SIR ISRAEL GOLLANCZ MEMORIAL LECTURE

THE LITERATE ANGLO-SAXON—ON SOURCES AND DISSEMINATIONS

By J. E. CROSS

Read 19 January 1972

THE name of Israel Gollancz, which it is my privilege to remember for you today, recalls with it other names in generations of scholars who laid foundations for our present study of vernacular Old English literature. Many of these assumed and often confirmed the concept of 'the literate Anglo-Saxon', realizing that such phrases as 'books tell us', 'as it says in books',[1] which are sprinkled about the poetry and prose, were not meaningless formulas. It is not, however, my choice here to summarize their conclusions. This has already been done to some degree by Professor Ogilvy in his 'Books known to the English, 597–1066'.[2] There are omissions in this study and some deficiencies in method,[3] but nothing too difficult to rectify for intelligent bibliographers who are willing to read the papers which they catalogue.

Here I want to discuss the nature and the value of the study of sources and disseminations. In doing so I hope also to illustrate the qualities of an ideal student of sources in order to remove the tarnish from his image—to many he is something like Browning's Grammarian laboriously mastering the crabbed text. Finally I wish to indicate some methods of approach which are now available for the positive finding of sources or of identifying ideas, particularly in that major genre, the homilies, but with repercussions within other kinds of Old English literature.

I have associated disseminations with sources partly because it is sometimes difficult to define an immediate source in this period of abstracting and of transmitting the 'flowers' of the

[1] See *Sprachschatz der Angelsächsischen Dichter* von C. W. M. Grein neu herausgegeben von J. J. Köhler (cited below as Grein–Köhler) (Heidelberg, 1912), s.v. *bōc*, for references to Old English poetry. For some references to prose see *Homilies of Ælfric—a supplementary collection*, ed. John C. Pope (cited below as Pope), E.E.T.S. 259, 260, (1967, 1968) 2 vols., vol. ii, s.v. Glossary, *bōc*.

[2] J. D. A. Ogilvy, *Books known to the English, 597–1066* (Cambridge, Mass., 1967). This is a sequel to his *Books known to Anglo-Latin Writers from Aldhelm to Alcuin (607–804)* (Camb., Mass., 1936).

[3] See a review of Ogilvy by Helmut Gneuss, *Anglia* 89 (1971), 129–34.

fathers, although it may yet be clear that an Old English writer saw a certain sequence of words which is recorded in a number of Latin texts—this may be called a dissemination—but mainly because my ideal scholar in this field is quite simply an identifier, if not of an immediate source, of an idea or sequence of ideas, or a sequence of words expressing those ideas.

Sources, as we already understand the term, are distinguished as immediate, intermediary, or ultimate, all having value for scholars under their varied titles. The student of sources accepts the names of these other kinds of scholar as he works. He is a shape-changer—on different occasions a lexicographer, an editor, a historian of ideas, or the better half of a critic, at times more than one of these.

For the lexicographer he has already provided a body of material especially in those translations or close adaptations of Latin texts which we now know. Normally of course he leaves the lexicographers or editors to shape the correspondences into a glossarial list. I find that I do not check every word against the dictionaries when a new source appears, but sometimes something unusual prompts a suspicion and then the lexicographer's job is done for him. In Thorpe's translation of Ælfric's homily on St. Stephen, for example, we read: 'Let no man presume on kinship without true love',[1] but Ælfric's word for Thorpe's 'kinship' is *mægðhād* which normally means 'virginity'.[2] Bosworth–Toller[3] accepted Thorpe's view and regarded this case as *mǣgðhād*, a new word, and as a unique example, meaning 'kinship'. But here Ælfric is exactly rendering a phrase from a sermon of Caesarius of Arles, which he has used largely in his own sermon: 'Nemo itaque sine caritate de virginitate praesumat',[4] and the dictionary can be corrected.

Within *The Rhyming Poem* in *The Exeter Book* the phrase *eorðmægen ealdaþ*[5] is found among a series of half-lines which

[1] *The Sermones Catholici or Homilies of Ælfric*, ed. B. Thorpe, 2 vols. (1844, 1846), vol. i, p. 55 (cited below as Thorpe).

[2] 'Ne gedyrstlæce nan man be mægðhade, butan soðre lufe', Thorpe i. 54.

[3] *An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary*, based on the manuscript collections of J. Bosworth, edited and enlarged by T. N. Toller (Oxford, 1882), s.v. *mǣgþ-hād* (cited below as Bosworth–Toller, Dict.). The ascription is not corrected in the supplement.

[4] *Sancti Caesarii Arelatensis Sermones*, ed. G. Morin, *Corpus Christianorum, series Latina* ciii, civ (Turnholti, 1953), 2 vols., vol. ii, p. 869.

[5] Citations of Old English poetry here and below are to the editions of G. P. Krapp and/or E. V. K. Dobbie, *The Anglo-Saxon Poetic Records* (New York, 1931–42), vols. i–vi, here iii. 168.

describe the vicissitudes of man 'as the world goes now'. Grein–Köhler[1] glossed the unique compound *eorðmægen*, 'vis terrestris', 'power, vigour, belonging to the earth', and it would be difficult to avoid that meaning in terms of the elements of the compound. But a question-mark was added in the dictionary, because, I suspect, the lexicographer could not understand how that meaning fitted the context: 'the power of the earth grows old'. We now know, however, of the Christian Anglo-Saxon belief in the parallel progress of man (the microcosm) and the world (the macrocosm) and that *The Rhyming Poem* appears to illustrate that belief. Also that the Anglo-Saxons believed that they lived in the last age of the world, as we still do, when 'the power of the earth *is* old',[2] so the question-mark may be deleted.

Let us hope that the new lexicographers will read the papers of those who identify idea and source for there they will find, if not always fact, often reasonably founded argument which should be seriously considered.

A source-hunter needs a well-edited text, a collated text with variants if possible, both of the Old English and of the Latin exemplars, and should be prepared to transcribe and edit, or to test the editor where necessary. On this point John Pope rightly warns us that the exact variant text of the Latin which the Anglo-Saxon may have seen may be lost to us.[3] This caveat is important, however, only where the Anglo-Saxon differs from the Latin since verbal equivalence obviously indicates that a particular Latin reading was available. Obviously where differences from any known Latin text occur, proposed reasons for those differences can, at best, only be probabilities. Yet most of our suggestions within the humanities are only probabilities at best and this should encourage us to continue.

As editor, the source-hunter may test a scribal rendering in Vercelli Homily V which was accepted by Max Förster without

[1] Grein–Köhler, s.v. *eorðmægen*.

[2] See J. E. Cross, 'Aspects of Microcosm and Macrocosm in Old English Literature', *Studies in Old English Literature in honor of Arthur G. Brodeur*, ed. S. B. Greenfield (Eugene, Oregon, 1963), 1–22.

[3] Pope i. 151, but limiting himself to Ælfric and expressing the idea in a different way: 'Even when the correspondence with Ælfric is persuasively clear, it must not be unquestioningly assumed that the Latin as quoted is precisely what Ælfric had before him.' By 'correspondence', of course, Professor Pope does not mean exact verbal equivalence. There are phrases in Ælfric's homilies which echo exactly Latin phrases which are printed in modern editions and it would be foolish to assume that Ælfric hit on the exact equivalence other than by seeing such Latin phrases before him.

comment since it made sense in its immediate context, and appears in the two other texts of the homily. This is the phrase used to describe Christ, as it says: 'who is rightly named *sōðfæstnesse sunu*',[1] where *sunu* should mean 'son'. *Sōðfæstness* is used later in the homily to translate *iustitia*, within a quotation of Romans 10: 10 which appears both in Latin and Old English,[2] so our phrase should be equivalent to a Latin *filius iustitiae*. But this is not an appropriate name for Christ within the passage, which speaks of the wonders that happened in Octavian Cæsar's reign,[3] among them that:[4] 'then at the third hour of the day . . . then was visible to men in the heavens the likeness of a golden ring around the sun and in the ring was betokened that in his reign the prince would be born who is rightly named *sōðfæstnesse sunu*. That is then our Saviour Christ who, with his beauty, adorned the sun which now daily gives us light'. As Augustine once said:[5] 'Some of you anticipated me', but there is a more important clue, the word 'named', for nowhere within Scripture is Christ named *filius iustitiae*. But the phrase *sol iustitiae* occurs in Malachi 4: 2, and this is commonly regarded as a name[6] for Christ in religious literature. Need we say more? The error is, I suggest,

[1] 's[e] is rihtlice nemned soðfæstnesse sunu' in *Die Vercelli-Homilien*, herausgegeben von Max Förster (Hamburg, 1932, 1964 reprint), V, ll. 73–4, p. 115.

[2] 'swa se eadega Paulus be þan cwæð: "Corde creditur ad iustitiam . . ." Mid heortan man sceall gelyfan, þæt he mæge to soðfæstnesse becuman . . . ,' Förster V, ll. 111–14, p. 118, with editorial emendation, suggested by Förster (n. 59) of: 'to soðfæstnesse' for Vercelli: 'mid soðfæstnesse'.

[3] For discussion of the main source see J. E. Cross, 'Portents and events at Christ's birth—comments on Vercelli V, VI and the *Old English Martyrology*', to appear in *Anglo-Saxon England* ii (1973).

[4] 'ða æt þære ð[riddan] tide þæs dæges, . . . þa wæs [man]num on heofonum gesine gyldnes hringes onlic[nes] ymb-utan þa sunnan. 7 on þam hringe wæs getacnod, þæt on his rice acenned wolde bion se æðeling s[e] is rihtlice nemned soð-fæstnesse sunu. þæt is þonne [u]re Hælend Crist, þæt he mid his fægernesse ge-wlitgode þa sunnan, þe us nu dæg-hwamlice lyhteð . . .', Förster, p. 115, reading 'us' for Vercelli 'up' with Förster in the last phrase.

[5] 'Nam praevenerunt aliqui . . .', Sermo cxvii § 11, *Patrologia Latina* (*P.L.*) 38, col. 667.

[6] Fred C. Robinson has discussed 'etymologies' as names in two seminal papers, 'The significance of names in Old English Literature', *Anglia* 86 (1968), 14–58, and 'Some uses of name-meanings in Old English poetry', *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen* 69 (1968), 161–71. See also J. E. Cross, '*Halga hyht* and poetic stimulus in *The Advent Poem* (*Christ I*), 56–70', *Neophilologus* 53 (1969), 194–9. *Sol iustitiae*, however, is a different kind of name, a scriptural phrase abstracted and used as an equivalent. For some discussion of this kind

palaeographical and in Old English, where *sunu* for an abbreviated or simplified *suna*[1] is likely, not in Latin where *filius* has no resemblance to *sol*. It is not a mistake of the Vercelli scribe since the two other manuscripts also have the error, nor of the original writer of the Old English homily (whether it is a translation from a Latin text or an Old English creation), since a translator of Latin would not confuse *filius* and *sol*, nor would an Old English composer cite a scriptural name which is inappropriate in context and indeed is not regarded as a name for Christ. The identifier has made a contribution to the placing and editing of the Vercelli text.

John Pope[2] has recently illustrated what he calls the 'very practical uses' of sources for editor and lexicographer, with examples which are well-worth considering, so we may continue with equally important uses for the history of ideas and for criticism. In these areas the student of sources obviously contributes to the understanding of the intellectual environment from which literature springs and of which each individual work of literature is a part. But there is always a danger in this period of accepted plagiarism in attempting to postulate direct

of name, although with particular application, see J. E. Cross, 'The "coeternal beam" in *The OE Advent Poem (Christ I)* ll. 104–129', *Neophilologus* 48 (1964), 72–81. The Latin antiphon, on which this last Old English poetic sequence is based, includes *sol justitiae* among the 'names' of Christ. Some among those who used this Scriptural name were Ælfric *De Temporibus Anni*, ed. H. Henel, E.E.T.S. o.s. 213 (1942), 14; *Sermones Catholici*, ed. Thorpe, ii. 224; an anonymous Old English composition on 'The Seven Sleepers' within *Ælfric's Lives of Saints*, ed. W. W. Skeat, E.E.T.S. (1881–1900), i. 538; Gregory, *Homilia XXX in Evangelia* § 10; Cæsarius of Arles, ed. cit. i. 429–30, 561; Bede in *Bedae Opera, pars III, opera homiletica*, ed. D. Hurst, *C.C.S.L.* cxxii (Turnholti, 1955), 19 and 287. Other citations could be added.

[1] The palaeographical and linguistic aspects of this suggestion have been generously considered by Dr. Donald Scragg who has made a study of the language of the Vercelli Book. As Scragg points out, there are instances of *sunna*, e.g. Vercelli IV l. 179, Förster p. 87, Vercelli XXI fol. 116b l. 4 (cf. also Bosworth–Toller Dict. s.v. *sunna*), and an *a/u* error is commonly attested in Old English manuscripts. Simplification of *nn* to *n* is also well-attested. Abbreviation is less likely since the use of the nasal tilde to denote *n* is comparatively rare, normally standing for *m* except in *poñ*, *poñe* (for *ponne*). Scragg says further: 'I cannot somehow see any scribe meaning *sunna* (*sunne*) by *sunu*; scribes usually attempt to avoid confusion of possible homographs e.g. in the use of accent-marks.' He raises the possibility (which is certainly permissible) of a scribal substitution of *sunu* because the scribe was more familiar with the concept 'son' associated with Christ. But I think that wide use of the name *sol iustitiae* would make *sunna* (*sunne*) the more familiar concept in this context.

[2] Pope, i. 153.

connections between one work and another. It can be done,[1] but extreme care is needed together with corroborative evidence. I illustrate the difficulty from invalid conclusions within two recent papers, but without any delight, so I will be brief.

In a paper called 'Microcosmic Adam', which appeared in *Medium Ævum* in 1966, J. M. Evans[2] commented on a theme, deriving ultimately from *The Book of the Secrets of Enoch*, which itemized the substances from which Adam was made. Two examples are known in England of our period, one in Latin in *The Durham Ritual*,[3] together with an interlinear vernacular gloss, and another in the Old English Prose *Solomon and Saturn*.[4] Unknown to Mr. Evans, Max Förster had written about the theme in 1908.[5] Mr. Evans suggested that the Latin of *The Durham Ritual* depended on the Old English of the *Solomon and Saturn*; Professor Förster, who had collected a number of Latin examples, thought that the Old English of *Solomon and Saturn*

[1] Obviously where there are clear indications of the source in the text, for example, where Ælfric (Thorpe i. 304) discusses the Epistle of James 2: 19 referring to a place: 'in quodam tractu, qui aestimatur Sancti Hilarii fuisse', and a verbal equivalence is found between his own Latin quotation and one from an *Expositio in VII epistolas catholicas*, once ascribed to Hilary, but now regarded as an Irish text of the eighth century. Max Förster, *Anglia* 16 (1894), 49–50 and 50 n. 1, looked through the works of Hilary, but overlooked the clear clue in Ælfric's 'aestimatur'. Even to Ælfric this text was Pseudo-Hilary. For further details see J. E. Cross, *Anglia* 86 (1968), 77–8. Ogilvy's reference to his 'Hilarius ignotus', *Books known to the English*, 158, may now be corrected.

[2] J. M. Evans 'Microcosmic Adam', *Medium Ævum* xxxv (1966), 38–42.

[3] Octo pondera de quibus factus est Adam, pondus limi inde factus est caro, pondus ignis inde rubeus est sanguis et calidus, pondus salis inde sunt salsae lacrimae, pondus roris inde factus est sudor, pondus floris inde est varietas oculorum, pondus nubis inde est instabilitas mentium, pondus venti inde est anhela frigida, pondus gratiae inde est sensus hominis', *Rituale Ecclesiae Dunelmensis*, revised edition ed. U. Lindelöf, *Publications of the Surtees Society* cxl (Durham, London, 1927), 192.

[4] 'Ic ðe secge, þæt æroste wæs foldan pund of ðam him wæs flesc geworht. Oðer wæs fyres pund; þanon hym wæs þæt blod read7 hat. Ðridde wæs windes pund; þanon hym wæs seo æðung geseald; feorðe wæs wolcnes pund; þanon hym wæs his modes unstaðelfæstnes geseald. Fifte wæs gyfe pund; þanon hym wæs geseald sefa 7 geðang. Syxte wæs blosmena pund; þanon hym wæs eagena myssenlicnys geseald. Seofoðo wæs deawes pund; ðanon him becom swat. Eahtoðe wæs sealtes pund; þanon hi*m* wæron þa tearas sealte'; text edited from MS. Cotton Vitellius A XV fol. 87^{v} (with capitalization as manuscript), since the printed text in J. M. Kemble, *The Dialogue of Salomon and Saturnus* (London, 1848), 180 has misreadings.

[5] 'Adams Erschaffung und Namengebung', *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft* xi (1907–8), 477–527. Förster, 494, regarded the Old English of *Solomon and Saturn* as 'eine wörtliche Übersetzung' of *The Durham Ritual*'s Latin.

derived from the Latin of *The Durham Ritual*. Mr. Evans's suggestion is demonstrably incorrect. Max Förster's conclusion is doubtful. Mr. Evans's argument rests mainly on the difference in item 7 of *The Durham Ritual*, *anhela frigida*, and item 3 of the *Solomon and Saturn*, *æðung*, and a proposal that Old English *æðung geseald* (given breath) was misread as *æðung geceald* (cold breath) and gave rise to the Latin phrase *anhela frigida*. There are obvious objections. The text of *The Durham Ritual* is tenth-century[1] while the text of the *Solomon and Saturn* is twelfth-century;[2] a form *geceald* would be a unique form of the adjective *ceald*, the letters s and c are quite dissimilar in the script of the *Solomon and Saturn* text, but, equally important, there are other examples of the Latin theme in texts before the tenth century. In Max Förster's paper, *The Durham Ritual* example was placed with other Latin examples to form a distinctive group.[3] To that group I would now add an example from the *Catéchèses celtiques*,[4] but would go no further. For, in the case of this common theme, examples of which are surely lost or as yet unprinted, one may well ask against Förster, why a man with an exemplar before him should vary the order of the items.[5] I suspect also that the Solomon scribe saw 'breath' alone as in, but not necessarily in, the *Catéchèses celtiques*.

Similarly, I select detail in opposition to Aaron Mirsky's suggestion[6] that the poets of the Old English *Genesis A* and of *Exodus*

[1] Our text is from Part III of the manuscript (ed. cit., p. xi). Most of the Latin section inclusive of our text is regarded as in the hand of the glossator which is dated as second half of tenth century (ed. cit., pp. xlix and liii). See also N. R. Ker, *Catalogue of manuscripts containing Anglo-Saxon* (Oxford, 1957), art. 106.

[2] Ker, *Catalogue*, art. 215.

[3] Förster, op. cit. 494.

[4] 'Dies dominicus dies beatus, in qua die spira[uit] pondus limi unde facta est caro, pondus salis unde salsae sunt lacrimae, pondus ignis unde rubicundus est sanguis, pondus uenti unde est anhela, pondus florum unde est uarietas oculorum, pondus nubis unde est instabilitas mentium, pondus roris unde est sudor. Haec sunt VIII pondera de quibus factus est Adam; alius pondus, idest anima, de celestibus facta est', printed in A. Wilmart, *Reg. Lat. 49, Catéchèses celtiques, Studi e Testi* 59 (1933), 111. Wilmart (29) dates the text as tenth century, with 'une préférence pour la première moitié', and suggests that it cannot be older than the end of the ninth century. It is very tentatively placed in Brittany (31) but has 'insular' features (29).

[5] There is also omission of the adjective at *æðung* (breath) compared with *anhela frigida*, and extension of *sensus* to *sefa 7 geðang*, but such omissions and extensions can occur in direct copying.

[6] Aaron Mirsky, 'On the Sources of the Anglo-Saxon *Genesis* and *Exodus*', *English Studies* 48 (1967), 385–97. The wording used by Mr. Mirsky indicates

had as source-material ancient writings of the Talmud, of the Midrashim, and Hebrew liturgical poems. Obviously some of Mr. Mirsky's examples could be near the ultimate source of certain ideas in the Old English poems, although some similarities are slight and scarcely distinctive, but it would be remarkable if the Old English poets knew of Jewish traditions directly. To take one of Mirsky's cases,[1]

	Hie on geogoðe bu
wlitebeorht wæron	on woruld cenned
meotodes mihtum	(*Genesis A*, 187–9)

for which he refers to the Midrash Rabah. There it says that Adam was 'created as a young man in his fullness'; so too was Eve—as a woman. Clearly the *Genesis A* poet is agreeing with the Midrash Rabah that Adam and Eve were created fully formed, in their prime, but also agreeing with a tradition, exemplified elsewhere in Old English that Adam and Eve were born fully grown, for example, among the twelfth-century jottings in a manuscript of Ælfric's *Heptateuch* where: 'Methodius cwað adam wæs gesceopa man on wlite of ðritig wintra.'[2] The name Methodius suggests a tradition in Latin which is the more likely venue of dissemination. A historian of Old English ideas should normally expect a dissemination in Latin, whether Irish or Continental, for an idea found in Greek or Hebrew. These papers are nevertheless contributions to the history of the ideas which appear in the named literary works. It is often valuable to identify commonplace ideas as I shall later emphasize.

Earlier I said, perhaps provocatively, that a student of sources and their ideas could be the better half of a literary critic, certainly, if criticism (as I understand it does) consists of two aspects, explication deriving from understanding and then evaluation. Perceiving what a poem says and what the poet is

that he thinks that his material provides direct sources, but his work has the value of directing our attention to the extra-Scriptural ideas in the poems by means of the parallels cited.

[1] Aaron Mirsky, op. cit. 388.

[2] *The Old English Version of the Heptateuch* etc., ed. S. J. Crawford, E.E.T.S. o.s. 160 (1922), 419. For other examples of the idea that Adam was created in his prime (normally at the age of 30) see Kemble, op. cit. 180; A. S. Napier, *Anglia* 11 (1889), 2; Whitley Stokes, *Revue celtique* 28 (1907), 316–17. The *Rituale Ecclesiae Dunelmensis* ed. cit. 197 notes that Eve was born at the age of thirty. For the reference to Stokes I am indebted to Dr. Thomas Hill of Cornell with whom I am preparing an edition of *The Prose Solomon and Saturn*.

attempting to do from the ideas presented and identified within it is a necessity for good criticism. The perception of those ideas in their sequences within a poem written some thousand years ago is often available only to a critic who is immersed in the waves of current thought. Obviously certain ideas linked with the unchanging condition of man are received clearly by the alert modern reader; but in our Old English literature, as we already know, many allusions, references, and attitudes need explication, many seemingly illogical sequences of thought need to be tested. Valid evaluation is based on full understanding of the ideas presented in the form and style which the poet has chosen.

Our illustration today must be short—the poem *The Order of the World* in *The Exeter Book* which Professors Huppé and Isaacs[1] have recently criticized. Here, only the ideas which they have misunderstood or overlooked can be considered, but if our identifications are valid, our view of the whole poem must obviously be different from those suggested. The body of the poem, the so-named *herespel* (story of praise), eulogizes God in his control of the visible creation, with some clear echoes of Scriptural idea as the two critics have suggested. But two statements about the created things are not Scriptural, the longer being the passage about the progress of the sun, which Huppé regards as a symbolic statement[2] and Isaacs leaves aside. We take relevant phrases from the quotation.[3] As the poet says, the sun comes from the east every morning 'over the waves' (61). Later the heavenly body (*tungol*, 69) departs with its glory *on heape* (69) into the western sky until, at evening, it treads the depths

[1] B. F. Huppé, *The Web of Words* (Albany, New York, 1970), 28–61; N. D. Isaacs, *Structural Principles in Old English Poetry* (Knoxville, Tennessee, 1968), 71–82.

[2] Huppé 34 and 49–50.

[3]
ond þis leohte beorht
cymeð morgna gehwam ofer misthleoþu
wadan ofer wægas wundrum gegierwed,
ond mid ærdæge eastan snoweð
wlitig ond wynsum wera cneorrissum . . .

Gewiteð þonne mid þy wuldre on westrodor
forðmære tungol faran on heape,
oþþæt on æfenne ut garsecges
grundas pæþeð glom oþer cigð;
niht æfter cymeð . . .

[note 3 continued on p. 76]

(*grundas*, 71) of the *utgarsecg*[1] or *garsecg* (70), and calls forth a second twilight. Night follows and the sun, a moving heavenly body (*farende tungol*, 75) hastens into the creation of God under the bosom or expanse (*fæðm*, 75) of the earth. The poet comments: 'Truly there is no man living so wise that can know its source (*æspringe*, 77), through his own ability, how the sun, bright as gold, goes through the depth (*geond grund*, 78) into that black darkness under the surge of waters, or what land-dweller can enjoy the light when it turns over the sea (76–81)'.[2]

Here, quite simply, is the geocentric universe[3] of the ancients where the sun, 'a moving heavenly body' 'comes' (60) and 'goes' (68) around the earth, which does not revolve. This earth is surrounded by water since the sun 'comes over the waves' (60) every morning and 'turns over the sea' (81) in the evening, eventually 'treading the depths' of the *garsecg* or *utgarsecg*. Such a phenomenon cannot be observed except unusually and ridiculously by a man standing on a high point of a small island, so the comment derives from the literate tradition of the circumambient *Oceanus*. Homer had referred to the river-sea *Oceanus* surrounding the earth, but ancient geographers had accepted the idea[4] and, much later, the writer of the influential *Visio S. Pauli*[5] had believed in it. Basil, however, had also spoken of

> Heofontorht swegl
> scir gescyndeð in gesceaft godes
> under foldan fæþm, farende tungol.
> Forþon nænig fira þæs frod leofað
> þæt his mæge æspringe þurh his ægne sped witan,
> hu geond grund færeð goldtorhte sunne
> in þæt wonne genip under wætra geþring,
> oþþe hwa þæs leohtes londbuende
> brucan mote, siþþan heo ofer brim hweorfeð.
> (*The Order of the World* 59–63; 68–72; 73–81).

[1] *The Exeter Book Part II*, ed. W. S. Mackie, E.E.T.S., o.s. 194 (1934), 52, reads line 70b as *utgarsecges*.

[2] There are some textual problems in this passage at line 77 as indicated by G. P. Krapp and E. V. K. Dobbie, A.S.P.R. iii (1936), 310. My translation assumes that *his* refers to the sun described in its nearest antecedent synonym *tungol*, neut. or masc., but there may be textual corruption in the whole line.

[3] See e.g. *Byrhtferth's Manual*, ed. S. J. Crawford, E.E.T.S. o.s. 177 (1929), 124 and parallels noted there.

[4] See G. Sarton, *A History of Science* (Camb., Mass., 1953), i. 138 (Homer, *Iliad* xviii. 399; *Odyssey* xx. 65) and 186 (Hecataios of Miletos). See also J. K. Wright, *Geographical Lore of the time of the Crusades* (New York, 1925), 18 and notes.

[5] See T. D. Hill, 'Apocryphal cosmography and the "stream uton sæ", a note on *Christ and Satan*, lines 4–12', *Philological Quarterly* xlviii (1969), 550–4, with citation of *Visio S. Pauli*: 'Hic est oceanus qui circuit omnem terram' (551).

it[1] and Isidore had recorded:[2] 'The *orbis* is so called from the roundness of the circle which is like that of a wheel ... For *Oceanus* flowing around in its circle on all sides surrounds its boundaries.' This concept is known in Old English in the vernacular version of Orosius:[3] 'Our ancestors, said Orosius, divided into three all this circle (*ymbhwyrft*) of this earth, which the *Oceanus* which we call *garsecg* surrounds.'

The equivalence of *Oceanus* with *garsecg* in this quotation, and also in Ælfric's Glossary,[4] may be a reason why the editors Krapp and Dobbie reject the unique but permissible[5] compounding of *utgarsecg* as in the standard dictionaries[6] in their reading of line 70b. Editors and lexicographers have to make a choice, and, while it makes no difference to the general meaning, I prefer to side with the lexicographers to the credit of the poet. If the words are read separately, *ūt* would be a tautological use of the adverb, i.e. '*Oceanus* (surrounding ocean) outside', but the alternative can be the compound *utgarsecg*, where presumably *garsecg*, which had been used in Old English poetry to signify any large expanse of water, now needs a limiting prefix to specify *Oceanus*, 'the outer ocean'.

In either case the sun 'treads the depths' of *Oceanus*, as Isidore expresses the concept with a different metaphor:[7]

> The eastern sun holds its way through the south (that is, in the northern hemisphere), and after it comes to the west and bathes itself in *Oceanus*, it passes by unknown ways beneath the earth and again returns to the east.

I did not translate *on heape* (69) which apparently has caused difficulties, Grein–Köhler setting a question-mark against a suggestion: '*coetus, concio*',[8] and Bosworth–Toller Supplement taking

[1] *Hexaemeron*, homily IV § 4 (*Patrologia Graeca* xxix, col. 88).

[2] 'Orbis a rotunditate circuli dictus, qui sicut rota est; ... Undique enim Oceanus circumfluens ejus in circulo ambit fines', *Etymologiarum libri XX*, XIV. ii. 1 (*P.L.* 82, col. 495).

[3] 'Ure ieldran ealne þisne ymbhwyrft þises middangeardes, cwæþ Orosius, swa swa Oceanus utan ymbligeþ, þone (man) garsecg hateð, on þreo todældon', *King Alfred's Orosius*, ed. H. Sweet, E.E.T.S. o.s. 79 (1883), 8.

[4] Note the order of presentation: 'mare *vel* aequor, sæ. pelagus, widsæ. oceanum, garsecg.' *Ælfrics Grammatik und Glossar*, herausgegeben von J. Zupitza (Berlin, 1880), 297.

[5] Compare Grein–Köhler s.v. *ūtgemāru*, Bosworth–Toller Dict. s.v. *ūthealf*.

[6] Bosworth–Toller Dict. and Grein-Köhler s.v. *ūtgārsecg*.

[7] 'Sol oriens per meridiem iter habet, qui postquam ad occasum venerit, et Oceano se tinxerit per incognitas sub terra vias vadit, et rursus ad orientem recurrit', *Etym.* III. lii. 1 (*P.L.* 82, col. 175).

[8] s.v. *hēap* 3. *coetus, concio*.

the phrase *on heape* as a vague 'together'.[1] But Old English *heap* is normally a crowd and more than two (the sun and the glory). Such a crowd here can be the group of 'fixed' stars which, to medieval man, revolve with the heavens although they are unseen in daylight, as Isidore says.[2]

There is yet one more medieval notion, I think, in that addition by the poet when he wonders whether 'a land-dweller' may enjoy the light of the sun[3] when it 'turns over the sea'. Such a statement has real meaning, I find, only in terms of the ancient discussion about the possibility of *antipodes*, that is, *inhabitants* of lands in the southern hemisphere, or on the underside of a flat-disc earth. This idea had been proposed and opposed among the Greeks themselves.[4] Christians had no need to worry about speculation on *land* which they had not seen. But *people* there, of course, would be souls whom the Faith could not save. So Augustine spoke:[5] 'as to the fable that there are Antipodes, that is to say, men on the opposite side of the earth . . . that is on no ground credible. And indeed, it is not affirmed that this has been learned by historical knowledge, but by scientific conjecture'. 'It is too absurd', he continues later—agreeing in his conclusions with Lactantius,[6] a flat-earth man, who illustrated his view with detail of trees and men upside down and rain falling upwards. Isidore and Bede[7] regarded the story as *fabulosus*. But

[1] s.v. *hēap* IV.

[2] Stellae immobiles sunt, et cum coelo fixae perpetuo motu feruntur, neque cadunt per diem, sed solis splendore obscurantur', *Etym.* III. lxii. 1; 'Sidera, aut feruntur, aut moventur. Feruntur quæ coelo fixa sunt, et cum coelo volvuntur', *Etym.* III. lxiii. 1 (*P.L.* 82, col. 177).

[3] There is no problem in the *shining* of the sun at night on the other side of the earth. See Ælfric's *De Temporibus Anni* ed. cit. 10 (I § 19) and notes.

[4] See J. O. Thomson, *History of Ancient Geography* (Cambridge, 1948), Index, antipodes, 414, and references in the text.

[5] 'Quod vero et antipodas esse fabulantur, id est homines a contraria parte terrae . . . nulla ratione credendum est. Neque hoc ulla historica cognitione didicisse se adfirmant, sed quasi ratiocinando coniectant . . . nimisque absurdum est', *De Civitate Dei*, ed. E. Hoffmann (*Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum* xl), vol. ii, p. 142. Translation by M. Dods, *The City of God* (Edinburgh, 1888), ii. 118, 119.

[6] See Wright, op. cit. 56.

[7] 'Extra tres autem partes orbis, quarta pars trans Oceanum interior est in Meridie, quae solis ardore nobis incognita est, in cujus finibus Antipodes fabulose inhabitare produntur', *Etym.* XIV, v. 17. On the Antipodes in IX. ii. 133 Isidore echoes Augustine in the passage cited in n. 5. Bede speaks most clearly in *De Temporum Ratione* xxxiv: 'Quamvis unam solummodo probare possunt habitatam, neque enim vel antipodarum ullatenus est fabulis accomodandus assensus . . .', cited from *Bedae opera de temporibus*, ed. C. W. Jones (Camb., Mass., 1943), 245.

one man, at least, held to the possibility, the Christian Irishman, Virgil of Salzburg who was accused of heresy for this belief by Boniface in the eighth century[1]—and Greek knowledge about the concept had been transmitted by the encyclopaedists Martianus Capella and Macrobius[2] early to Ireland and their works appear to be available in tenth/eleventh century Britain. Our poet is equivocal since as he says: 'there is no man so wise that can know', which echoes Augustine's *reason*: 'this has not been learned by historical knowledge', but does not add the Latin writer's *conclusion*: 'that is on no ground credible'. Nevertheless the poet's statement has meaning and allusion in relation to the persistent argument.

The other non-Scriptural statement in the poem about the real world is one which we may still accept, although of ancient origin, and, as I translate it, the statement is understood:[3] 'His power draws forth the heavenly candles (or candle),[4] and the waters with them.' This obviously refers to the influence of sun and/or moon on the tides, and, leaving aside the many names of early supporters of this belief, I note only Anglo-Saxons who knew of it. Clearly Bede is important. In his early work *De Natura Rerum* he drew indirectly on the Irish Augustine,[5] and

[1] See M. L. W. Laistner, *Thought and Letters in Western Europe* (London, 1931, revised edition 1957), 184–5, and references cited there. On Virgil (Fergal) of Salzburg see P. Grosjean, 'Virgil of Salzburg' in *Irish Monks of the Golden Age* ed. J. Ryan (Dublin, 1963), 73–85.

[2] Ogilvy op. cit. 199–200 on Martianus Capella, and 196–7 on Macrobius. On the importance of encyclopaedias in the transmission of information see W. H. Stahl, 'Dominant traditions in early medieval science', *Isis* 50 (1959), 95–124.

[3]
meaht forð tihð
heofoncondelle ond holmas mid
(*Order of the World*, 53–4).

Huppé op. cit. 31 (cf. 47, 49) mistranslates *tihð* (*tēon*) as 'sends' and probably thus prevents himself from recognizing the idea.

[4] The form *heofon-condelle* (*candel* fem. -jo stem) in this context may be accusative singular or plural. The meaning of the compound is as in the translation, but its application here is regarded by Grein–Köhler and Bosworth–Toller Dict. s.v. as being to the stars. This application takes no account of 'ond holmas mid', and the fact that no ancient writer regarded the stars alone as having influence over the waters. Huppé op. cit. 47 chooses 'stars' to fit his pre-conceived symbolic interpretation.

[5] A number of chapters in Bede's *De Natura Rerum* reveal clear verbal echoes of *De Ordine Creaturarum Liber*, a text once regarded as Isidore's and printed in *P.L.* 83, cols. 913–54, but now regarded as an anonymous text with Irish connections. Professor C. W. Jones, who is editing *De Natura* for the

technical names which are found in this Augustine's work, *malinae* for the stronger tides and *ledones* for the weaker tides,[1] appear in Old English glossarial lists from the eighth/ninth century.[2] Ælfric turned to Bede[3] for information on the moon and tides, Byrhtferth abstracted from Ælfric and others.[4] Other anonymous Anglo-Saxons transcribed texts entitled: 'De Concordia Maris et Lunae'.[5] One scribe thought fit to fill a manuscript page with a snippet beginning: 'Her is seo endebyrdnes

Corpus Christianorum Series Latina, knew of this link and was generous enough to confirm my findings in a letter of 26 Nov. 1969 in which he said that, at present, he believed that *De Ordine* was 'written in Northumbria, quite possibly at Whitby'.

M. C. Díaz y Díaz has shown the connection between *De Ordine* and *De mirabilibus sacrae scripturae* (*P.L.* 35, cols 2149–2200) in 'Isidoriana I, sobre el *liber de ordine creaturarum*', *Sacris Erudiri* 5 (1953), 147–66. *De mirabilibus* was written by Augustinus Hibernicus in A D. 655, as indicated in J. F. Kenney, *The sources for the early history of Ireland* (1966 reprint, revised by L. Bieler), 276–7.

[1] R. E. Latham, *Revised Medieval Latin word-list* (1965), s.v. *ledo* and *malina* has references with dates within our period or earlier for *ledo(n)*, 'neap tide' 655, 720, for *malina*, 'high or spring tide' *c.* 550, 860, but the 'select classified bibliography of authors etc.', pp. xxi–xxiii, is not sufficient to identify the works in which the words appeared. Dictionaries can be useful to historians of ideas if the works from which the words are gathered are adequately identified. One could make a guess for *ledo* 655 (Augustinus Hibernicus) and 720 (Bede, *De Temporum Ratione* cap. xxix), and add that *malina* also appears in these works. But on *malina* and *ledo* see a full note in C. W. Jones, *Bedae Opera de Temporibus* 364, pointing out that the first known use of the words occurs in *De Medicamentis* of Marcellus of Bordeaux (fourth century). See also Díaz y Díaz op. cit. 162 n. 1.

[2] *The Corpus Glossary* (eighth/ninth century) in *The Oldest English texts* E.E.T.S. o.s. 83 (1885), ed. H. Sweet, 35: 'ledo: nepflod'; 'malina: fylledflood'. On the date see Ker *Catalogue* art. 36 p. 49. Other Old English glosses to the words are recorded in *Anglo-Saxon and Old English vocabularies*, ed. T. Wright, second edition, ed. R. P. Wülcker (London, 1884), vol. i col. 225 l. 11: 'dodrans i malina: egur', (B. M. Harley MS. 3376, tenth/eleventh century); vol. i col. 289 l. 4: 'ledo: nepflod' (Brussels, Bibliothèque royale 1828–30, eleventh century); vol. i col. 182, 39, 40: 'ledona: nepflod vel ebba; malina: heahflod' (from a copy by Franciscus Junius, Bodley Junius 71, of glosses which are extant in Antwerp, Plantin-Moretus Museum 47+BM. Add. MS. 32246: see Ker, *Catalogue* art. 2).

[3] See Ælfric, *De Temporibus Anni* viii. 15, ed. cit. 66, parallels noted by Henel 67 and the note to the passage. See also *The Sermones Catholici* ed. cit. i. 102.

[4] *Byrhtferth's Manual* ed. cit. 156–8 and notes by Crawford. See also notes by Henel 99 on Byrhtferth's statement.

[5] MSS. Caligula A XV fol. 127^{r}, Tiberius B V fol. 49^{v}, Tiberius C I fol. 36^{v} noted by Henel ed. cit. 99.

monan gonges 7 sæ flodes',[1] followed immediately by an explanation of the Virgin's age. However curious and inconsequential these snippets may be, they are important evidence of what were remembered commonplaces of the period. Aldhelm certainly expected the concept to be a commonplace when he referred to it in his enigma on *Luna*.[2]

So now we seem to have a poem in which Scriptural and non-Scriptural statements about God and the world are mingled.[3] Of course this is the common Christian attitude to the physical creation in the Old English period and earlier. The great hexaemeral writers, Basil and Ambrose, based their comments on the nature of the world on Scripture whose statements were not to be denied. If the speculations and deductions of the pagan Greeks opposed the words of Scripture, they were ridiculed or avoided. If, however, there was no conflict or misunderstanding, Greek concepts of the world were aligned with Scripture and these finally passed to the Anglo-Saxons.[4] Our poet writes within this tradition, and in the same manner about God and the real

[1] MS. Titus D 27 fol. 55^{v} printed by Napier, *Anglia* 11 (1889), 6.

[2] Nunc ego cum pelagi fatis communibus insto
Tempora reciprocis convolvens menstrua cyclis:
Ut mihi lucifluae decrescit gloria formae,
Sic augmenta latex redundans gurgite perdit.

Aldhelm, *Ænigma VI*, 'Luna', *Collectionis Ænigmatum Merovingicae Aetatis*, ed. Fr. Glorie, *C.C.S.L.* cxxxiii (Turnholti, 1968), 389.

[3] Even within the description of the sun's movement, which is discussed above, there are obviously agreements with Scripture. Psalm 103: 19 (Vulgate) speaks of the setting of the sun as in l. 69 seq., Psalm 103: 20 (cf. 135: 9) emphasizes God's *control* over night (and day) as in:

niht æfter cymeð healdeð nydbibod
halgan dryhtnes. (72–73)

Such obvious contacts are sometimes overlooked.

[4] 'For all of them (Christians) their doctrine is a revelation to be received by faith, with Scripture as the inspired word of God. "Crede ut intellegas" . . . Some like Basil and his friends wish to retain from the pagans what is proper and will help to understand the wonderful works of God. If the texts leave the case open, they are ready to adopt the usual science, as on earthquakes and volcanoes and the dependence of the tides on the moon. But all are aware of the free philosophising tradition of "the Greeks" as a rival power, and they handle this science with a more or less jaunty uneasiness. They like to point out the contradictions of the "physici" . . . Often the note becomes more crudely hostile. If Christians think little of these matters, it is not from ignorance but from contempt of such useless labour. . . . Anyhow Scripture is to be accepted as higher than any human reason . . . Nam quicquid homo extra didicerit, si noxium est, ibi damnatur; si utile est, ibi invenitur', Thomson, op. cit. 384–5 with references in footnotes.

world. The source-hunter and identifier, I hope, has delimited the area within which total explication and then evaluation may operate.

So far, we may appear to have illustrated the identifier's reading and knowledge through isolated results, although I suppose we may say that his perception may be that of lexicographer, editor, and critic on given occasions. But the source-hunter's image is still that of continual reader, not thinker, as even John Pope suggests in his magnificent edition of the extra Ælfrician homilies when he says that sources 'are now being turned up by J. E. Cross'.[1] I disagree with this comment but without any irritation since I know that it comes from his true modesty about his own vast work in this area. But it is a misplaced modesty if it prevents the alert young scholar from beginning. And I modify his statement with a story from our first conversation, about seven years ago, when he was in London revising the text for his edition. Our talk had turned to Ælfric's sources and especially to a homily then printed only by A. O. Belfour from the Bodley MS. 343.[2] The passage that came up was one containing two *exempla* on the power of prayer to move mountains,[3] where a bishop, actually Gregory Thaumaturgus, is said to have moved a mountain to build a monastery and then turned a lake into dry land to stop a quarrel over fishing-rights. The passage is an extension on Ælfric's main source. John Pope said something like this: 'The difficulty about sources is that sometimes you miss the obvious. You remember the two *exempla* in Belfour No. 2 about the power of prayer to move mountains—I completely forgot that Ælfric's history was Rufinus[4] and it took me about three weeks to find the source.' At this point I had the good fortune to be able to say: 'And do you know why he uses these stories here?—if you look at Bede's Commentary on the scriptural verse, you'll find the first of the stories attached to the verse.' Hurst's edition of Bede was pulled off the shelf for immediate checking and John Pope generously used the information in his edition.[5]

[1] Pope 158 n. 1.

[2] *Twelfth-century homilies in MS. Bodley 343*, ed. A. O. Belfour, E.E.T.S. o.s. 137 (1909, 1962 reprint).

[3] Ed. cit. 16, now Pope i. 361–3.

[4] This was of course a statement in conversation and was so understood. Ælfric takes some historical information from elsewhere, via such as Haymo, as John Pope illustrates.

[5] Pope i. 369. I may also add that there was a heart-stopping moment caused by D. Hurst's presentation of the commentary on Luke before that on

But the point of the story is that we were both willing to accept that each of us had distinguished, not merely an isolated case but a pattern of behaviour which indicated a pattern of thought in Ælfric. I knew that Ælfric had used Rufinus elsewhere and he knew that Ælfric had read Bede's Commentaries on Mark and Luke. He may not then have been willing to accept that Ælfric often associates a commentary with a Scriptural verse but this particular pattern of behaviour has since been more fully demonstrated.[1]

An alert identifier is one who perceives patterns, and the central figure for him in the Old English period is Ælfric, quite simply because he wrote the most. The more a man writes, the more he reveals his processes of thought as indicated in his patterns of behaviour. But, since any creative writer is not only an individual but a man of his intellectual environment, some of Ælfric's patterns are those of his contemporaries, and, further, since much of the thought and many of the behavioural patterns of our period are derivative and transmitted, Ælfric's patterns can sometimes be those of the religious poets, whose work constitutes the bulk of our extant poetry.

The most productive of the patterns for Ælfric was one discovered by C. L. Smetana,[2] that all Ælfric's homilies on the gospels within *The Catholic Homilies* drew to greater or lesser extent on those within some version of the homiliary of Paul the Deacon, collected at the wish of Charlemagne. And also that there is some contact with homilies within the homiliary of Alanus of Farfa[3] gathered during the same period. The correspondence is between homilies for the same feast-day, and, if no manuscript identification of the festival is given, the correspondence is normally of homilies on the same gospel-reading. This pattern may now be applied quite simply to the four Ælfrician homilies in the Bodley MS. 343, which were left aside

Mark in his edition (cited above). I recall that, influenced by the Scriptural order, we first consulted Luke 11: 23 and then realized our mistake. Any young scholar who has found a source will realize why the details of this conversation are so clear in my mind.

[1] See below.

[2] C. L. Smetana, 'Ælfric and the early medieval homiliary', *Traditio* xv (1959), 163–204. Cyril Smetana saw the pattern as he indicated when he said to me recently with a smile: 'Max Förster was using the wrong prayer-book.' While disagreeing with his application of the adjective, I take the point.

[3] Smetana op. cit. 185 n. 17 and 191 n. 25 cites as source two Pseudo-Augustinian sermons which are found within the homiliary of Alanus of Farfa.

by Professor Pope, and we find that two of the four have major or minor contact with homilies on the corresponding gospel-reading within that version of Paul the Deacon's homiliary which is printed in *Patrologia Latina*, Volume 95.[1] The pattern can also find sources for non-Ælfrician homilies. The Bodley 343 homily, no. 10 in Belfour's printing, is not assigned to Ælfric. Its lection is Matthew 4, the temptation of Christ, a gospel-reading for the first Sunday in Lent, and this homily has strong contact with Gregory's homily on the same lection. This is the one chosen in Paul the Deacon's 'original' homiliary,[2] a homily which is also used for the second part of Blickling Homily No. III[3] on the same lection and feast, and by Ælfric on the same occasion.[4] The applications ramify and I could continue with further examples, but I generalize for new students of Old English homilies on the gospels that it is always worth identifying the pericope, associating it with the appropriate festival and referring first to the important homiliaries and then to such collections as those of Augustine and Bede, some of whose sermons have found their place in Paul and Alanus. And, still holding to this pattern, we recall that Cynewulf used Gregory's Homily XXIX on the Gospels for *The Ascension*, not, I speculate, because Gregory sent the mission, and because his works were known in England, but because the homily was chosen for the day by the influential Paul the Deacon.[5] This homily was also known to the writer of

[1] The four unsourced homilies of Ælfric in MS. Bodley 343 are: Belfour no. 3, on John 4: 46–53, which has echoes of Gregory, *Homilia XXVIII in Evangelia*, a homily chosen for the Twenty-second Sunday after Pentecost in the version of Paul the Deacon's homiliary in *P.L.* 95; Belfour no. 4, on Matthew 18: 23–35, which is based on Augustine, *Sermo LXXXIII* (*P.L.* 38, col. 514 seq.), chosen for the Twenty-third Sunday after Pentecost in the *P.L.* 95 version of Paul the Deacon; Belfour no. 7, on John 11: 1–39, which is based on Augustine, *Tractatus XLIV in Johannis Evangelium*, not included in Paul's homiliary; Belfour no. 8, part of a homily (approximately 50 lines) for St. Vincent, the remainder of which is printed in *Ælfric's Lives of Saints*, ed. cit.

[2] Belfour no. 10 is based on Gregory *Homilia XVI in Evangelia*, chosen by Paul the Deacon in the 'original' homiliary (no. 76) whose contents are described by J. Leclercq, *Scriptorium* ii (1948), 195–214.

[3] *The Blickling Homilies*, ed. R. Morris, E.E.T.S. o.s. 58, 63, 73 (1874–80, 1967 reprint), 26–38. The source was first noted by M. Förster, *Archiv. für das Studium der neueren Sprachen* 91 (1893).

[4] Thorpe i. 166–80. This source was first noted by M. Förster, *Anglia* 16 (1894), § 60.

[5] It is relevant to note that three of Cynewulf's signed poems are associated with Latin material for days in the Church calendar, and that *The Fates of the Apostles* is similar to the beginning of a martyrology, as K. Sisam noted in

Blickling Homily No. XI for the same feast.[1] We should not forget that Paul gathered his collection probably before much of our poetry was composed,[2] certainly from authors most of whom wrote before the Old English period, and that a religious poet was probably a man who heard or read the homilies for the appropriate festivals year by year within his foundation.

Such contacts between exegetical homilies as have just been illustrated suggest that there can be another way of studying anonymous homilies. In the past the homilies of one or another manuscript have been edited, such as Bodley 343 by Belfour and Cotton Vespasian D XIV by Miss Warner.[3] Such collections, however, predispose the editors towards a study of the language and the behaviour of scribe or scribes. These studies obviously should continue. But alternatively, or as well, studies can be made of homilies on the same pericope or for the same feast, for here will be found clusters of ideas allied with the commentaries on the appropriate gospel and on the celebration of the feast. Such studies are equally important to the Anglo-Saxonist. I have had some success, I think, with Ascension Day homilies,[4] and Miss Bazire and I[5] have already found some interesting repetitions and sources for some of the unpublished Rogation Day homilies in Old English.

Clusters of ideas can be themes which are commonplace, and the presentation of a theme in repetition can indicate a pattern which may then be expected. The good teacher Ælfric never fears to repeat a comment in elaboration of a main source if on

'Cynewulf and his poetry', Israel Gollancz Memorial Lecture (1933), *Proceedings of the British Academy* xviii, reprinted in K. Sisam, *Studies in the history of Old English Literature* (Oxford, 1953), 13.

[1] J. E. Cross, 'On the Blickling Homily for Ascension Day (no. XI)', *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen* 70 (1969), 228–40.

[2] Laistner op. cit. 268 notes that Paul had come to Charlemagne's court in 783, and Charlemagne's *Epistola generalis* (between 786–800) recommends 'to all the clergy a homiliary specially compiled at Charlemagne's request by Paul the Deacon' (Laistner, 195). The cultural contacts between England and Charlemagne's centre of learning in the eighth century (which are illustrated by W. Levison, *England and the Continent in the eighth century* (Oxford, 1946, 1966 reprint), ch. vi) suggest that the homiliary's contents could be known in England without a considerable lapse of time.

[3] *Early English homilies from the twelfth century MS. Vespasian D XIV*, ed. Rubie D.-N. Warner, E.E.T.S. o.s. 152 (1917).

[4] Cross, *Anglia* 86 (1968), 67–78; *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen* 70 (1969), 228–40.

[5] We propose an edition of the unpublished sermons together with a discussion of the material for Rogation Days.

a topic which he judges is important for his audience, or indeed in a form which he thinks effective. He persistently comments on the persons and dogma of the Trinity and repeatedly deals with problems of resurrection with echoes from one exposition to another, but here I illustrate with themes used in distinctive forms. One is the vivid explanation of Matthew 13: 30: 'Gather up first the cockle . . . and bind it into bundles to burn.' The ultimate source is Gregory's *Dialogues* and Ælfric twice uses the passage, on both occasions as extension of his main source, though not in its entirety nor exactly in the same words.[1] Such variations indicate to me that the thematic presentation is in his mind ready to be used as the trip-wire of memory is touched. In the one case the trip-wire is the Scriptural verse, in the other the general topic of hell-torment. Another theme presented in a figure of rhetoric is the sequence on the various martyrs' deaths which on one occasion, the All Saints sermon, derives from the main source but is used twice elsewhere in elaboration of the main source.[2] Yet another is the sequence of examples to em-

[1] 'Messores quippe angeli zizania ad comburendum in fasciculos ligant, cum pares paribus in tormentis similibus sociant, ut superbi cum superbis, luxuriosi cum luxuriosis, avari cum avaris, fallaces cum fallacibus, invidi cum invidis, infideles cum infidelibus ardeant', Gregory, *Dialogorum Libri* IV. xxv. Also in Haymo, *De Varietate Librorum* III. xxxvii; Pirmin, *De Singulis Libris Canonicis Scarapsus*; Ambrosius Autpertus, *Sermo de Cupiditate*; Pseudo-Isidore, *Sermo* III (*P.L.* 83 col. 1224) and an Old English sermon in C.U.L. MS. Ii. 1.33. 'Byrþenmælum hi gadriað þa synfullan fram þam rihtwisum; þonne ða manslagan beoð togædere getigede innon þam hellicum fyre, and sceaþan mid sceaþum, gytseras mid gytserum, forliras mid forlirum', Thorpe i. 526 associated with Matthew 13: 30. '. . . manslagan togædere ecelice on tintegrum cwylmiað; and forligras mid forligrum, gitseras mid gytserum, sceaðan mid sceaðum, ða forsworenan mid forsworenum . . .', Thorpe i. 132, within general discussion of hell-torment. See Cross, *Anglia* 81 (1963), 336–9 for references.

[2] 'Sume hi wæron mid wæpnum ofslagene, sume on lige forswælede, oðre mid swipum ofbeatene, oþre mid stengum þurhðyde, sume on hengene gecwylmede, sume on widdre sæ (cf. "pelagus: widsæ", *Glossary*, see p. 77 n. 4 above) besencte, oðre cuce behylde, oðre mid isenum clawum totorene, sume mid stanum ofhrorene, sume mid winterlicum cyle geswencte, sume mid hungre gecwylmede, sume handum and fotum forcorfene, folce to wæfersyne, for geleafan and halgum naman Hælendes Cristes', Thorpe i. 542. The source of this sermon (Thorpe i. 538–48) is the complete version of a sermon in Paul the Deacon's homiliary noted in *P.L.* 95 col. 1536, but not printed in a modern edition. On this source see J. E. Cross, 'Ælfric and the mediaeval homiliary—objection and contribution', *Regiae societatis humaniorum litterarum Lundensis: Scripta Minora* 4 (1961–2), 20–3. I have continued my interest in this Latin sermon since its opening lines clearly date the celebration of the feast of All

phasize the resurrection of the flesh which points out that however the body is destroyed and transmuted it yet will be made whole. I refer merely to a new example in John Pope's edition of Ælfric's sermon for the Octave of Pentecost,[1] which is based on the Latin of the Boulogne-sur-Mer manuscript. One item in Old English is an extension on the Latin, the 'drowning by water', which prompts Professor Pope rightly to recall Ælfric's other use of the theme, in connection with resurrection, in the homily on Martyrs,[2] and there in extension of his main source. As he says, 'it is evident that Ælfric was familiar with the idea independently of the sources which he was using at the moment',[3]

Saints as November 1st and this may be of wider significance than merely for Ælfrician studies, but here call attention only to the reading: 'alii pelagi periculo *demersi* (Ælfric: *besencte*)' of Pembroke College MS. 25 fol. 132b, an eleventh-century homiliary from Bury according to M. R. James, *Catalogue ... of Pembroke College* (Cambridge, 1905), 25. This reading does not appear in the printed edition of Eucherius Cervicornus (A.D. 1539) which is the exemplar for the homiliary printed and noted in *P.L.* 95. The Latin text here is from Pembroke College MS. 25:

'Alii ferro p*e*rempti, alii flammis exusti, alii flagellis verberati, alii vectibus p*er*forati, alii cruciati patibulo, alii pelagi p*er*iculo demersi, alii vivi decoriati, alii vinculis mancipati, alii linguis privati, alii lapidibus obruti, alii frigore afflicti, alii fame cruciati, alii vero truncatis manib*us* sive ceteris cesi membris spectaculu*m* contumeliae in populis nudi p*ro*pt*er* nome*n* d*omini* portantes.'

We note that Ælfric appears not to have used one item: 'alii linguis privati', and await the collated edition of vol. i of *The Catholic Homilies* by Professor P. A. M. Clemoes.

Ælfric uses the theme in extension of his main source at Thorpe i. 212 'Sume hi wæron on fyre forbærnde, sume on sæ adrencte, and mid mislicum pinungum acwealde', where the people who threw garments under the feet of the ass on Palm Sunday were regarded as signifying martyrs, and for the *Passion of St. Maurice*, *Lives of Saints*, ed. cit. ii. 166: 'hi man swang mid swipum and on sae adrincte oððe on fyre forbærnde oþþe forðwyrftum limum to wæfersyne tucode mid gehwylcum witum.' The Latin *repetitio* series seem to have been inspired by Hebrews 11: 36–8 which is quoted immediately following our passage in the sermon for All Saints.

[1] Pope i. 433: 'Ælc man sceal arisan þonne þe æfre on life wæs; wære he on wætere adruncen, oððe hine wilde deor æton, oððe hine fyr forbærnde færlice to duste, and ðæt dust wurde toworpen mid blædum, swa ð[ea]h se ælmihtiga God mæg hine eft aræran, se ðe ealle þas woruld geworhte of nahte.' Based on Boulogne-sur-Mer MS. 63, fol. 7: 'Etsi a bestiis devorentur, sive igne concremantur et in auras aspergantur, potens est tamen eos in puncto temporis reformare, qui de nichilo mundum creavit.'

[2] Thorpe ii. 542–4: 'Ne bið þæs mannes lichama næfre swa swiðe fornumen on fyre oððe on sæ, oþþe ðurh deora geslit, þæt he ne sceole eft arisan ansund þurh þæs Scyppendes mihte, ðe ealle ðing of nahte gesceop.'

[3] Pope i. 451.

and he generously referred to my study[1] of the theme in which I gathered twenty-four examples, deriving the theme ultimately from the Scriptural Apocalypse of St. John. I used the theme eventually to illustrate that curious sequence in *The Wanderer*,[2] where battle, one bird, the grey wolf, and a sad-faced man dispose of man through death. On this last point, I suspect, few believe me;[3] and this may illustrate the dangers linked with the pattern of themes, that the scholar may press into service an example which is not valid. But I still believe in my speculation since arguments against it may still be debated,[4] and still think that when the *Wanderer* poet wrote he could have been reflecting, although adapting, the cliché sequence and further that, since clichés carry the so-named 'typewriter' response of understood allusion, the poet was here anticipating his Christian conclusion.

But for the immediate future we should realize that we have lagged behind our friends in folk-lore studies, who have moved

[1] J. E. Cross, 'On the Wanderer lines 80–4—a study of a figure and a theme', *Vetenskaps-Societetens i Lund Årsbok* (1958–9), 77–110.

[2]
Sume wig fornom,
ferede in forðwege: sumne fugel oþbær
ofer heanne holm; sumne se hara wulf
deaðe gedælde; sumne dreorighleor
in eorðscræfe eorl gehydde
(*The Wanderer* 80–4).

[3] R. F. Leslie, in his edition of *The Wanderer* (Manchester, 1966), 16 notes 'that the poet has drawn upon this well-known Christian theme seems likely', but is not willing to accept my suggested implication (op. cit. 93–4), that, since the theme in prose reflects the heretical objection to resurrection of the flesh, the Christian poet here intended, and an alert Christian reader would accept, a corollary in the Christian answer that God had power to restore in resurrection.

[4] One argument has been presented against the suggested association of the poetic and prose passages, and one against the suggested implication of the link. In their edition of *The Wanderer* (1969), 120 n., T. P. Dunning and A. J. Bliss suggest that the presence of burial as one of the fates in the poem and also in the Old English prose parallels opposes the association with the discussions about resurrection, but, as any reader interested in the Body and Soul theme in medieval literature, or in modern thrillers, knows, a body decays and is transmuted in the ground (see Cross, *Wanderer 80–4*, 89) and a buried body needs to be made whole at resurrection. The argument against the association of poetic and prose passages is that 'deaðe gedæled' means 'hand(ed) over to death' (Dunning–Bliss, 119), 'consigned to death' (D. Whitelock, *Sweet's Anglo-Saxon Reader*, fifteenth edition (1967), 276), and presumably describes the wolf killing the man, not destroying him (as R. F. Leslie ed. cit. 84, and older scholars, implied by referring to an attested meaning of *gedælen*, 'to divide up'). Dunning–Bliss and Whitelock cite the use of 'deaðe gedælan' as an idiom in *Andreas* 955, 1217, as a valid reason for

from the dilettantism of recording isolated stories to the professionalism of collected motif-indices where the patterns are distinguished. Our colleagues in medieval Irish studies, in Icelandic studies, even of medieval romances now have their motif-indices.[1] The critic would be greatly helped by a motif-index which gathers examples of a theme.[2] A young American scholar has begun at my suggestion with a theme-index and name-index for *The Catholic Homilies* by which he will find 'sources', which may be minor in extent of words, but major in exemplifying the writing-methods and processes of thought of this great English stylist Ælfric.

Yet another pattern may be illustrated through Ælfric's use of Scripture. His Bible was a version of the Vulgate,[3] but Ælfric is never unduly troubled to quote the exact words of Scripture since he uses it for its ideas and he knows that his predecessors such as Gregory and Augustine could use other pre-Vulgate Old Latin versions.[4] So that if an Ælfrician quotation differs from the Clementine Vulgate, the possibilities are always, as I think, four:

1. His Vulgate version differs from the Clementine.
2. He may be adapting, perhaps for rhythm, perhaps for the content of his piece, or he may simply conflate or paraphrase for brevity.

their suggestion. Two points may be made. Firstly, there is a possibility (which is a probability for the phrase 'scyldum bescyredne', *Vainglory* 8, and 'scyldum biscyrede', *Rhyming Poem* 84) that a phrase may have different meanings in different contexts. Secondly, however the phrase is translated, every Anglo-Saxon should know that a wolf kills to eat. Dunning–Bliss appear willing to accept the association of poem and prose passages for the singular bird of the poem when they say: 'The homilies may preserve a more original form of the concept since in them *fug(e)las* is plural, and the prefix *to-* in *tobæron* means "asunder".' One supposes that if the poet looked to the homilies etc. for the bird, he would also bring the animal (wolf) and burial from the same place.

[1] T. P. Cross, *Motif-index of Early Irish Literature* (Bloomington, Indiana), Indiana University Publications, Folklore Series no. 7. Inger M. Boberg, *Motif-index of Early Icelandic Literature* (Copenhagen, 1966), Bibliotheca Arnamagnæana vol. xxvii. G. Bordman, *Motif-index of the English metrical romances* (Helsinki, 1963), FF Communications no. 190.

[2] If Mr. Evans had known that T. P. Cross op. cit. 36 had made an entry 'man made of substance from eight different sources' at A 1260.0.2, he might have realized that the theme was more widely disseminated than he thought.

[3] Pope i. 152 on pericopes.

[4] For an example of his knowledge of versions of the Bible see Thorpe ii. 446: 'Una translatio dicit "filii Dei", et altera dicit "angeli Dei"', referring to Job 1: 6, where Vulgate has 'filii Dei' but Ælfric's Old English text has 'Godes englas'.

3. He may be quoting from memory, leading to slight adaptation.
4. He may cite the Old Latin, or a mixture of Old Latin and Vulgate.

The student of Ælfric, or of any homilist, should identify Scriptural quotations and note any differences from the Clementine Vulgate. If necessary, he may speculate on those differences in terms of the immediate context and of the established attitude of the homilist. But if a Scriptural citation is found to be Old Latin, or a mixture of Old Latin and Vulgate, this normally points to a source in which the exemplar quotes the Old Latin, and Ælfric either accepts the quotation, or modifies it towards the Vulgate. I refer to two examples from the sermon on 'The Nativity of the Lord—concerning the Testimonies of the Prophets'.[1] Both identifications can be supported on other grounds. The extract from Quodvultdeus is a sermon for the Nativity in Paul the Deacon's homiliary, and the Commentaries of Bede on Mark and Luke were held firmly in Ælfric's mind for recall or possible consultation.

Other clues are offered by other kinds of differences from the Clementine Vulgate, and I refer to that Ælfrician homily for Rogation Monday which Max Förster[2] regarded as a free sermon mainly of linking Scriptural quotations, and for which John Pope[3] could see no logical plan. Well at least there is an elaboration

[1] (i) 'Eft se witega Hieremias cwæð be ðam Hælende: "Ðes is ure God, and nis nan oðer geteald to him. He arærde and gesette steore and þeawfæstnysse his folce Israhel. He wæs siððan gesewen ofer eorðan, and mid mannum he drohtnode"', Thorpe ii. 12. This is a paraphrase of Baruch 3, 36–8, one of the untraced Scriptural quotations in A. S. Cook, *Biblical Quotations in Old English prose-writers*, First Series (1898), 257 (also untraced in Second Series (1903), vii–viii), and ascribed to Jeremiah in the extract of Quodvultdeus which is printed in *P.L.* 95 col. 1470 seq., but noted as a Nativity sermon in Paul the Deacon's 'original' homiliary by Leclercq op. cit. 205 as no. 10. On the use of the Quodvultdeus piece by Ælfric see Cross, *Mediaeval Homiliary* 14, 15. The early fathers regarded Jeremiah as the author of Baruch.
(ii) 'Be mancynnes æriste witegode Isaias: "þa deadan sceolon arisan, and *þa ðe licgað on byrgenum* hi ge-edcuciað"', Thorpe ii. 18. Isaias 26: 19 in the Vulgate reads: 'Vivent mortui tui, interfecti mei resurgent.' But Bede on Luke 20: 37 (ed. cit. 359) and on Mark 12: 26 (ed. cit. 589) abstracts from Jerome on Matthew, who quotes Isaias 26: 19 as: 'Suscitabuntur mortui et resurgent *qui in sepulchris sunt*.'

[2] *Anglia* 16 (1894), 58, §143.

[3] ii. 749: 'Ælfric moves quickly from topic to topic, treating first the two basic Christian commandments and proceeding to a more or less bewildering array of particulars', and 'the casual organization of the compendium'.

on an outline which Ælfric recalled.[1] The main section of the homily is a series of precepts of behaviour for various classes and states of man in his relationships within society and in the home. 'Let everyone now consider what befits his state', says Ælfric.[2] The identifier begins methodically by assigning the Scriptural quotations and paraphrases and eventually comes to the paraphrase (Appendix no. 3(e)): 'The same apostle (Paul) also exhorted those of middle rank to be content with their food and clothing', which is an echo of I Timothy 6: 8, but not in Scripture addressed to men of middle rank. The next paraphrase (Appendix no. 4) can be compared with Romans 12: 12, but with a significant difference. Ælfric says (4(e)): 'He taught the poor to be patient in the poverty (*wædlung*) of life and always to rejoice', where the Scriptural epistle has 'tribulation'. On wives (Appendix no. 9(e)), Ælfric echoes part of Ephesians 5: 22 in telling them to be obedient to their husbands but the comparison of the obedience is different—in Scripture 'as to the Lord'; in Ælfric: 'as their own lords'. The differences alert the identifier. Is there a reason for the adaptations? Was there an intermediary? There was—a Marcellus text of the Passion of the Apostles Peter and Paul which Ælfric used in his sermon for the same festival. At one point in that Latin tract the Emperor Nero turns to Paul and asks what he has done. Paul replies with a list running to fourteen[3] items, beginning with *docui*, and in thirteen of these recounting the kinds of people he taught, with obvious echoes of Scriptural statements within the Pauline Epistles. In his sermon on the Passion Ælfric uses eleven of the thirteen Latin items and Blickling Homily XV uses twelve, but omits one (Appendix no. 8) which Ælfric also does. This, of course, may suggest that the Latin text available to the Anglo-Saxons also omitted that one. But, more importantly here, Ælfric's Rogation Monday sermon echoes the form of adaptation of Scripture in the Passion text in the three items already considered and in two more (Appendix nos. 10, 11),[4] and refers to the same Scriptural texts or ideas in 5 more (Appendix nos.

[1] The material for the following section is presented as an appendix since it also has significance for the edition of Blickling Homily XV.

[2] 'Smeage nu gehwa hwæt his hade gedafnige', Thorpe ii. 318.

[3] There are two *docui* phrases within item one in the Appendix but I count this as a single item as the two Old English writers did. The Latin text has fifteen *docui* phrases.

[4] In Appendix no. 10 note the extending clause of Ælfric 10e; in no. 11 note Ælfric's *milde* (11e) corresponding to the Latin *mitius* (11a).

1, 2, 5, 6, 12). It seems clear to me that the initial impetus for the 'free' sermon on Rogation Monday was Ælfric's recall of Paul's answers to Nero in the Passion text.

We have not finished the game of watching the Scriptural quotation, but state confidently that in religious prose the Scriptural quotation is often associated with its exegesis, and the statement of a theme is often allied with fixed Scriptural quotations. The first arises from the way they read or heard their Bible—with explanation; the second derives from their regard of the Bible as truth, where the Scriptural quotations are *testimonia*, testimonies, proof of the validity of a general statement. The latter may be illustrated in the clear words of a religious poet who wrote *The Old English Phoenix*. He has described the bird (which was real to certain medieval Christians) as an analogy (or proof) from nature for the resurrection of the flesh, and he turns to Scripture for another proof in the quotation of *his* version of Job with this clear preface: 'Let none of the race of men think that I compose my song of *lygeword* (lying-words, fiction).'[1]

In recent papers[2] I have suggested with illustration that many of Ælfric's elaborations, particularly the small ones, are made from memory, and two scholars whose opinions I respect have told me that this is not demonstrable as a certainty. That is obviously right. We cannot look over Ælfric's shoulder as he composed. But the speculation remains a probability also on other grounds provided by other scholars. Professor Whitelock generously commented on my suggestion: 'Those who do not work with manuscripts do not realize how difficult and time-consuming it is to find a passage in them.' In other words, Ælfric's writing conditions appear to preclude varied and continuous consultation of books other than main sources before him. And Jean Leclercq[3] wrote many years ago about the habits of reading in monasteries which was called *ruminatio* and means, as he says[4] 'assimilating the content of the text by means of a kind of mastication which releases its full flavour'—and, as he continues, 'explains the extremely important phenomenon of

[1] See J. E. Cross, review of *The Phoenix*, ed. N. F. Blake, in *J.E.G.P.* lxiv (1965), 159.

[2] See, for example, *Anglia* 81 (1963), 335–46, *Anglia* 86 (1968), 59–78, *Studia Neophilologica* xli (1969), 135–55.

[3] *L'Amour des lettres et le désir de Dieu. Initiation aux auteurs monastiques du moyen-âge* (Paris, 1957). This is now translated as: *The love of learning and the desire for God* (Mentor Omega Books, New York, 1961).

[4] Quotations from the translation, *Love of Learning* 78, 79.

reminiscence'. I may admit that I was not at all influenced by Leclercq's remarks when working on Ælfric, partly because I think it important to draw conclusions from what happens in the text without presuppositions.[1] If one attempts to apply a theory to a given text, this may lead to what the critics call the 'intentional fallacy'. But I now think that Ælfric could be an excellent example of the associative memory cultivated by the habit of *ruminatio*, and I shall attempt to illustrate this again in the future.

But whether from memory or by consultation, the association of commentary and Scriptural verse is a pattern for finding sources. I recall the most remarkable example in Ælfric[2] when he is using a Gregorian homily and comes to the verse Matthew 22: 14: 'Many are called but few are chosen.' But these words occur also in Matthew 20: 16. So Ælfric's explanation is an interweaving of Gregory's comment on Matthew 22: 14 which he sees before him, and Gregory's explanation of Matthew 20: 16 which occurs in another sermon and which, in my view, he remembers.

This pattern occurs elsewhere, for example, in Vercelli Homily V, an interesting commentary on Luke 2: 1–14, which I propose to discuss at another time. Max Förster looked at it and found a number of contacts with Gregory's homily VIII on the Gospels.[3] But no source was found for the comment on Luke 2: 14. The Scriptural index to Gregory's homilies, however, informs us that he commented on this verse in his homily no. V; and on Luke 2: 14 in Vercelli[4] are statements which have clear verbal echoes of two separate sentences from Gregory's comment on this verse.

From these patterns for finding sources and echoes it seems

[1] Also, many of Leclercq's illustrations are post twelfth-century and attitudes of that period are not necessarily attitudes of our earlier period.

[2] This example is presented fully in J. E. Cross, 'Ælfric—mainly on memory and creative method in two *Catholic Homilies*', *Studia Neophilologica* xli (1969), 152–3.

[3] *Die Vercelli-Homilien* ed. cit. 119, 121, 123, 125, 126–7, 129.

[4] On Luke 2: 14: 'and on earth peace to men of good will', Vercelli Homily V ed. cit. 128: 'þæt is se goda willa, þæt man oðrum þæs unne, þe he wille, þæt him gelimpe *and* þæt he on oðres gesyntum blissie *and* gefeo, swa on him sylfum wille. Hæbben we forþam godne willan on ure heortan, forþanþe we ne bioð æfre idele godra weorca for Godes eagum, gif usse heortan bioð gefyllede mid godum willan' (accepting Förster's editorial suggestions). Cf. Gregory, *Homilia V in Evangelia* § 3: 'Voluntas autem bona est . . . sic de prosperitate proximi sicut de nostro profectu gratulari . . .' 'Ante Dei namque oculos numquam est vacua manus a munere si fuerit arca cordis repleta bona voluntate.'

clear that we now need a thorough revision and extension of A. S. Cook's two volumes of *Biblical quotations in Old English prose*. There were deficiencies in his work, notably his failure to distinguish differences from Vulgate Scripture, his failure to use discovered sources, and, of course, omissions.[1] The work, however, still has great value and can be used now.[2]

Our final pattern today takes me back to my beginning, the pattern of the known book, although some care is often needed in its use. If we are led to suggest a source among the words of the homilies of Gregory, of *The Etymologies* of Isidore, of certain works of Bede, we may feel confident in the attribution, although often with the proviso of a possible intermediary. These works are known to be generally available. But if a sequence in a Latin book appears to be the source of an isolated passage in Old English, or an idea seems to be found only in one Latin source, other argument is needed, and it may be prudent to read further in order to establish a pattern of availability.

Not too long ago I found by the distinguishing of certain unusual features what appeared to be the source of comments on the days of creation in the *Old English Martyrology* or its assumed Latin exemplar. George Herzfeld[3] had illustrated the Old English passage by reference to Rabbinic writings, but I had found a Latin tract with great general similarity and many verbal contacts known as *De Ordine Creaturarum Liber*. Its author was formerly regarded as Isidore, but now the tract is thought to be an anonymous text written in the second half of the seventh century and certainly with Irish connections.[4] S. J. Crawford used it in his illustrative notes on Ælfric's *Hexaemeron*, when it was attributed to Isidore.[5] That was not unreasonable when attached to Isidore's name, although, I think, tentative. But

[1] See the review by M. Förster, *Englische Studien* 28 (1900), 419 seq. It is sufficient for our purpose to cite only references in the replacement of Cook's volumes. There is no need to quote the Scriptural texts in full, as Cook did. Any texts which differed from the Vulgate citations could be marked distinctively. Cook did this in his Second Series (1903).

[2] I note from the latest issue of the *Saga-Book of the Viking Society* xviii (1970–1), 195–9, that a revision of the list of Scriptural quotations in J. Belsheim, *Af Bibeln paa norsk-islandsk i Middelalderen* (1884), is already taking place.

[3] *An Old English Martyrology*, ed. G. Herzfeld, E.E.T.S. o.s. 116 (1900), 226–7. He did not regard these as immediate sources, and referred also to Bede's scientific works and to later writers.

[4] See p. 79 n. 5 above.

[5] *Exameron Anglice or The Old English Hexameron*, ed. S. J. Crawford, Bibliothek der angelsächsischen Prosa X (Hamburg, 1921), 78, 84, 85.

now that the Latin text is isolated in its anonymity, one should attempt to establish a wider dissemination. Fortunately this is possible. Bede abstracted largely from it in his *De Natura Rerum*, Haymo of Auxerre cited from it by name and ascribed it to Isidore, the Transfiguration Homily in Bodley MS. 343 used it,[1] and Ælfric echoed its ideas and some distinctive phrases in his sermon *De Falsis Deis*.[2]

But for our future source-hunting the pattern of availability now distinguished indicates that this text can be a source for the *Old English Martyrology*[3] or its exemplar and should always be consulted as a possible source for vernacular ideas on creation together with other popular works such as Isidore, Bede, and Ambrose.

On the other hand although we recognize similarities between the one manuscript, known as *Catéchèses celtiques*,[4] and Vercelli Homily IX on the five likenesses of earth to hell,[5] I, for one, would not presume to say more at present than that they are two examples of the theme. I could not indicate any relationship between one and the other without other evidence.

But these two opposite examples emphasize the need for a thorough revision of Ogilvy's work, with supplements as new sources are identified, for here what I call 'the pattern of availability' can be recorded.

The patterns distinguished have indicated, I trust, that there is work to do in the creation or extension and revision of works of reference, but the distinguishing of the patterns—and there may be more to be tested—has, I hope, suggested to alert young scholars that here is work which is worthy of their consideration.

[1] See now J. E. Cross, '*De Ordine Creaturarum Liber* in Old English prose', *Anglia* 90 (1972), for Bede, *De Natura Rerum* 133 and n. 5, for Haymo 140 and n. 21, for the Transfiguration homily 138–40.

[2] Noted in my review of J. C. Pope in *Studia Neophilologica* xliii (1971), 570. The echoes of ideas from *De Ordine* in *Exameron Anglice* noted by Crawford now become more of a possibility.

[3] See Cross, *Anglia* 90 (1972), 132–3 for demonstration of verbal echoes and echoes of idea.

[4] See above p. 73 n. 4 for description of the text.

[5] V inferni sunt: I dolor, II senectus, III mors, IIII sepulchrum, V pena.

Dolor comparatur inferno, quia si habuisset homo omnes substantias quibus homines in hoc mundo uti solent letus fieri non potest, ut dicit filius Serac: non est census super censum salutis corporis [Ecclesiasticus 30: 16, Vulgate].

II. Senectus assimilatur inferno, quando V sensus in exitum exeunt. Nam oculi caliginant, aures sordescunt, gustus non bene discernit, odoratus uitiatur, tactus rigescit; sed et dentes denudantur, lingua balbutiat, pectus

licoribus grauatur, pedes tremore et tumore tumescunt, manus ad opus debilitantur, canities floret, et corpus omne infirmatur, sed sensus diminuitur.

Sepulchrum etiam infernus est: ubi terra terrae redditur, cibi cadauer uermibus exhauritur; ubi limo caro miscetur; ubi aures et os et oculi III impletionibus replentur: primo cruore, II uermibus, III humo; ubi ossa arida redatis [for *redactis*, Wilmart] pulueri carnibus remanent. [Wilmart op. cit. 44, noting the omission of a description of the fifth likeness *pena*].

Cf. þonne is leornod on bocum, þæt on þysse worulde syn fif onlicnessa be helle-gryre.

Sio *æreste* onlicnes is nemned wræc (al. *wærc* 'pain'), forðan se wræc bið miceles cwelmes ælcum, þara þe he tocymeð; . . . (particularizes *woruld-dreamas* which are lost).

Þonne is þære *æfteran* helle onlicnes genemned oferyldo . . . (details of failing senses, but seemingly some corruption in the Vercelli text as Förster indicates. He compares a similar description in the Pseudo-Wulfstan homily XXX. For some similarity to the Latin see the Irish tract *De duodecim abusivis saeculi*, ed. S. Hellmann (Leipzig, 1909), 34–5).

Þonne is þære *þriddan* helle onlicnes on worulde deað . . . (not described in the Latin).

Ðonne is þære *feorðan* helle onlicnes byrgen nemned; . . . Hafað him þonne syððan þry gebeddan, þæt is þonne greot *and* molde *and* wyrmas.

Þonne is þære *fiftan* helle onlicnes tintrega genemned . . . (ed. M. Förster in 'Der Vercelli-Codex CXVII' in *Festschrift für Lorenz Morsbach*, ed. F. Holthausen and H. Spies (Halle, 1913), 106–8).

APPENDIX

Texts

(*a*) 'Passio Sanctorum Apostolorum Petri et Pauli' (Marcellus text), *Acta Apostolorum Apocrypha* ed. Lipsius (1891), i. 151.

(*b*) Scripture, Clementine Vulgate (identification of phrases or thoughts in Latin *Passio*).

(*c*) Blickling Homily XV, 'Spel be Petrum et Paulus', *The Blickling Homilies*, ed. cit. 185.

(*d*) Ælfric's 'Passio Apostolorum Petri et Pauli', Thorpe i. 378.

(*e*) Ælfric's 'Feria Secunda, Letania Maiore', Thorpe ii. 314–32.

1. (*a*) Docui, ut homines se inuicem diligant. docui ut inuicem se honore praeueniant.

(*b*) Caritate fraternitatis invicem diligentes: honore invicem praevenientes (Romans 12: 10).

(*c*) ærest ic lærde þæt men lufodan hie him betweonan, *and* ælc on oþrum arwyrþnesse wiste.

(*d*) Ic lærde þæt men him betweonan lufodon and gearwurðedon.

(*e*) 'Lufa ðinne Drihten mid ealre ðinre heortan . . . lufa ðinne nextan swa swa ðe sylfne' (Thorpe ii. 314, cf. Matthew 22: 37–40; note that Ælfric describes the first of these commandments as 'þæt mæste bebod' (cf. Matt. 22: 38 *maximum*) which is not in Mark 12: 30).

2. (*a*) docui sublimes et diuites non se extollere et sperare in incerto diuitiarum, sed in deo ponere spem suam.

(*b*) Divitibus hujus saeculi praecipe non sublime sapere, neque sperare in incerto divitiarum, sed in Deo vivo (I Timothy 6: 17).

(*c*) ic lærde wlance men *and* heahgeþungene þæt hie ne astigan on ofermedu, ne upgendra welena to wel ne truwedon, ah þæt hie on God ænne heora hyht gesetton.

(*d*) Ic tæhte ðam rican, þæt hi ne onhofon hi, ne heora hiht on leasum welan ne besetton, ac on Gode anum.

(*e*) Eft, se ðeoda lareow lærde ða rican, þæt hi hi ne onhebbon on healicere modignysse, ne heora hiht ne besetton on ðam swicelum welum, ac hihton on God, þæra goda syllend (Thorpe ii. 326–8).

3. (*a*) docui mediocres uictu et uestimento contentos esse.

(*b*) habentes autem alimenta, et quibus tegamur, his contenti sumus (I Timothy 6: 8).

(*c*) Ic lærde eac þa medstrangan men þæt hie wæron on heora biwiste *and* on medmyclum hrægle gehealdene.

(*d*) Ic tæhte ðam medeman mannum, þæt hi gehealdene wæron on heora bigwiste and scrude.

(*e*) Se ylca apostol manode eac ða medeman, þæt hi beon gehealdene on heora bigleofan and scrude (Thorpe ii. 328).

4. (*a*) docui pauperes in sua egestate gaudere.
(*b*) Not Scripture. It could be a confusion from II Corinthians 6: 10: 'tristes, semper autem gaudentes; sicut egentes, multos autem locupletantes', if the two phrases ran together.
(*c*) *and* þearfan ic lærde þæt hie heora wædle gefean hæfdon *and* Gode þancodon.
(*d*) Ic bebead þearfum, þæt hi blissodon on heora hafenleaste.
(*e*) Þearfan he lærde þæt hi on lifes wædlunge geðyldige beon and symle blissian (Thorpe ii. 328, cf. Romans 12: 12: Spe gaudentes; in tribulatione patientes).

5. (*a*) docui patres docere filios suos disciplinam timoris dei.
(*b*) Et vos patres . . . educate illos in disciplina, et correptione Domini (Ephesians 6: 4).
(*c*) Fæderas ic lærde þæt hie heora bearnum þone þeodscipe lærdon Drihtnes egsan.
(*d*) Fæderas ic manode, þæt hi mid steore Godes eges heora cild geðeawodon.
(*e*) Not cited, but there is a section on the correction of children, Thorpe ii. 324–6 with Scriptural citations and *exempla*. On this section see J. E. Cross, 'Source and Analysis of some Ælfrician passages', *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen* 72 (1971), 446–7.

6. (*a*) docui filios obtemperare parentibus et monitis salutaribus.
(*b*) Filii obedite parentibus per omnia (Colossians 3: 20, cf. Ephesians 6: 1).
(*c*) *and* suna ic lærde þæt hie hyrdon heora yldrum *and* heora magum.
(*d*) Þam cildum ic bead, þæt hi gehyrsume wæron fæder and meder to halwendum mynegungum.
(*e*) Se ðeoda lareow lærde manna bearn, þæt hi gehyrsume beon heora fæderum a (Thorpe ii. 324).

7. (*a*) docui possidentes reddere tributum cum sollicitudine.
(*b*) Not Scripture. Cf. Romans 13: 7: reddite ergo omnibus debita: cui tributum, tributum.
(*c*) *and* landagende men ic lærde þæt hie heora gafol mid gehygdum aguldon.
Not in (*d*) (*e*).

8. (*a*) docui negotiatores reddere uectigalia ministris reipublicae.
Not in (*b*) (*c*) (*d*) (*e*), but Romans 13: 7 continues: cui vectigal, vectigal.

9. (*a*) docui uxores diligere uiros suos et timere eos quasi dominos.
(*b*) Mulieres viris suis subditae sint, sicut Domino (Ephesians 5: 22, cf. Colossians 3: 18).

(*c*) *and* wif ic lærde þæt hie heora weras lufedan *and* him ege towiston.

(*d*) Ic manode æwfæste wif, þæt hi heora weras inweardlice lufodon, and him mid ege gehyrsumodon, swa swa hlafordum.

(*e*) Wif sceolon gehyrsumian heora werum (Ephesians 5: 22), gedafenlice, and hi symle arwurðian swa swa agene hlafordas (Thorpe ii. 322).

10. (*a*) docui uiros fidem seruare coniugibus, sicut illi sibi seruare pudorem omnimodis uolunt. quod enim punit maritus in uxore adultera, hoc punit in marito adultero ipse pater et conditor rerum deus.

(*b*) for sentiment of *first* sentence cf. viri diligite uxores vestras (Ephesians 5: 25, Colossians 3: 19).
Second sentence not Scripture.

(*c*) *and* ic lærde weras þæt hie be him anum getreowlice hie heoldan, swa hie willan þæt him man do, *and* forþon þe God gewrecþ ond þæm were gif he unrihthæmed fremeþ wiþ oþer wif *and* swa se wer hit wreceþ gif his wif hie forhealdeþ, forþon þe God is Scyppend ond Reccend ealra his gesceafta.
Note Morris: 'forhealdeþ. Forþon', in the last phrase.

(*d*) Ic lærde weras, þæt hi heora æwe heoldon, forðan þæt se wer gewitnað on æwbrecum wife þæt wrecð God on æwbrecum were.

(*e*) Se apostol awrat be eawfæstum werum: Lufiað, ge weras, eowere wif on æwe, ne beo ge bitere him [Colossians 3: 19 . . . et nolite amari esse ad illas] ungebeorhlice, and healdað eowere æwe, swa swa eow licað þæt eowere wif healdon hi wiþ forligre: þæt þæt se wer gewitnað on eawbræcum wife, þæt gewitnað Drihten on eawbræcum were (Thorpe ii. 322).

11. (*a*) docui dominos ut mitius cum seruis suis agant.

(*b*) Cf. Domini, quod justum est et æquum, servis praestate: scientes quod et vos Dominum habetis in coelo (Colossians 4: 1, cf. Ephesians 6: 9).

(*c*) *and* hlafordas ic lærde . . .; *lærde* at end of MS. line. Morris does not indicate omission.

(*d*) Ic lærde hlafordas, þæt hi heora ðeowum liðe wæron; forðan ðe hi sind gebroðru for Gode, se hlaford and se ðeowa.

(*e*) Þa hlafordas he manode þæt hi milde wæron heora ðeowum mannum mid þæslicnysse (Thorpe ii. 326).

12. (*a*) docui seruos ut fideliter et quasi deo seruiant dominis suis.

(*b*) Cf.: Servi obedite per omnia dominis carnalibus . . . sicut Domino (Colossians 3: 22, 23, cf. Ephesians 6: 5, 7).

(*c*) . . . þæt hie getreowlice Gode hyrdon swa heora hlafordum *and* þeowdon Godes ciricum. See 11(c) for omission.

(*d*) Ic bebead ðeowum mannum, þæt hi getreowlice, and swa swa Gode, heora hlafordum þeowdon.

(*e*) Þeowe men manode eac se mæra apostol, þus to-clypigende, Eala ge ðeowan, beoð gehyrsume eowerum hlafordum (Colossians. 3: 22, part) swa hwæt swa ge wyrcað, wyrcað mid mode, swa swa Gode sylfum (3: 23, part) and he sylð eow mede (cf. 3: 24, idea). Ne ðeowige ge to ansyne (cf. 3: 22) ac mid anfealdre heortan (3: 22) ne swilce beforan mannum (cf. 3: 22) ac mid Godes ogan (3: 22) (Thorpe ii 326). Phrases from 3: 22 in second sentence not in Vulgate order.

13. (*a*) docui ecclesias credentium unum et omnipotentem inuisibilem et inconprehensibilem colere deum.

(*b*) No individual Scriptural phrase is similar.

(*c*) *and* ic lærde ealle men þæt hie beeodan anne Ælmihtigne God unbegripendlic[n]e *and* ungesynelicne God.

(*d*) Ic tæhte eallum geleaffullum mannum, þæt hi wurðian ænne God Ælmihtigne and ungesewenlicne.

Not (*e*).