutione A. *after* bonam: qui cecidit *per* auariciā surgat *per* caritatem. qui (cecidit M) *per* gulam surgat *per* abstinētiā. qui (cecidit *per* AM) luxuria(m M) surgat (*per* A) castitate(m AM). qui (cecidit A) *per* falsitatem (mendacium AM) surgat ueritate (*per* ueritatem AM) AMO. 14 cecidit AM. patientiam] humilitatem O. 15 ceciderit] cecidit AM, om. O. 16 quando O. ille populus B. 17 mirabilia et uirtutes qua dominus faciebat B. cepit M. magnificare et laudare ABMO. 18 dominum] deum deum A, om. M. dicens M, dicentes BO. 19 MS corrects surrexerunt. 20 deus] om. O. 21 karissimī] om. BM, et postquam nos O. 22 dei] om. A. dei. . . opera] sua in nobis quando resuscitat nos. de uia mala. et de opere diaboli ad uiam dei B qui. . . nos] quod dominus fecit in nos A, quam dominus facit in nobis M, quoniam deus in nos fecit O. sesuscitauit MS, resuscitat M. 23 bonis operibus A. 25 uocauit] uisitauit AO, uisitat M. uocauit. . . uitam] dignatus est uisitare et resuscitare de morte peccati. ad uiam B. dom. dig. n.] pius dominus A. 26 de mo. pes.] et O.

/286v/

eternam ipso adiuuante:-

In illo tempore; Dixit ihesus discipulis [No. 59; unknown feast, Matthew XIII.44]

suis; Simile est regnum caelorum

thesauro abscondito in agro. et *reliqua*.

Thesauros iste *fratres* karissimi quem *dominus* 5

adsimilauit intellegitur. sapientia

dei. Ager significat mundum. Sicut

thesauros crescit in edificationem agro

inabsconso. Ita sapientia christi lucrat

hominem in uitam eternam agrum 10

relinquit omnia iudicia mundi.

Emit regnum celorum ieiunando

penitendo. orando. Vigilando. eli-

mosinis faciendo; Leuius emitu[r] cum

postea carius possidetur; Similiter 15

margarita pretiosa[:] sapientiam

dei demonstrat per ipse debemus eme-

re per bona opera et amare et custodire.

Iterum simile est regnum caelorum

sagena missa in mare. Sagena quos 20

inuenerit bonos et malos ad litus

trahit; Mare istum *saeculum* demonstrat.

Sagena uerbum predicationis osten-

dit. Litus intellegitur. finis mun-

di. Ibi ueniunt et aparebunt quales 25

[. . .]

1 eter. i. adiu.] perpetuam ut cum sanctis et electis suis (cum sanctis angelis M) uiuere (uibere M) ualeamus in uitam eternam. ipso adiuuante (A *ends here*) qui cum patre et spiritu sancto omnia regia in saecula saeculorum. amen AM, perpetuam. ut cum sanctis suis angelis et archangelis ibidem mereamur permanere B, perpetuam cum sanctis angelis suis deducere O. 2 *no rubric in MS and O, a rubric* MATHEUM A, IN NATALE UIRGINIS LECTIO SANCTI EUANGELII SECUNDUM MATHEUM B, SECUNDUM MATHEUM M. dominus ihesus A. 3 *after* suis: parabola[m] hanc A. 4 absconso *after that* HOMELIA EIUSDEM M. *after* agro: quem qui inuenit homo abscondit et post gaudio illius uadit et uendit omniam que abet et emit agrum illum et rel. A. 5 quem] de quo O. 6 adsimilauit regnum celorum B. a. i. sap. d.] ait sapientia dei intelligitur O. 7 *after* dei: thesaurus id est christus uel sapientia absconsa in agro. id est in ecclesia. siue scripturis diuinis A. mundus iste A, istum mundum B. *after* iste: siue in ecclesia uel in scriptura diuina A. 8 edificatione agro A, edificatione agri B, hedificatione in agro M, edificatio agri O. 9 inabscondito B, absconso M, inabsconsi O. et sapientia B. lucratur M. 10 hominis A. in] ad B. *after* eternam: qui uendit omniam. id est reliquit uicia seu rebus terrenis. emit agrum. id est reliquit omnia uicia mundi et A. agrum. . .celorum] emere agrum; id est relinquere omnia uitia mundi. et emere regnum celorum. hoc est B. emit agrum MO. 11 iudicia] uicia MO. 12 et emit MO. 13 elimosius] *corr. by later* hand elimosinas in MS, elimosinas A, elimosinam MO. 14 faciendo] dando. et omnia bona ministrando. tunc B. emitur MS, emittitur A, emitur regnum celorum B. cum] quam M, sed O. 15 ea] *om.* O. Similiter. . .custodire] iterum simile est regnum celorum homini negotiatori querenti bonas margaritas. inuenta autem una preciosa margarita. habiit et uendit omniam que abiit. hoc sunt patriarche et prophete. uel apostoli. siue martires et omnes sancti. omniam uendideret. id est uicia et terrena mundi cupiditate despiciunt. et celestia diuicia acceperunt. quia omnia uendit. qui nichil retinet. nam qui occupatus fuerit rebus terrenis non potest sedere eam. id est habere item homini negotiatori. id est qui querit christum. uel doctrina celestem. una margarita. id est christus. uel doctrina celestis atque sapientia. ille est quid reliquit omnia uicia siue res terrenas et cupiditates dimittit. quia cupiditas radix est omnium malorum. id est quia omnia mala per cupiditatem diabolum emit. id est infernum. et per ueram caritatem et ueritatem. emit christum quia christus ueritas est. et inuenit regnum celorum. ita et nos fratres debemus ipsa margarita emere per opera cum bona uoluntate. amare et custodire illa. in omnibus diebus uite nostre. A. similiter et B. 16 sapientia B. 17 dei] *om.* O. demonstratur O. per ipse] quam et ipsem B, quam ipsi M, quoniam O. 20 sagene misse ABMO. mari M. *after* mare: et ex omni genere piscium congreganti. sagena christus est. per sagenam ostendit uerbum predicationis. in mare. id est in mundo. et ex omni genere piscium congreganti. hoc est omnes genus humanum congregatum ad audiendum uerbum dei. per doctores et predicatorum suos. quam completa esset. educentes et secus litus sedentes. elegerit bonos in uasa. malos autem foras miserrunt A. sagena] quam B, sagene O. 21 inuenit AB, inueniunt O. pisses bonos B. 22 trahunt O. maris A, illa maris B. istum] *om.* AMO. saeculum] mundum B. 23 uerba BM. 24 secus litus id est proprie finem mundi A. intel.] *om.* O. finem BO. mundi] saeculi B. 25 ubi ueniunt omnes B, ueniunt M, ubi ueniunt O. quales] quali A, qui O.