

TWO ÆLFRIC TEXTS

The Twelve Abuses
and The Vices and Virtues



EDITED AND TRANSLATED BY
MARY CLAYTON

Anglo-Saxon Texts

11

TWO ÆLFRIC TEXTS

THE TWELVE ABUSES AND THE VICES AND VIRTUES

AN EDITION AND TRANSLATION OF

ÆLFRIC'S OLD ENGLISH VERSIONS OF

DE DUODECIM ABUSIVIS AND *DE OCTO VITIIS ET DE DUODECIM ABUSIVIS*

Anglo-Saxon Texts

ISSN 1463–6948

Editorial Board

MICHAEL LAPIDGE

MARY CLAYTON

LESLIE LOCKETT

RICHARD MARSDEN

ANDY ORCHARD

Anglo-Saxon Texts is a series of scholarly editions (with parallel translations) of important texts from Anglo-Saxon England, whether written in Latin or in Old English. The series aims to offer critical texts with suitable apparatus and accurate modern English translations, together with informative general introductions and full historical and literary commentaries.

Previously published volumes in the series are listed at the back of this book.

TWO ÆLFRIC TEXTS

THE TWELVE ABUSES AND THE VICES AND VIRTUES

AN EDITION AND TRANSLATION OF

ÆLFRIC'S OLD ENGLISH VERSIONS OF

DE DUODECIM ABUSIVIS AND

DE OCTO VITIIS ET DE DUODECIM ABUSIVIS

Edited with a translation by

MARY CLAYTON

D. S. BREWER

© Mary Clayton 2013

All rights reserved. Except as permitted under current legislation no part of this work may be photocopied, stored in a retrieval system, published, performed in public, adapted, broadcast, transmitted, recorded or reproduced in any form or by any means, without the prior permission of the copyright owner

First published 2013
D. S. Brewer, Cambridge

ISBN 978 1 84384 360 3

D. S. Brewer is an imprint of Boydell & Brewer Ltd
PO Box 9, Woodbridge, Suffolk IP12 3DF, UK
and of Boydell & Brewer Inc,
668 Mt Hope Avenue, Rochester, NY 14620-2731, USA
website: www.boydellandbrewer.com

A CIP catalogue record for this book is available
from the British Library

The publisher has no responsibility for the continued existence or accuracy of URLs for external or third-party internet websites referred to in this book, and does not guarantee that any content on such websites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.

Papers used by Boydell & Brewer are natural, recyclable products made from wood grown in sustainable forests



Typeset by Word and Page, Chester

Printed in Great Britain by
CPI Group (UK) Ltd, Croydon, CR0 4YY

Contents

Preface	vii
Acknowledgements	viii
Abbreviations	ix
Manuscript Sigla	x
Editorial Conventions	x
Introduction	
1. The Old English Manuscripts	1
2. The Two Versions of the Old English Text	23
3. <i>De duodecim abusiuis</i>	34
4. The Vices and Virtues	71
De duodecim abusiuis	109
De octo uitiiis et de duodecim abusiuis	139
De duodecim abusiuis: Latin Text (Oxford, Jesus College, MS 3)	179
Bibliography	191
Index	197

For Catherine Clayton

Preface

The texts edited in this volume are Ælfric's vernacular versions of two highly influential early-medieval ethical treatises. The first text, *De duodecim abusiuis*, is his Old English version of a short tract dealing with the twelve abuses of the world and the second, *De octo uitiis et de duodecim abusiuis*, is a composite text, of which *De duodecim abusiuis* forms the second part; the first part deals with the eight vices and the complementary eight virtues and is otherwise familiar as the last part of Ælfric's *Lives of Saints* XVI. Both texts were composed in Ælfric's hallmark rhythmical, alliterative prose. The Latin *De duodecim abusiuis* is a short moral tract, written in seventh-century Ireland, which lists and describes twelve abuses and suggests remedies for them. The main source for Ælfric's treatment of the vices and virtues is Alcuin's *De uirtutibus et uitiis*, written on the continent in the ninth century. The stand-alone text and the composite one survive in three manuscripts each.

The two Old English texts have been in print for a long time, but there has not been a satisfactory edition of either. Richard Morris published two versions of the composite text in his *Old English Homilies*;¹ in the main body of the volume he edited the very late, and altered, text in Xⁱ, London, Lambeth Palace 487, and in an appendix he supplied an earlier version of the composite text, from R, CCC 178, transcribed for him by the Rev. W. Snell.² The Lambeth version was edited again in Sarah O'Brien's unpublished thesis.³ The stand-alone version was printed by Rubie Warner from G, British Library, Cotton Vespasian D xiv,⁴ a manuscript of considerably later date than the other two manuscripts which contain this version of the text. Neither included any information about the relationship between the two versions or about how these texts fit into Ælfric's oeuvre as a whole. Ælfric's treatment of the sources for both texts has never been analysed in any detail before now.

This edition presents new texts of Ælfric's two works, with an extensive discussion of their sources. The text of the stand-alone version is based on P, Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 115, not hitherto edited, and for the composite text I have re-edited R. In each case, the manuscript chosen is the earliest in date and in linguistic forms. Both versions of the text, in my view, are the work of

¹ R. Morris, ed. and trans., *Old English Homilies and Homiletic Treatises of the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries*, EETS os 29 and 34 (London, 1867–8, repr. 1988), pp. 107–19.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 296–304.

³ S. O'Brien, ed., 'An Edition of Seven Homilies from Lambeth Palace Library MS 487' (unpubl. D. Phil. dissertation, Oxford University, 1985).

⁴ R. Warner, ed., *Early English Homilies from the Twelfth Century MS Vesp. D. XIV*, EETS os 152 (London, 1917), pp. 11–16.

Preface

Ælfric and so it seemed best to make both available in the form in which he issued them. In addition, I have included a Latin text of *De duodecim abusiuis* from a twelfth-century English manuscript, Oxford, Jesus College 3; this is a copy of the Cyprianic recension, the recension which Ælfric used, and gives a good idea of the kind of Latin text from which he was working. His principal source for the vices and virtues section of the text, Alcuin's *De uirtutibus et uitiiis*, is readily available, although not in a modern critical edition, and I have not included it here.⁵

Acknowledgements

This edition has been prepared over a long time and I owe many debts of gratitude. I should like to thank the librarians of University College, Dublin, and Trinity College, Dublin, the Parker Library in Corpus Christi College, Cambridge (where I should particularly like to thank Gill Cannell and Catherine Hall), the Bodleian Library, Oxford, and the British Library. Thanks also to Malcolm Godden, Timothy Graham, Colin Ireland, Rohini Jayatilaka, Niall MacMonagle, Niamh Pattwell, Don Scragg and Janet Wilson. My special thanks to Aidan Breen, who died while this book was in press, for his help, and to Michael Lapidge for his forbearance. I should also like to thank the National University of Ireland for a publication grant.

⁵ PL 101, 613–38D.

Abbreviations

Assmann	<i>Angelsächsische Homilien und Heiligenleben</i> , ed. B. Assmann, Bibliothek der angelsächsischen Prosa 3 (Kassel, 1889; repr. with a supplementary introduction by P. Clemoes, Darmstadt, 1964)
CCCC	Corpus Christi College, Cambridge
CCCM	Corpus Christianorum, Continuatio Medievalis
CCSL	Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina
CHI	<i>Ælfric's Catholic Homilies. The First Series. Text</i> , ed. P. Clemoes, EETS ss 17 (Oxford, 1997)
CH II	<i>Ælfric's Catholic Homilies: The Second Series: Text</i> , ed. M. Godden, EETS ss 5 (Oxford, 1979)
CH III	M. Godden, <i>Ælfric's Catholic Homilies: Introduction, Commentary and Glossary</i> , EETS ss 18 (Oxford, 2000)
CSEL	Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum
EETS	Early English Text Society
Fehr	B. Fehr, <i>Die Hirtenbriefe Ælfrics in altenglischer und lateinischer Fassung</i> , Bibliothek der angelsächsischen Prosa 9 (Hamburg, 1914; repr. with a supplementary introduction by P. Clemoes, Darmstadt, 1966)
Hellmann	'Pseudo-Cyprianus de XII abusivis saeculi', ed. S. Hellmann, <i>Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur</i> , Reihe 3, Band 4, Heft 1 (Leipzig, 1909), pp. 1–62
Ker	N. Ker, <i>Catalogue of Manuscripts Containing Anglo-Saxon</i> (Oxford, 1957)
LS	<i>Ælfric's Lives of Saints</i> , 4 vols., ed. W. Skeat, EETS os 76, 82, 94, 114 (Oxford, 1881–1900; repr. as 2 vols., 1966)
MRTS	Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies
MGH	Monumenta Germaniae Historica
PG	Patrologia Graeca, ed. J.-P. Migne, 162 vols. (Paris, 1857–66)
PL	Patrologia Latina, ed. J.-P. Migne, 221 vols. (Paris, 1844–64)
Pope	<i>Homilies of Ælfric: A Supplementary Collection</i> , 2 vols., ed. J. Pope, EETS os 259 and 260 (Oxford, 1967–8)

Sigla of Manuscripts containing the Old English Texts

C	Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 303
G	London, British Library, Cotton Vespasian D.xiv
L	Cambridge, University Library, Ii.1.33
P	Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 115
R	Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 178
S	Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 116
V	Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 421
W	London, British Library, Cotton Julius E.vii
X ⁱ	London, Lambeth Palace Library 487

Editorial Conventions

In the Old English texts edited here, punctuation, word division and capitalisation are all modern and abbreviations have been silently expanded in the text. Quotation marks are not used for direct discourse. The following signs are used:

[] indicates a letter that a scribe has deleted or subpuncted in the manuscript.

/ indicates a line break in the manuscript.

^^ indicates insertions by scribes.

om. indicates omitted. Where the apparatus says, for example, *om. S*, it means that this one word has been omitted; where more than one word has been omitted, the omitted passage is given in full in the apparatus.

Where a list of manuscripts is given in the apparatus, the spelling is that of the first in the list.

Introduction

1

The Old English Manuscripts and the Transmission of the Texts

The Old English manuscripts

Six manuscripts of Ælfric's work on the twelve abuses are extant and they fall into two groups of three manuscripts, one group containing the stand-alone short treatise *De duodecim abusiuis* and the other a composite text composed of an introductory paragraph and an account of the eight chief vices and eight chief virtues, corresponding to Ælfric's *LS* xvi, lines 267–381, followed by a text of the entire *De duodecim abusiuis*. I will refer to this composite text as *De octo uititiis*.¹ The manuscripts in the first group are Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 115 (P), CCCC 303 (C) and British Library, Cotton Vespasian D.xiv (G); those in the second group, with the composite text, are CCCC 178 (R), Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 116 (S) and London, Lambeth Palace Library 487 (X').² In addition, we have three manuscripts which preserve Ælfric's treatment of the eight vices and virtues as part of *LS* xvi; these are London, British Library, Cotton Julius E.vii (W), CCCC 303 (C) and Cambridge, University Library, Ii.1.33 (L). This text begins with an account of the saints, covering the Old Testament, Christ and the martyrs and other saints of the New Testament; it then has a passage on the devil's attempts to seduce Christians, leading into descriptions of the three virtues of faith, hope and charity (the *heahmægnu*), the eight chief vices (*heafodleahtras*) and the eight chief virtues (*heafodmægnu*).

We also know of two further copies of Ælfric's twelve abuses text in manuscripts which have survived but are now incomplete and from which this text has been lost. One of these is W, described below, and the other is V, CCCC 421. This manuscript is a composite volume: Part 2 was written at an unknown centre, possibly Canterbury, in the first half of the eleventh century and contains

¹ The three titles in the manuscripts are *De octo uititiis et de duodecim abusiuis gradus* (R), *De octo uititiis et de xii abusiuis* (S) and *De octo uiciis et de duodecim abusiuis huius seculi* (X').

² The sigla used are those devised by Peter Clemoes for the *Catholic Homilies*. On connections among the manuscripts containing Ælfric's *De duodecim abusiuis* and some other works of his, see A. Kleist, 'Assembling Ælfric: Reconstructing the Rationale behind Eleventh- and Twelfth-Century Compilations', in *A Companion to Ælfric*, ed. H. Magennis and M. Swan (Leiden and Boston, 2009), pp. 369–98.

Introduction

a collection of vernacular homilies,³ while Part 1, which also contains vernacular homilies, was written in Exeter between 1050 and 1072.⁴ The original items now end on p. 354 with an incomplete copy of Ælfric's *CHI* 21 (for the Ascension), but Parker's table of contents lists *De duodecim abusiuis* as beginning on p. 356, the verso of the leaf which contained the end of the Ascension homily; it was, then, in Part 2, the earlier part of the manuscript. This item was missing by the time that Wanley described the manuscript in 1705.

It is clear from the titles of the text in both W and V that they contained copies of the stand-alone text, not the composite version, whose title, in all three manuscripts which contain it, begins *De octo uitiiis*.

Manuscripts containing *De duodecim abusiuis* as a stand-alone text

P

Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 115, and Kansas University Library Y 104 (Ker 332)

P is a collection of homilies and short pieces.⁵ It has 157 medieval leaves; the measurement varies somewhat, but the texts in the main hand are written on leaves measuring 247 × 155 mm, with a written space 195 × 98 mm.⁶ The manuscript is foliated i–v, 1–139, 139a, 140–58. 139 of the leaves were written in a single hand of the second half of the eleventh century;⁷ this hand is very like that of British Library, Cotton Faustina A.x, a manuscript which contains Ælfric's *Grammar* and *Glossary* and which is of unknown origin.⁸ Six leaves were removed from

³ See *CHI*, p. 47, and Pope, pp. 80–3, but, for caution on a Canterbury origin, see J. Wilcox, ed., *Wulfstan Texts and Other Homiletic Materials*, Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts in Microfiche Facsimile 8, MRTS 219 (Tempe, AZ, 2000), pp. 1 and 7–8. Wilcox's verdict is: 'Where the contents overlap with other manuscripts, they [i.e. CCCC 419 and 421, companion volumes] show textual affiliation with south-eastern manuscripts, most fully with Cambridge, Trinity College, B. 15. 34, which was written at Christ Church, Canterbury. The language of the homilies, mostly standard late-West Saxon but with considerable tolerance for non-standard forms, is most close to the language of south-eastern manuscripts, especially those from Canterbury. The idiosyncratic content of the two manuscripts, though, with their high number of unique anonymous homilies militates against a Canterbury origin, where the works of Ælfric were readily available and extensively copied at the time. Instead the range of contents suggests that these manuscripts were compiled in a scriptorium less central to the mainstream tradition than those of Canterbury, although one dominated by Canterbury influences' (p. 1).

⁴ Described by Ker, no. 69; Pope, pp. 80–3; *CHII*, pp. lxxi–lxxii; *CHI*, pp. 46–8; and Wilcox, *Wulfstan Texts*, pp. 7–13.

⁵ As well as the description in Ker, no. 332, the manuscript is described in Pope, pp. 53–9; *CHII*, pp. lxi–lxviii; *CHI*, pp. 33–6; and C. Franzen, *Worcester Manuscripts*, Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts in Microfiche Facsimile 6, MRTS 186 (Tempe, AZ, 1998), pp. 44–54.

⁶ These measurements are from Franzen, *Worcester Manuscripts*, p. 45.

⁷ Fols. 140–7 and fols. 148–55 were added to the original core of the manuscript. See Ker, pp. 402–3, and Pope, p. 53.

⁸ Pope, p. 58, says that the same scribe was almost certainly responsible for both manuscripts.

the manuscript at some point after about 1200, when a list of contents was drawn up; one of these leaves is now Kansas University Library Y 104. The manuscript is a collection of five booklets and the texts written in the main hand were copied in three blocks or booklets, the quiring of each of which had to be adjusted at the end:

- (a) Quires 1–9, fols. 1–67: *Ælfric's Hexameron*; *CH I* 19; *CH I* 20; Pope xviii; *LS* xvii; Pope xix; *CH II* 19; *CH II* 20; *CH II* 21; *LS* xxv, lines 812–62 (on the three estates); *De cogitatione*; a short piece on abstinence; a short piece on baptising infants; a short piece forbidding the eating of blood and condemning those English who adopt Danish practices (elsewhere called *De sanguine*); *Ælfric's De septiformi spiritu*; Pope xxii (*Wyrdwriteras*); *LS* xix, lines 155–258 (on Absalom and Achitophel and thieves and traitors).
- (b) Quires 10–13, fols. 68–94, and the Kansas leaf: *CH II* 35; *CH II* 36; *CH II* 38; Assmann iv;⁹ *CH II* 39, with Pope xxviii; *CH II* 40.
- (c) Quires 14–19, fols. 95–139: *Sermo ad populum* (*Ælfric's Letter to Wulfgeat*, adapted to form a homily); a piece on Antichrist, adapted from the Preface to *CH I*; Pope xx; *Ælfric's Judges*; *De duodecim abusivis secundum disputacionem Cypriani episcopi et martiris*; *Interrogationes Sigeuulfi presbiteri*; *LS* xviii.

Fol. 65 is an inserted leaf with two short pieces, written at the end of the eleventh century by two scribes, whose contents are not included in the list above. The extract from *LS* xix is on two singleton leaves, fols. 66 and 67, written by the main scribe and bound between the first and second booklets.¹⁰ These three leaves form the end of the first booklet. The second booklet ends on the verso of fol. 94 with *CH II* 40; one-third of the page is left blank. At the end of the third booklet, after *LS* xviii, a page and a half are left blank (half of fol. 147^r and all of the verso) and it seems from the make-up of the last quire that the scribe expected to add further material.¹¹ Two other booklets at the end of the manuscript are in different hands. Fols. 140–7 form a folded booklet (folded across the middle) containing a sermon on hell; this may have been written earlier than the bulk of the manuscript, having been ‘clearly once independent of the others’.¹² It is similar to Vercelli IX. Fols. 148–55 form another booklet, with eleven short texts on dreams and prognostics, as well as two paragraphs on the number of masses and psalms equivalent to different fasts on fols. 148–53; these are all in a twelfth-

⁹ This is lost apart from the Kansas leaf.

¹⁰ P. Robinson, ‘Self-Contained Units in Composite Manuscripts of the Anglo-Saxon Period’, *Anglo-Saxon England* 7 (1978), 231–8, at 235. See also D. Scragg, ‘An Unpublished Vernacular Exhortation from Post-Conquest England and its Manuscript Context’, in *Essays on Anglo-Saxon and Related Themes in Memory of Lynne Grundy*, ed. J. Roberts and J. Nelson, King’s College London Medieval Studies 17 (London, 2000), 511–24, at 513.

¹¹ Scragg, ‘An Unpublished Vernacular Exhortation’, p. 512.

¹² Robinson, ‘Self-Contained Units’, p. 235.

century hand. Fols. 154–5 have some lines in the tremulous hand, taken from *CHI* 35, and a note on Adam in another hand, as well as some scribbles. Robinson points out that ‘this collection could not have been bound together until some time after its component parts were copied’.¹³ A table of contents on fol. v, added c. 1200, lists all the texts as far as *LS* xviii, including the pieces on fol. 65, and it is possible that it was added when these folios were bound together.¹⁴

The items in the main hand are probably all by Ælfric.¹⁵ The first booklet contains ‘general sermons’,¹⁶ followed by a collection of short pieces, the second homilies for the Common of Saints and the third Old Testament pieces, some sermons, *De duodecim abusiis* and the *Interrogationes*. The group of texts in P seems to be of mixed origin¹⁷ and Pope wrote that the compiler was evidently ‘making a fresh compilation, perhaps at intervals, from several different exemplars’.¹⁸ Scragg suggests that P and Cotton Faustina A.x should be viewed together ‘as part of a collection of the works of Ælfric, with three books or booklets now gathered together in Hatton 115 but originally made separately’.¹⁹ He adds that the ‘impression of an idiosyncratic assemblage of items, made in separate parts, is reinforced by the fact that the scribe made many small but significant textual changes, adding or subtracting sentences especially from the beginning and ends of items, clearly to make them fit in with his now irrecoverable purpose’.²⁰ Two of the texts in the third booklet are from what Skeat called the ‘appendix’ to *LS*: item 31, fols. 116–21, *De duodecim abusiis secundum disputacionem Cypriani episcopi et martiris*, and item 32, *Interrogationes Sigeuulfi presbiteri*.²¹ The different abuses are numbered in the margin of *De duodecim abusiis* in the same black ink as the text hand. Small capitals are filled in with red.

The hand of the main scribe is ‘not like the hands of other Anglo-Saxon manuscripts from Worcester’,²² but the manuscript must have been in Worcester by the first half of the thirteenth century, as it was glossed by the tremulous hand. Clemoes regards P as likely to be of West Midland origin²³ and the set which was the source of its *CHI* items may have gone direct to where P was written, as it

¹³ Ibid., p. 31.

¹⁴ See C. Franzen, *The Tremulous Hand of Worcester* (Oxford, 1991), p. 40.

¹⁵ Clemoes, *CHI*, p. 35, states that he does not consider that the pieces on infant baptism and the piece headed *De sanguine* (heading in a later hand) are by Ælfric.

¹⁶ The phrase is from Scragg, ‘An Unpublished Vernacular Exhortation’, p. 516.

¹⁷ Pope, p. 58.

¹⁸ Pope, p. 58, n. 3.

¹⁹ Scragg, ‘An Unpublished Vernacular Exhortation’, p. 516. Scragg notes here that the same scribe wrote P and Cotton Faustina A.x.

²⁰ Ibid.

²¹ The principal manuscript of *LS*, W, originally ended, as we know from the original table of contents, with three items which are not saints’ lives: *DE Interrogationibus sigewulfi presbyter[i]*, *DE falsis diis* and *DE XII abusiis*. Skeat, the editor of *LS*, termed these items an appendix (*LS*, II, p. ix, n. 1).

²² Ker, p. 403.

²³ *CHI*, p. 166; Pope, p. 81, says that P seems to ‘have been written in some scriptorium in the south-west’.

is demonstrably different in type to material known to have been at Worcester. P also shares a source with the south-eastern manuscript G.²⁴

C

CCCC 303 (*Ker* 57)

C is a large collection of homilies and saints' lives, mainly by Ælfric, from the first half of the twelfth century, probably later rather than earlier in that period.²⁵ It has 182 leaves, measuring 260 × 196 mm, with a written space of 213–203 × 149–138 mm. This is a simply produced manuscript, with minuscule rubrics and large red initials at the beginning of the pericopes and homilies and black initials highlighted in red within the texts. The manuscript is paginated on the rectos 1–141 and 141–361. Forty-four leaves seem to be missing from the beginning of the manuscript²⁶ and an unknown number from the end, but the remaining texts fall into five groups, the first four of which are chronologically arranged in the order of the church year:

- (a) Items 1–17, pp. 1–75: homilies for the *temporale* from the second Sunday after Epiphany²⁷ to Easter, mostly from *CH I* and *II*.
- (b) Items 18–34, pp. 76–185: texts for the *sanctorale* from 3 May to 6 December. All but four of these texts are by Ælfric and all but one of the Ælfric items are from *CH I* (the other item by him is Assmann III, part of a late re-issue of *CH I*).
- (c) Items 35–40, pp. 185–202: six homilies for the common of saints (four from *CH II* and two anonymous).
- (d) Items 41–61, pp. 203–90: texts for the *temporale* from Rogationtide to the twenty-first Sunday after Pentecost, largely from *CH I* and *II* but including one item from *LS* (*LS* xvii, *De Auguriis*, for Rogationtide) and three anonymous items for Rogationtide.
- (e) Items 62–73, pp. 290–360: miscellaneous items, almost all by Ælfric: *LS* xvi (headed *Sermo de memoria sanctorum quando uolueris*); *De duodecim abusiis* (on pp. 296–301, with the title *Sermo de duodecim*

²⁴ *CH II*, p. lxxviii.

²⁵ As well as Ker's description, the manuscript is described by Pope, pp. 18–20; *CH II*, pp. xxxiii–xxxvii; *CH I*, pp. 5–7; and T. Graham, R. Grant, P. Lucas and E. Treharne, ed., *Corpus Christi College, Cambridge I: MSS 41, 57, 191, 303, 367, 383, 422*, Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts in Microfiche Facsimile 11, MRTS 265 (Tempe, AZ, 2000), pp. 55–66. Ker, p. 99, dated the manuscript to the first half of the twelfth century; for the suggestion that it was late in that period, see E. Treharne, 'The Production and Script of Manuscripts Containing English Religious Texts in the First Half of the Twelfth Century', in *Rewriting Old English in the Twelfth Century*, ed. M. Swan and E. Treharne (2000), pp. 11–40, at 28–30, and E. Treharne, *The Old English Life of St Nicholas with the Old English Life of St Giles*, Leeds Texts and Monographs, n.s. 15 (Leeds, 1997), pp. 20–1 (this work contains a very detailed description and discussion of the manuscript at pp. 4–28).

²⁶ The medieval foliation begins at fol. 45 on what is now p. 1 of the manuscript.

²⁷ Only the last four lines of this homily are now extant; see Ker, no. 57, item 1.

Introduction

Abusiuis secundum disputationem sancti Cypriani); Pope XIX; Pope XXI; Ælfric's *Interrogationes*; *LS* XII and XIII; Latin and English forms of excommunication; the Absalom and Achitophel pendant to *LS* XIX; *LS* XXV; and Ælfric's version of the Book of Judith (Assmann IX).

The manuscript is the work of three hands: one wrote pp. 1–50 and most of pp. 203–362, the second pp. 51–202 and the third a couple of short passages, as well as being the main corrector and the miniator and rubricator.²⁸ Treharne suggests that this third scribe was 'perhaps authoritative enough to be the manuscript's compiler'.²⁹ The compiler of C or its source appears to have drawn upon different exemplars to produce this collection, as the Ælfric texts are drawn from different lines of transmission.³⁰ The collection may have been assembled in the twelfth century, with the compiler 'picking and choosing from a range of earlier manuscripts' to produce an order based on the church year.³¹

The last section of C contains all three texts from the so-called 'appendix' to *LS* in W (*De duodecim abusiuis*, *De falsis diis* and the *Interrogationes*), as well as other texts from *LS*.³² The only other items in this section are Pope XIX, Ælfric's version of the Book of Judith and the anonymous Latin and English forms of excommunication. If this section was assembled by the compiler, then he was drawing on Ælfric's *LS* or a selection drawn from this collection and was choosing only items which were not saints' lives. This collection clearly included all the items in the 'appendix' to Skeat's manuscript of *LS*, W (not, of course, signalled as an appendix in the manuscript itself). That an item from *LS* (*De auguriis*) was included in section (d) of the manuscript suggests that the source of the *LS* items in section (e) may have been available when section (d) was being compiled, though no saints' lives from *LS* are included in the *sanctorale* earlier in the manuscript (in section (b)). Either *LS* was not available at this point, or the compiler choose to restrict himself to the saints celebrated in *CHI* and *II*, whose feasts were kept by the laity, and excluded the more monastic saints in *LS*. If this were the case, then it would suggest that the distinction made by Ælfric at the end of the tenth century was still a valid one in the middle of the twelfth. On the other hand, it may be the case that the *LS* source became available only at a fairly late stage in the compilation of the collection. It is striking that in this manuscript *LS* XVI precedes *De duodecim abusiuis*, as XVI contains the account of the vices and virtues to which the twelve abuses text was added in the composite version.

De duodecim abusiuis is written as a continuous text, with no breaks to mark the different abuses (there is no case of an abuse beginning on a fresh line) and

²⁸ On this third hand, see Treharne, 'Production and Script of Manuscripts', p. 29.

²⁹ Ibid.

³⁰ As Godden, *CH II*, p. xxxvii, notes: 'the compiler of C or its source must have had access to a considerable range of earlier manuscripts, and drawn on them freely to produce his own collection'. See also S. Irvine, 'Compilation and Use of Manuscripts Containing Old English in the Twelfth Century', in *Rewriting Old English in the Twelfth Century*, ed. M. Swan and E. Treharne (2000), pp. 41–61, at 45–7.

³¹ See Irvine, 'Compilation and Use', p. 47.

³² See below, pp. 31–2, on the 'appendix'.

no numbers in the margin to number the abuses. The beginning of a fresh abuse is marked only by a slightly larger than usual capital.

Ker assigned the manuscript to Rochester on the basis of the script ('small neat script of the "prickly" kind found often in Rochester (and Canterbury) manuscripts of s. xii¹')³³ and its relationship to Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 340+342, an early-eleventh-century collection whose provenance is Rochester.³⁴ The texts from the CH in parts (c) and (d) of the manuscript derive from the second volume of Bodley 340 and 342, though with at least one intervening copy,³⁵ and some items in C are related to some in CCCC 162, again probably a Rochester manuscript.³⁶ Clemons also says that the manuscript is likely on textual grounds to have been written at Rochester and Mary Richards notes that two of the three anonymous saints' lives in the manuscript have Rochester connections. She feels that such manuscripts were connected with the monks of Rochester Cathedral, who wished to have simple teaching materials in the vernacular, for preaching in English or for use in the instruction of young students.³⁷ Susan Irvine has disputed this, suggesting that the vernacular manuscripts from Rochester Cathedral Library appear to have been for devotional reading rather than preaching or classroom purposes and that, if available to a wider reading audience than the monks alone, might have been 'read and culled by clergy who relied on the vernacular for their own education or preaching material'.³⁸

G

British Library, Cotton Vespasian D.xiv, fols. 4–169 (Ker 209)

G, fols. 4–169, dated by Ker to the middle of the twelfth century, contains a varied collection of fifty-three texts.³⁹ This part of the manuscript has 166 original leaves, measuring 189 × 123 mm, with a written space of 147 × 92 mm. There are multiple foliations and that used ordinarily in referring to the manuscript is a pencil foliation which includes the parchment flyleaves and in which the texts begin on fol. 4. The original compilation consisted of what are now articles 3–19, 21–2, 27–32, 35–53 and some now lost material after article 53.⁴⁰ Additions in

³³ Ker, p. 105.

³⁴ Ker, p. 105; the Rochester library catalogue preserved in the manuscript of the *Textus Roffensis* shows that Bodley 340+342 was there c. 1124 (see Ker, p. 367). See also K. Sisam, 'MSS. Bodley 340 and 342: Ælfric's *Catholic Homilies*', in his *Studies in the History of Old English Literature* (Oxford, 1953), pp. 148–98 (first published *Review of English Studies* 7–9 (1931–3)), at 152.

³⁵ Ker, p. 99; *CH II*, p. xxxvi.

³⁶ *CH II*, pp. xxxii–xxxvii.

³⁷ M. Richards, *Texts and their Traditions in the Medieval Library of Rochester Cathedral Priory*, *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society* 78 (Philadelphia, 1988), at 92, 94 and 119.

³⁸ Irvine, 'Compilation and Use', pp. 52–3 (quotation from p. 53) and p. 61.

³⁹ As well as the description in Ker, the manuscript is described by Pope, pp. 24–6; *CH II*, pp. xl–xlii; *CH I*, pp. 16–18; and Wilcox, *Wulfstan Texts*, pp. 53–64. It is also discussed in M. Förster, 'Der Inhalt der altenglischen Handschrift Vespasian D xiv', *Englische Studien* 54 (1920), 46–68; Richards, 'Date and Provenance'; and R. Handley, 'British Museum MS. Cotton Vespasian D.xiv', *Notes and Queries*, n.s. 21 (1974), 243–50. The contents were edited by Warner in *Early English Homilies*. The probable uses of the manuscript are discussed by Irvine, 'Compilation and Use', pp. 48–54.

⁴⁰ Handley, 'Vespasian D.xiv', p. 244.

originally blank spaces are usually in the main hand of the manuscript. The texts are all in English and ‘of a homiletic and proverbial nature’,⁴¹ ranging in date from at least as early as Ælfric’s *CHI* to works of the twelfth century, including a translation of a Latin sermon by Ralph d’Escures, bishop of Rochester (1108–14) and archbishop of Canterbury (1114–22) and Old English translations of two extracts from the *Elucidarius* by Honorius of Autun (died c. 1151). About half of the manuscript consists of works by Ælfric. The manuscript is probably the work of three hands;⁴² the main scribe, who wrote most of the manuscript, has a hand consistent with the middle of the twelfth century, while Treharne suggests that the second scribe ‘appears to use features of script which can be dated slightly later than the mid-twelfth century’.⁴³

G was assembled in five blocks of quires, as Rima Handley has shown, and often additions were made at the end of quires:

- (a) Ker, items 1–2: Additions on two quires at the beginning of the manuscript: extract from *CHI* 1 and Ælfric’s *Letter to Sigefyrth* (now fragmentary)
- (b) Ker, items 3–20: Old English translation of some of the *Disticha Catonis*; definition of the Trinity extracted from Ælfric’s *CH I* 20; extract from Ælfric’s *Second Old English Letter for Wulfstan*, on the Ten Commandments; *De .xii. abusiuis secundum disputationem sancti Cypriani martyris*; *De .VIII. principalibus uiciiis* (equivalent to *LS* xvi, lines 267–311); *De .VIII. uirtutibus* (equivalent to *LS* xvi, lines 312–81); extract from *CHI* 25 (Gospel text); extract from *CHI* 26 (gospel text); part of Old English *passio* of St James the Greater; extract from *CH II* 27 (on the Seven Sleepers); first part of *CH II* 24 (homily for feast of St Peter); *CHI* 28; *CH II* 28; *CHI* 30 (first part); *CH II* 29 (most); *CH I* 30 (second part); *CHI* 32. Added in a blank space here are an extract from Pope IV and an adaptation of two sentences from *CHI* 21.
- (c) Ker, items 21–6: first part of *CH II* 32; second part of *CH I* 34. Added on are a brief extract from *CH II* 30; a short passage quoting Augustine; an extract from Ælfric’s *First Old English Letter for Wulfstan*; and some prognostications.
- (d) Ker, items 27–34: A piece on Antichrist; *CHI* 40; second part of *CH I* 36; a translation of John 14.1–13; Old English *Gospel of Nicodemus*; abridged Old English *Vindicta Salvatoris*. Added at the end are Assmann xvii, on the fifteen days before Judgment, and prophecies based on thunder.

⁴¹ Ibid., p. 243.

⁴² Though Treharne, ‘Production and Script’, pp. 31 and 32, n. 71, points out that Ker seems undecided about whether there were two or three hands and suggests that it is possible that scribes 1 and 2 are ‘actually one and the same, and that the manuscript represents a number of stints over a period of time by the main scribe’ (p. 32, n. 71).

⁴³ Ibid., p. 34.

- (e) Ker, items 35–53: Old English translation of part of Alcuin's *De uirtutibus et uititiis*; extract from *CH I* 37; *CH II* 20; *CH II* 21; extract from *CH I* 18; extract from *CH I* 27; *CH II* 30; a homily on St Neot; Old English translation of a sermon by Ralph d'Escures; an Old English version of the *Trinubium Annae*; short Old English account of the captivity of the Jews in Babylon and a note giving the number of years from the Creation to the Incarnation; abbreviated translation of Honorius Augustodunensis, *Elucidarium*, book II, chs. 1–6. Added here are an abbreviated translation of Honorius Augustodunensis, *Elucidarium*, book I, chs. 23–5; an extract from *CH I* 19; a homily on the Phoenix; an extract from *CH I* 13; an extract from *CH I* 10, which ends imperfectly.

Blocks (b) to (e) were written first, while block (a) seems to have been added after the manuscript was put together. The second article in block (a) was written in the main hand of the manuscript, however, so the addition must be close in date to the other blocks. Handley suggests that the items in blocks (b) – (e) were copied from a single exemplar in a sequence whose liturgical items were based on the calendar.⁴⁴ If this is the case, then the exemplar must have gathered together texts from different textual traditions; the *CH I* and some of the *CH II* texts in G go back to the textual tradition represented by Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 340 and 342, CCC 198 and CCC 162, whereas other *CH II* texts agree with P in both errors and authentic revisions.⁴⁵ Other items, like the translation of the sermon by Ralph d'Escures,⁴⁶ were written in the twelfth century so that, if most of the manuscript goes back to a single exemplar, it too would have had to be twelfth-century. The remaining, non-liturgical, material fits in with this selection: 'the pieces which have been selected represent the elementary essentials of the Christian faith'.⁴⁷ The compiler (whether the scribe or whoever commissioned the manuscript) typically extracted from the texts selected, rather than copying whole texts: 'the compiler of the manuscript seems systematically to have selected and edited his material with a freedom and assurance not matched in any other collection of homilies from the period after the Conquest'.⁴⁸

De duodecim abusiis (article 6), on fols. 15–21, forms part of what was originally the beginning of the manuscript, block (b). The texts in this block begin with didactic material and *De duodecim abusiis* is preceded by a piece on the

⁴⁴ Handley, 'Vespasian D.xiv', p. 244.

⁴⁵ Godden, *CH II*, p. xli; Godden's conclusion is that 'The compiler must have drawn on a composite collection belonging to the DEF tradition but must also have had access to work belonging to a later stage of Ælfric's career, as is evident too from his inclusion of Ælfric's letters for Wulfstan.'

⁴⁶ On this text, see E. Treharne, 'The Life of English in the Mid-Twelfth Century: Ralph D'Escures's Homily on the Virgin Mary', in *Writers of the Reign of Henry II: Twelve Essays*, ed. R. Kennedy and S. Meecham-Jones (New York and Basingstoke, 2006), pp. 169–86.

⁴⁷ Handley, 'Vespasian D.xiv', p. 244.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 243; see also Irvine, 'Compilation and Use', p. 50: 'The evidence indisputably points to a compiler working around the middle of the twelfth century who, far from reproducing uncritically a random sample of Old English, is organising and adapting the material for practical purposes.'

ten commandments and followed by two extracts from *LS* xvi, headed *De .VIII. principalibus uiciis* and *De .VIII. uirtutibus*. Articles 5 to 8, then, all consist of catalogues: of the commandments, the abuses, the vices and virtues. That the extracts on the eight vices and virtues, which form part of the composite text, *De octo uitiiis et de duodecim abusiuis gradus*, follow *De duodecim abusiuis* here might suggest that we have in G an alternative arrangement of the composite text (twelve abuses followed by vices and virtues),⁴⁹ but I do not believe this to be the case. The G text lacks the introductory paragraph found in the three texts of the composite version and does not have the composite title;⁵⁰ instead it has a title similar to that of the other two stand-alone texts.⁵¹ We also know from the numerous instances in the manuscript that the G compiler favoured extracting from texts. It seems much more likely that the collocation is a coincidence and that the compiler was responsible for extracting these two catalogues of vices and virtues. Alternatively, it is possible that the pieces on vices and virtues had been circulated in this stand-alone form by Ælfric before being incorporated in *LS* xvi and that this format has survived only in G.

The beginning of *De duodecim abusiuis* is signalled by a one-and-a-half line title, *De xii abusiuis secundum disputationem sancti cipriani martyris*, with a large, decorated capital N marking the beginning of the text and initials two lines high marking the beginning of each section. All abuses but the first and fourth begin on a fresh line.⁵² There are no numbers in the margins.

Ker considers that G is ‘probably from Rochester or Canterbury’, while Handley argues for a Christ Church, Canterbury origin, at least for the original compilation, and Richards for a Rochester origin.⁵³ Handley suggests that a ‘man working at Christ Church, Canterbury, would have had available to him sufficient collections of Anglo-Saxon works from which to make the selection preserved in this manuscript, and sufficient interest in preserving the relicts of an earlier culture and transmitting them to his own time’.⁵⁴ Richards, on the other hand, contends that the ‘combined evidence of language and orthography’ point to Rochester.⁵⁵ Treharne favours Christ Church and argues that the most likely purpose is ‘that this is a monastic production originally intended for an exclusively monastic

⁴⁹ As suggested by J. Hill, ‘The Dissemination of Ælfric’s *Lives of Saints*: A Preliminary Survey’, in *Holy Men and Holy Women: Old English Prose Saints’ Lives and their Contexts*, ed. P. Szarmach (Albany, NY, 1996), pp. 235–59, at 259, n. 63: ‘It is the same adaptation in Vespasian D.xiv (Ker 209) but here the material that forms one substantial homily in CCCC 178 is divided up into shorter pieces with separate Latin headings.’

⁵⁰ See above, n. 1, for the wording in the three manuscripts of the composite text.

⁵¹ P: *De duodecim abusiuis secundum disputationem cypriani episcopi et martiris*; C: *Sermo de duodecim Abusiuis Secundum disputationem sancti Cypriani*; G: *De .xii. abusiuis secundum disputationem sancti Cypriani martyris*.

⁵² The first abuse, ‘Nu gyf se wite. . .’, begins in mid-line with a large capital N.

⁵³ Ker, p. 277; Handley, ‘Vespasian D.xiv’, pp. 247–50; Richards, ‘Date and Provenance’, pp. 31–5. Treharne, ‘Dates and Origins’, p. 232, says that Handley’s argument for Christ Church is persuasive.

⁵⁴ Handley, ‘Vespasian D.xiv’, p. 249.

⁵⁵ Richards, ‘Date and Provenance’, p. 34, and *Texts and their Traditions*, pp. 93–4.

audience'.⁵⁶ The manuscript was read and annotated by a woman at the end of the twelfth century.⁵⁷

Manuscripts containing the composite text

R

CCCC 178, pp. 1–270, + CCCC 162, pp. 139–60 (Ker 41)

This is a collection of homilies and other texts, all probably by Ælfric⁵⁸ and all copied in the first half of the eleventh century by two scribes.⁵⁹ There are 144 original leaves, measuring *c.* 287 × 195 mm, with a written space of *c.* 225 × 130 mm. The eleven leaves now in CCCC 162 seem to have been transferred by Parker from CCCC 178 and they belong between pp. 30 and 33 of CCCC 178. There is a Parkerian pagination on the rectos of R, which skips from p. 75 to p. 79, in the course of *De octo uitiiis et de duodecim abusiuis gradus*. The titles of the texts are in metallic red rustic capitals and there are red initials also. The pieces are arranged in two groups, the rationale for which is explained by a note at the end of the first group, in the hand of the first scribe; it explains that each group contains twelve texts, with the first twelve intended to be said whenever one wished and the second twelve intended for specific days, and it lists the twelve texts in the second book.⁶⁰ It does not, however, mention six short additional pieces between the eleventh and twelfth longer items in the first book. The note also says that two pieces, 'an be þam heafodleahtrum. 7 oðer be þam wiglungum', have been augmented; these augmented texts are the *De octo uitiiis et de duodecim abusiuis gradus* and *De auguriis*. The last piece in the manuscript ends imperfectly and eight more leaves were extant in the sixteenth century, as is evident from the pagination and from two tables of contents, one thirteenth-century (by the 'tremulous hand') and the other Parkerian, which both list *De septiformi spiritu* after the last extant homily; it is possible that some other items were also lost.⁶¹

The full contents are as follows:

⁵⁶ Treharne, 'The Life of English', p. 171.

⁵⁷ See Handley, 'Vespasian D.xiv', p. 247, and Irvine, 'Compilation and Use', p. 51.

⁵⁸ Clemoes, *CH I*, p. 39, says that he does not believe that two of the short pieces, *De sanguine prohibito* or *De inphantibus non baptizandis*, are by Ælfric; Godden accepts the first piece but casts doubt on the second (*CH II*, p. lxxvii, n. 1); Pope, pp. 55–7, defends both pieces as Ælfric's.

⁵⁹ As well as the description by Ker, the manuscript is described by Pope, pp. 62–7; *CH II*, pp. lxxviii–lxx; *CH I*, pp. 37–40. The first scribe copied from p. 1 to p. 169 (as far as the first five pages of the first homily of the second book) and the second pp. 170–270. Pope, p. 62, noted that, in his opinion, both hands 'may be dated only a little before the middle of the century'.

⁶⁰ See below, p. 24, for the text of the note. It is printed in full by Ker, p. 62.

⁶¹ See Ker, p. 60; Pope, p. 66, and P. Acker, 'Three Tables of Contents, One Old English Homiliary in Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 178', in *Old English Literature in its Manuscript Context*, ed. J. Lionarons, *Medieval European Studies* 5 (Morgantown, WV, 2004), 121–37.