

MORE LATIN SOURCES FOR THE OLD ENGLISH “THREE UTTERANCES” HOMILIES

Charles D. Wright

TO judge from the fifty surviving copies ranging in date from the eighth century through the fifteenth, the Latin sermon known as *The Three Utterances of the Soul* must have informed the ideas and the fears of many people during the Middle Ages about what would happen after death.¹ According to this sermon,² when the soul exits the body, two hosts come to meet it, one of demons and one of angels. The two hosts contend over the soul, which is taken by the host whose members are able to recognize it as a companion of theirs on account of its good or bad deeds. If the demons recognize it as their companion, they rejoice and the angels are saddened. The demons then order the soul to be extracted roughly from its body; after Michael takes it to the throne of God to be judged, the demons divide into two groups, one leading and one following, and conduct the soul to hell as they sing Psalm 51:3, “Why do you glory in malice, you that are mighty in iniquity?” If the angels recognize the soul as their companion, they rejoice and the demons are confounded. The angels command that the soul be extracted gently from its body; then they divide into two groups, one leading and one following, and conduct the soul to heaven as they sing Psalm 64:5, “Blessed is he whom you have chosen and taken to you: he shall dwell in your courts.” Along the way to its destination, the wicked or righteous soul makes a series of three utterances, exclaiming over what it perceives as it enters the next world. There are significant variations in the formulation and sequence of these utterances, but the most common series has the wicked soul exclaim first “How great the darkness!”; then “How harsh the road!”; and finally “How great the straits!”

¹ I have inventoried the fifty copies known to me in “Manuscripts of *The Three Utterances of the Soul*,” the appendix to Charles D. Wright, “Latin Analogue for *The Two Deaths: The Three Utterances of the Soul*,” in *The End and Beyond: Medieval Irish Eschatology*, ed. John Carey, Emma Nic Cárthaigh, and Caitriona Ó Dochartaigh (Aberystwyth, 2014), 113–37, at 128–37. The appendix is cited below as “Manuscripts.”

² See nn. 3, 7–10, and 14 for editions of the Latin text. The following summary represents the common core content of the great majority of the manuscripts, ignoring features distinctive to each recension and the many minor variations within the manuscripts of each recension.

After each utterance the devils in concert respond “Greater darkness awaits you!”; “A harsher road awaits you!”; and “Greater straits await you!” The righteous soul, for its part, exclaims “How great the light!”; “How great the happiness!”; and “How pleasant the road!” The angels predictably reply that greater light, greater happiness, and a more pleasant road await the soul.

One of the two oldest copies of the Latin sermon was written on the continent, at Freising, by an Anglo-Saxon scribe named Peregrinus,³ but not one of the fifty was written or owned in Anglo-Saxon England.⁴ We know, however, that the sermon must have been very popular there before the Conquest, because three independent Old English versions survive,⁵ and there are also brief but unmistakable allusions in Vercelli Homily IV and Pseudo-Wulfstan Homily 46, and possible echoes in other homilies.⁶

³ Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek Clm 6433 (E. A. Lowe, *Codices Latini Antiquiores* [CLA], 11 vols. and Supplement, with 2d ed. of vol. II [Oxford, 1934–72], IX, no. 1283), fols. 67r–69r, ed. Wright, “Latin Analogue,” 118–27; see “Manuscripts,” no. 1, with references.

⁴ The earliest English manuscript is Oxford, Bodleian Library Hatton 26 (SC 4061), part B (s. XIIIⁱⁿ), fol. 75ra–vb; see “Manuscripts,” no. 44. For paleographical and contextual evidence regarding the Insular role in the transmission of the Three Utterances, see Wright, “Latin Analogue,” 116–17 n. 17.

⁵ These are HomM 5 (B3.5.5), HomS 5 (B3.2.5), and HomS 31 (B3.2.31) in the *Dictionary of Old English* list of short titles. HomM 5 is from Oxford, Bodleian Library Junius 85/86, fols. 25r–40r, with the Three Utterances at fols. 32v–34r, ed. A. M. Luiselli Fadda, *Nuove omelie anglosassoni della rinascenza benedettina* (Florence, 1977), 19–23 (Homily I, §§31–35); HomS 5 is from London, British Library Cotton Faustina A.ix, fols. 21v–23v, and Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 302, pp. 71–73, ed. Loredana Teresi, “*Be heofonwarum 7 be helwarum*: A Complete Edition,” in *Early Medieval English Texts and Interpretations: Studies Presented to Donald G. Scragg*, ed. Elaine Treharne and Susan Rosser (Tempe, 2002), 211–44; and HomS 31 is from Oxford, Bodleian Library Hatton 114, fols. 102r–105v, ed. Joyce Bazire and James E. Cross, *Eleven Old English Rogationtide Homilies* (Toronto, 1982; rpt. with addenda, London, 1989), 115–24 (Homily 9). The Three Utterances sections of all three homilies were first published by Rudolph Willard, *Two Apocrypha in Old English Homilies*, Beiträge zur englischen Philologie 30 (Leipzig, 1935), 37–57. For a summary of the evidence for the transmission of the Three Utterances in Anglo-Saxon England, see Charles D. Wright, “Three Utterances Apocryphon,” in *Sources of Anglo-Saxon Literary Culture: The Apocrypha*, ed. Frederick M. Biggs (Kalamazoo, 2007), 80–83. For the Old Irish version, see Katja Ritari, “The Two Deaths,” in *The End and Beyond*, ed. Carey et al., 101–11; earlier ed. and trans. Carl Marstrander, *Ériu* 5 (1911): 120–25; and Ritari, “The Irish Eschatological Tale *The Two Deaths* and Its Sources,” *Traditio* 68 (2013): 125–51.

⁶ Rudolph Willard, “The Address of the Soul to the Body,” *PMLA* 50 (1935): 957–83, at 980 n. 77, points out that in Vercelli Homily IV (ed. D. G. Scragg, *The Vercelli Homilies and Related Texts*, EETS o.s. 300 [Oxford, 1993], 104.120–23) the angels bless the good soul after it is conducted before God’s throne with the same Psalm verses that the angels use to praise the good soul in the Three Utterances (Ps 64:5–6, “Beatus quem eligisti ...”). See also Charles D. Wright, *The Irish Tradition in Old English Literature*, Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England 6 (Cambridge, 1993), 264–65; and Scragg, *Vercelli Homilies*, 106. Willard (*Two*

The standard study of the Three Utterances was published in 1935 by Rudolph Willard,⁷ who was the first to edit the Old English versions, though he excerpted the Three Utterances material from longer homilies whose complete texts remained unpublished for many years thereafter. At that time Willard knew just one late manuscript of the Latin sermon,⁸ so his conclusions about how each Old English homilist had adapted his sources were necessarily very tentative. Within two years Willard had discovered and published one more Latin text, representing a distinct variant recension, enabling him to answer some of the questions that had been unresolved in his monograph, but leaving many others open.⁹ Two of the Old English homilies, Willard’s J and C (Oxford, Bodleian Library Junius 85/86, fols. 25r–40r [Fadda I] and the homily entitled *Be heofonwarum ond be helwarum*), diverge strikingly from both Latin recensions known to Willard, and while the third Old English homily, Willard’s H (Oxford, Bodleian Library Hatton 114, fols. 102v–105v [Bazire/Cross Homily 9]), is fairly close to the first Latin recension, it also shows some significant variation. The next major advance came in 1977 with the publication by R. E. McNally of another Latin text—a variant type of the first recension—from two early manuscripts.¹⁰ Unfortunately, McNally was un-

Apocrypha, 74–76) has also noted the echoes of the Three Utterances in conjunction with the *Apocalypse of Paul* in HomU 37 (Nap 46; B3.4.37), ed. Arthur Napier, *Wulfstan: Sammlung der ihm zugeschriebenen Homilien nebst Untersuchung ihrer Echtheit* (Berlin, 1883; rpt. Dublin, 1967), 232–42, at 235.6–21 and 236.17–237.10. On the relationships of the Old English and Latin homiletic version, see also Claudia DiSciaccia, “Due note a tre omelie anglosassoni sul tema dell’anima e il corpo,” in *Antichità Germaniche. II Parte*, ed. Vittoria Dolcetti Corazza and Renato Gendre, *Bibliotheca Germanica, Studi e Testi* 12 (Alessandria, 2002), 223–50, at 241–43 and n. 58, who suggests some further echoes of the Three Utterances in Vercelli IV and also in the parallel accounts of the going-out of souls in Napier 29 (HomU 26 [B3.4.26], ed. Napier, 134–43) and the “Macarius Homily,” HomU 55 (B3.4.55).

⁷ Willard, *Two Apocrypha*, 31–149.

⁸ Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France (BnF) lat. 2628 (s. XI, Fécamp), fols. 103v–105r; see “Manuscripts,” no. 30. The text had previously been printed by Louise Dudley, *The Egyptian Elements in the Legend of the Body and the Soul* (Baltimore, 1911), 164–65.

⁹ Rudolph Willard, “The Latin Texts of *The Three Utterances of the Soul*,” *Speculum* 2 (1937): 147–66. The text edited here (along with Paris lat. 2628) is from Oxford, University College 61 (s. XIV), p. 367; see “Manuscripts,” no. 46.

¹⁰ Robert E. McNally, “‘In nomine Dei summi’: Seven Hiberno-Latin Sermons,” *Traditio* 35 (1979): 121–43, at 124–25, with text at 134–36, from Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana Pal. lat. 212 (s. VII^{ex} or IXⁱⁿ, Upper Rhineland or Lake Constance; *CLA* I, no. 85), fols. 15v–17r, and Pal. lat. 220 (s. IXⁱⁿ, Middle or Upper Rhineland, in Anglo-Saxon script), fols. 28r–30v; see “Manuscripts,” nos. 6 and 20. A third manuscript of this homiliary, overlooked by McNally, is in Berlin, Staatsbibliothek Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Phillipps 1716 (s. IX^{3/4}, Holland), fols. 16v–17v; see “Manuscripts,” no. 7. The sermons McNally extracted have been translated by Thomas O’Loughlin, “The Celtic Homily: Creeds and Eschatology,” *Milltown Studies*

aware of Willard's studies, but James J. O'Donnell, who prepared the edition for publication in *Traditio* after McNally's death, was able to add selected variants from Willard's texts to McNally's apparatus. Bazire and Cross were able to show that McNally's text accounted for a number of divergent readings in the Old English Rogationtide homily they edited in 1982.¹¹

In the early 1980s, initially in collaboration with Mary F. Wack, I undertook a search for additional manuscripts of the sermon.¹² Most of the additional copies have proved to be further witnesses to the versions already published by Willard and McNally, and so have not dramatically impacted source analysis of the distinctive features of the Old English versions. But one of them, Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek (BSB) Clm 28135, also from Freising, turned out to contain two versions of the Latin sermon,¹³ the first of which represents a distinctive abbreviated recension quite close to the source that must have been consulted by the author of Fadda I. The discovery, which Professor Wack and I published in 1991,¹⁴ answered many of the questions raised by Willard in a chapter he titled "The Problem of J." In addition to resolving a number of specific textual problems, this new recension showed that the Old English homilist was not radically abridging or revising either of the two recensions known to Willard, but was following this distinctive abbreviated Latin recension.¹⁵ In the present article I will discuss two further,

41 (1998): 99–115; see also idem, "Irish Preaching before the End of the Ninth Century: Assessing the Extent of Our Evidence," in *Irish Preaching 700–1700*, ed. Alan J. Fletcher and Raymond Gillespie (Dublin, 2001), 18–39, at 30–38. On the compilation, see Tomás O'Sullivan, "*Predicationes Palatinae*: The Sermons in Vat. Pal. Lat. 220 as an Insular Resource for the Christianization of Early Medieval Germany" (diss. St. Louis University, 2011), esp. 147–63.

¹¹ Bazire and Cross, *Eleven Old English Rogationtide Homilies*, 115–20.

¹² See James E. Cross, "Towards the Identification of Old English Literary Ideas—Old Workings and New Seams," in *Sources of Anglo-Saxon Culture*, ed. Paul E. Szarmach (Kalamazoo, 1986), 77–102, at 84 and 88–89 nn. 45–48, referring to unpublished findings by Mary Wack. Some additional manuscripts were cited in Charles D. Wright, "Apocryphal Lore and Insular Tradition in St. Gall, Stiftsbibliothek MS 908," in *Irland und die Christenheit: Bibelstudien und Mission*, ed. Próinséas Ní Chatháin and Michael Richter (Stuttgart, 1987), 124–45, at 134–36, and in the essay cited in n. 14 below.

¹³ Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek Clm 28135 (s. ix^{1/6}), fols. 13r–v and 44r–47v; see "Manuscripts," nos. 12 and 13.

¹⁴ Mary F. Wack and Charles D. Wright, "A New Latin Source for the Old English 'Three Utterances' Exemplum," *Anglo-Saxon England* 20 (1991): 187–202.

¹⁵ For further commentary on Fadda I in relation to the abbreviated Three Utterances in Clm 28135, see Ananya Jahanara Kabir, *Paradise, Death and Doomsday in Old English Literature*, Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England 32 (Cambridge, 2001), 51–52; and Loredana Teresi, "Mnemonic Transmission of Old English Texts in the Post-Conquest Period," in *Rewriting Old English in the Twelfth Century*, ed. Mary Swan and Elaine M. Treharne, Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England 30 (Cambridge, 2000), 98–116, at 105.

previously unstudied manuscripts of the Three Utterances that affect source analysis not primarily in relation to the Three Utterances exemplum itself, but in relation to its immediate contexts in two of the Old English homilies, Fadda I and Bazire/ Cross Homily 9.

I

The Lenten homily in Oxford, Bodleian Library Junius 85/86, fols. 25r–40r (Fadda I) is a compilation from a variety of Latin sources, including a popular pseudo-Augustinian Doomsday sermon that often circulated with the Three Utterances and was often paired with it in early manuscripts.¹⁶ Were the diverse Latin sources translated in Fadda I already compiled in a single Latin homiliary or florilegium available to the homilist? And had they already been patched together in a composite Latin sermon he was translating? To what extent, in other words, was the author of Fadda I himself responsible for the resulting pastiche? In the vast majority of manuscripts containing the Three Utterances it occurs as a separate work, even when it immediately precedes or follows the Doomsday sermon.¹⁷ The Doomsday sermon in Clm 28135 does not belong to the same textual family as the one that the homilist of Fadda I used, and the abbreviated recension of the Three Utterances in Clm 28135 is not bundled with any *other* source used in Fadda I. That evidence would seem to support the conclusion that the homilist had encountered the abbreviated recension as a separate text and combined it with material from other Latin sources, or even with material of his own composition.

The evidence of a newly identified Latin Three Utterances manuscript suggests, to the contrary, that the homilist found the Three Utterances already bundled with some of the material that precedes and follows it. The manuscript is Engelberg, Stiftsbibliothek 44,¹⁸ dating from the first half of the thir-

¹⁶ See J. E. Cross, “A Doomsday Passage in an Old English Sermon for Lent,” *Anglia* 100 (1982): 103–8; idem, “Towards the Identification of Old-English Literary Ideas,” 84; and Charles D. Wright, “A Doomsday Passage in an Old English Sermon for Lent, Revisited,” *Anglia* 128 (2010): 28–47. The homily is pseudo-Augustine, *Sermo* App. 251 (PL 39:2210) = pseudo-Ambrose, *Sermo* 24 (PL 17:673); see J. Machielsen, *Clavis Pseudepigraphorum Medii Aevi, I: Homiletica*, 2 vols. (Turnhout, 1990), 1:212–13 (no. 1036).

¹⁷ For some manuscripts in which the Doomsday sermon immediately precedes or follows the Three Utterances, see Wright, “Apocryphal Lore,” 136; and Charles D. Wright and Roger Wright, “Additions to the Bobbio Missal: *De dies malus* and *Joca monachorum* (fols. 6r–8v),” in *The Bobbio Missal: Liturgy and Religious Culture in Merovingian Gaul*, ed. Yitzhak Hen and Rob Meens (Cambridge, 2004), 79–139, at 85 n. 11.

¹⁸ “Manuscripts,” no. 42; the incipit is “Isidorus. Initium sapientiae timor domini *laudatio eius manet in seculum seculi* [Ps 110:10]. Primum quidem docet nos audire iusticiam dei. . . .”

teenth century. The Engelberg manuscript has received some attention as a copy of the Homiliary of Angers, the source of the Old English homilies in the Taunton fragment¹⁹ and also of one of the early Middle English Lambeth Homilies, as Stephen Pelle has recently shown.²⁰ Winfried Rudolf added Engelberg 44 to the list of witnesses of the Homiliary of Angers,²¹ and Aidan Conti has supplied a description of the manuscript for the digital facsimile.²² In addition to the Homiliary of Angers, however, the manuscript includes other anonymous sermons, and among these, on folio 105v, is a version of the Three Utterances that has not hitherto been identified.²³

The Engelberg text is distinctive in two ways: first, it represents another copy of the abbreviated recension that was the source of Fadda I, but was previously known to exist only in Clm 28135; second, unlike the copy in Clm 28135, the Three Utterances text in Engelberg 44 does not stand alone but is embedded within a longer homily including material that accounts for some of the contents of Fadda I both preceding and following the Three Utterances. Although not the immediate source of Fadda I, the sermon in Engelberg 44 must be related to that lost source and brings us closer to it. The table below gives the relevant parts of Fadda I and the text of the Engelberg sermon in the first two columns.²⁴ The text of the abbreviated recension of the Three Utter-

¹⁹ Mechthild Gretsch, "The Taunton Fragment: A New Text from Anglo-Saxon England," *Anglo-Saxon England* 33 (2004): 145–93; Helmut Gneuss, "The Homiliary of the Taunton Fragments," *Notes and Queries*, n.s., 52.4 (2005): 440–42; Aidan Conti, "The Taunton Fragment and the Homiliary of Angers: Context for New Old English," *The Review of English Studies* 60 (2009): 1–33. On the homiliary, see Raymond Étaix, "L'homélaire carolingien d'Angers," *Revue Bénédictine* 104 (1994): 148–90.

²⁰ Stephen Pelle, "Source Studies in the Lambeth Homilies," *Journal of English and German Philology* 113 (2014): 34–72, at 38–48.

²¹ Winfried Rudolf, "The Homiliary of Angers in the Tenth Century," *Anglo-Saxon England* 39 (2010): 162–92.

²² Aidan Conti, "Standard description," at *e-codices*, the website of manuscripts from Swiss libraries, <<http://www.e-codices.unifr.ch/en/list/one/bke/0044>>, uploaded in March 2014. The sermon is there flagged as "unidentified," and indeed it seems to be unique except for the Three Utterances exemplum it incorporates.

²³ In fact, the manuscript contains two distinctive variant recensions of the Three Utterances: the one edited here, and another on fol. 1rb, which was discovered by Stephen Pelle, who is preparing an edition.

²⁴ The text of Fadda I is from Luiselli Fadda's edition, but with the following corrections from the review by Malcolm Godden in *Modern Language Review* 76 (1981): 431–33, at 432: §25, *forgifenes* for *forgifeness*; §30, *bilehwitnesse* for *liliehwitnesse* and *geþylmodnesse* for *geþylmodnesse*; §33, *mycel* for *micel*; §36, *þær* (*bip wita*) for *ðær*; §39, *breohtnes* for *breohtenes*. I have also modified the punctuation of the first two sentences of §33 in light of Godden's comments. In the Latin texts I expand abbreviations silently and supply standard word-division

ances in Clm 28135 is included for comparison with that of the Engelberg homily. Some of the material that is not accounted for in the Engelberg homily can be accounted for in other Latin texts, included in the facing-page columns: two sermons in Cambridge, Pembroke College 25, a copy of the Homiliary of St. Père de Chartres known to have been used by several Old English homilists;²⁵ Redaction I of the *Visio Pauli*;²⁶ the *Predicatio cotidiana* and the so-called *Dicta Sancti Effram II*, both preserved in Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana (BAV) Pal. lat. 220;²⁷ the bilingual *Sermo ad reges* in the Irish Leabhar Breac;²⁸ the so-called *Apocrypha Priscillianistica*;²⁹ and three homilies in BAV Pal. lat. 556,³⁰ the first of which (Homily 4) includes material derived from the abbreviated recension of the Three Utterances. These are not direct sources but rather represent discrete “disseminations” (discussed below), which must have circulated more widely in many different contexts and therefore afford parallels only for brief passages. **Bold font** highlights material in Fadda I paralleled in the Engelberg homily; and underlining highlights material in Fadda I paralleled in the other Latin texts.

as well as punctuation. I do not correct grammatical errors, but emendations necessary to the sense are given in square brackets.

²⁵ See James E. Cross, *Cambridge Pembroke College MS 25: A Carolingian Sermonary Used by Anglo-Saxon Preachers*, King’s College London Medieval Studies 1 (London, 1987). The texts of Sermons 25 and 50 are from transcripts by Thomas N. Hall: <<http://www.stoa.org/Pembroke25/text-ed/25.html>> and <<http://www.stoa.org/Pembroke25/Website-tv/PDF/50.pdf>>.

²⁶ Redaction I of the *Visio Pauli* is edited by Theodore Silverstein, *Visio Sancti Pauli: The History of the Apocalypse in Latin Together with Nine Texts*, Studies and Documents 4 (London, 1935), 153–55; and by Lenka Jiroušková, *Die Visio Pauli: Wege und Wandlungen einer orientalischen Apokryphe im lateinischen Mittelalter* (Leiden, 2006), 925–27 (siglum *W¹*).

²⁷ On these two texts, see O’Sullivan, “*Predicationes Palatinae*,” 289 (no. 6, *Predicatio cotidiana*, with extracts at 287–93 nn. 71, 75, 76, 82); 332–33 (no. 10, *Dicta Sancti Effram II*, ed. G. S. Assemani, *S. p. n. Ephraem Syri opera omnia* . . . , vol. 3 [Rome, 1746], 582–83).

²⁸ The bilingual Latin—Irish *Sermo ad reges* (perhaps dating to the twelfth century) has been edited by Robert Atkinson, *The Passions and the Homilies from Leabhar Breac*, Todd Lecture Series 2 (Dublin, 1887), 151–62 (Irish text), 401–13 (translation of the Irish), and 414–18 (Latin text). See Brent Miles, “The *Sermo ad reges* from the Leabhar Breac and Hiberno-Latin Tradition,” in *Authorities and Adaptations: The Reworking and Transmission of Textual Sources in Medieval Ireland*, ed. Elizabeth Boyle and Deborah Hayden (Dublin, 2014), 141–58.

²⁹ Donatien De Bruyne, “Fragments retrouvés d’apocryphes priscillianistes,” *Revue Bénédictine* 24 (1907): 318–35, at 322 (no. I), from Karlsruhe, Badische Landesbibliothek Aug. perg. 254, fols. 72–213 (s. VIII/IX, Novara); and see n. 32 below. The manuscript also contains a text of the Three Utterances (“Manuscripts,” no. 4). I supply selected variants from another copy of De Bruyne’s text no. I in Salisbury, Cathedral Library 9, fols. 60v–81r (s. XII^{1/4}, Salisbury) from an unpublished transcript by Thomas N. Hall. On this manuscript, see Teresa Webber, *Scribes and Scholars at Salisbury Cathedral c. 1075–c. 1125* (Oxford, 1992), 23, 24, 160–62.

³⁰ Graziano Maioli, ed., “*Ramenta patristica 1: Il florilegio Pseudoagostiniano Palatino*,” *Ephemerides Carmeliticae* 14 (1963): 195–241 at 219–20 (Homily 4) and 231 (Homily 11).

Oxford, Bodleian Library Junius 85/86,
fols. 30v–32r (ed. Luiselli Fadda,
Nuove omelie, 15, 17, Hom. I §§ 23–29)

Engelberg, Stiftsbibliothek 44,
fol. 105va–vb

(23) ... he is soþlice ðæt geþwære **leohtes bearn**;
ond **þa beoð** witodlice **þeostra bearn** þa ðe
willað simle standan on ðam mæstum geflitum.
(24) Ac gehealden we us þæt **we sien** þæs
leohtesten leohtes bearn, **na læs þiestra bearn**,
forðan se man se ðe deð manige synna, se bið
þiestra bearn ond deofla bearn **geciged**, ond þa
mæn þa doð god and beoð ælmesfulle, **þa beoð**
Godes **bearn geciged**. **Ond ða mæn þa ðe doð**
god ond **Drihtnes willan**, þanne wuniað þara
saula in ecum wuldre.

(25) Ond þare saule mete biþ wutodlice þæt se
man healde Drihtnes bebodo þa hwile ðe he
lifiende sie; ond ðæt bið ðære saule drinca, þæt
man him geornlice to Gode gebidde on þæt man
gelome fæste ond Godes naman geþence; ond
seo ælmesse biþ hiera synna forgifenes, ond
hiere organan beoð þa halgan Godes word þe
men singað.... (27) ... ond ure lichaman þe of
eorþan gewordene wæran, beoð ælce dæge fedde
fram þam heofonlican cyninge. (28) Þæs mannes
saul bið liflic [*read lyftlic = celestibus?*] ond
cymeð fram eorðan se lichama, forðan he sceal
beon mid eorðan fed, ond þæs mannes saul bið
Godes oroðes ond heo forðan sceal beon mid
codcundum mægenum ond mid husle gefeded
ond forðan us is to witanne þæt God us gefylle
mid soðfæstesse. (29) Hwæt, þanne we beoð mid
ðurste ond mid hungre gewyrde, ac we willað
þanne sone drincan ond etan; forþan se lichama
ne mæg nane hwile lyfgean swa ðeah butan
mete ond drincan, swa þæs mannes saul ne
mæg nane hwile beon butan godcundum
weorcum.

Ysidorus. Initium sapientie timor
domini; intellectus bonus omnibus
facientibus eum laudatio eius manet in
seculum seculi [Ps 110:10]. Primum
quidem docet nos audire iusticiam dei
et intelligere et reddere fructus doc-
trine,

ne filii tenebrarum sumus.
Quia qui facit peccatum [dei et
intelligere et reddere *repeated from*
fol. 105va] **filius tenebrarum**
appellatur [cf. 1 Thess 5:5].
Qui facit uoluntatem dei filius lucis
est.
Colenda est nobis anima nostra ut sit
leta et salua et sine ruga, et sine
querela [cf. 1 Thess 3:13] apud deum.

Non potest anima uiuere sine
precepto dei, **sicut non potest uiuere**
corpus sine cibo.

Cambridge, Pembroke
College 25, fols. 50v–51r
(Sermon 25, ed. Hall)

Dicta Sancti Efram II
(Vatican City, BAV Pal. lat.
220, fols. 22v–23r)

Apocrypha Priscillianistica
(Karlsruhe, BLB 254,
fols. 154v–155r,
ed. De Bruyne, 322)

Ita non potest anima sine
precepta dei uiuere. Idcirco
alenda est nobis anima nos-
tra ut filius regis, quia do-
mus est regis de celo misa.
Colenda est anima ut sit
pura, leta, et salua et munda
sine rugo sine querella
coram Domino rege
celestium et terrestrium et
infernorum.

Sancta [esca Salisbury 9]
autem anime precepta [+ dei
Salisbury 9], potus autem
eius oratio, baltheus eius
ieiunium, organa eius lau-
datio domini in toto corde.

Reficiamus ergo primum
animam nostram quasi do-
minam diuinis eloquiis.
quia de caelestibus uenit, et
postea carnem quasi ancil-
lam de fructibus terre, quia
de terra orta est. sicut enim
non potest caro uiuere sine
cibo. Ita non potest anima
uiuere sine preceptis dei. et
sancto sacrificio corporis
christi. Propter quod refi-
cienda est. prius anima nos-
tra bonis operibus.

Anima ergo de celestibus
uenit, ideo de celestibus
pascitur; sicut corpus qui de
terra exiit, de terrenis fructi-
bis uescitur. Itaque uelud
coro [*read* caro] in fame et
siti uel frigore aut lasitu-
dine, cibo, potuque, uestitu,
siue requ(i)e desiderat, sin'e
quibus uiuere non potest,
sicutique nobis iustitia et
opera bona quaerenda sunt.
Qui(a) anima sine precepto
Dei et sacrificio uiuere ne-
quit.

Anima de celestibus uenit,
ideo de celestibus pascitur;
corpus de terra exiuit, ideo
de fructibus terre pascitur.
Ita desideranda est nobis
iustitia ut fame ac siti
desideratur cybus et potus.
... [*Salisbury 9: Corpus non*
(potest) uiuere sine cibo et
potu, ita et anima si non
uerbo dei pascitur.]

Oxford, Bodleian Library Junius 85/86,
fols. 32r–33r (ed. Luiselli Fadda,
Nuove omelie, 17, 19, Hom. I §§30–32)

(30) Ac gegearwian we ura **saula clænnesse** mid **lufan** ond mid **eaðmodnesse** ond mid **arfæstnesse** ond mid **rummodnesse** ond mid **halignesse** ond mid **smiltnesse** ond mid **geðungennesse** ond mid **bilehwitnesse** ond mid **rihtnesse** ond mid **godcundnesse** ond **gebyldmodnesse** ond **geswigunge**, þonne us mon on ðweorh to sprece, ond mid **wæccean** ond mid **mildheortnesse** ond mid sigefæstnesse ond gemetfæstnesse ond mid ar(fæst)nesse godcundre beboda.

(31) **Þis** ðonne **is swiðe gastlic weorc and swiðe halwendlic** ond **mid þyllicum** mægennum **bip** ðæs mannes **saul** mid **gereordum gefylled**, ond þa mæn þe ðis eall beoþ donde, þanne **beoð þara saula breohtran þanne sunne**, þanne heo breohtest scineð, **swa he self wæs cwedende: *Tunc iusti fulgebunt sicut sol in regno patris eorum; qui habet aures audiendi audiat*** [Mt 13:43].

Anima hominis peccatoris cum exierat de corpore. Drihten he cwæð: “Soðfæste mæn. . .”
(32) **Hit gelimpeð þanne þæs synfullan mannes saul gæð of his lichaman, ðonne bið heo seofon siðum sweartre ðonne se hræfen.** And hit is cweden on ðissum godspelle þæt **deofla lædan ða saule ond þanne heo spreceð wependre stæfne** to ðam deoflum **ond hyo cwep: “Micle siendon þa dyostre** þe ge me tolædað.” **Ond** þanne andsweriað hire **ða deoflo and hie cwedað: “Maran þe siendan toward in helle.”**

Engelberg, Stiftsbibliothek 44,
fol. 105vb

Refectiones autem **anime** sunt **caritas, castitas, humilitas, pietas, largitas, sanctitas, longanimitas, sinceritas, sobrietas, simplicitas, equitas, misericordia, iusticia, pacientia, obedientia.**

Nec [read Hec] **spiritalia sunt precepta quibus reficitur anima.**

Futurum est ut [read iter] facere de hoc mundo et mortem suscipere, ut propheta dicit: *Quis est homo qui uiuet et non uidebit mortem?* [Ps 88:49] Quemadmodum mors in Adam data est, ita dominabitur in omnibus filii eius [cf. 1 Cor 15:22].

Anima autem hominis peccatoris cum exierit de corpore

sexcies **nigrior est coruuo, †et demones qui ducunt eam** et infernus in quo ducitur†. **Et dicit anima cum lacrimis et gemitu, “Magne sunt tenebre.”**

Et dicunt demones, “Maiores tibi future sunt.”

Et ueniunt duo hostes in obuiam ei, hostis niger (et) alius hostis in uestibus albis, et faciunt certamina erga hominem ut sciant cuius eorum socia sit.

<p>Cambridge, Pembroke College 25, fol. 51r (Sermon 25, ed. Hall)</p> <p>Optima enim eius refectio est <u>castitas</u>. <u>caritas</u>. <u>humilitas</u>. <u>pietas</u>. <u>largitas</u>. <u>sanc-titas</u>. <u>sobrietas</u>. <u>simplicitas</u>. <u>aequitas</u>. <u>bonitas</u>. <u>longanimitas</u>. <u>taciturnitas</u>. <u>miseri-cordia</u>. <u>iustitia</u>. <u>patientia</u>. in deo oboedientia.</p>	<p><i>Dicta Sancti Efram II</i> (Vatican City, BAV Pal. lat. 220, fol. 23r–v)</p> <p>Refectio <u>animae</u> est <u>caritas</u>, <u>castitas</u>, <u>pietas</u>, <u>patientia</u>, <u>humilitas</u>, <u>humanitas</u>, <u>largi-tas</u>, <u>longanimitas</u>, <u>sanctitas</u>, <u>sinceritas</u>, <u>bonitas</u>, <u>benigni-tas</u>, <u>sobrietas</u>, <u>simplicitas</u>, <u>equitas</u> et <u>iusticia</u>, <u>obedi-entia</u>, <u>misericordia</u>, <u>taci-turnitas</u> et pax, <u>uigiliae</u> et orationum instantia.</p>	<p><i>Apocrypha Priscillianistica</i> (Karlsruhe 254, fols. 154v–154v, ed. De Bruyne, 322)</p> <p>Refectio autem spiritus ieiunium ... <u>misericordiam</u> ... <u>humilitatem</u> ... <u>bonita-tem</u> ... <u>caritatem</u> ... helimo-sinam ... gaudium ... fidem ... mansuetudinem ... <u>pacientiam</u> ... pacem [<i>acc. forms thus</i>] et alia bona.</p>
<p><u>Haec sunt nostra alimenta spiritalia ac salubria</u>. quibus reficitur anima nostra .</p>	<p><u>Hec omnia cibaria sunt spiritalia et salubria quibus reficitur anima et satiatur et faciunt eam splendorem</u> [<i>sic</i>] <u>sole</u>. <u>Domino dicente</u>: <u>Tunc iusti fulgebunt sicut sol in regno Patris eorum</u>.</p>	
<p>Munich, BSB Clm 28135, fol. 13r (ed. Wack and Wright, 189)</p>	<p>Vatican City, BAV Pal. lat. 556, fol. 19v (ed. Maioli, 219–20, Homily 4)</p>	
<p><u>Anima hominis peccatoris cum exigerit de corpore</u></p> <p><u>septies nigrior erit quam coruus</u>. †<u>Et demones qui ducunt eam</u> infernus qui dicitur.† <u>Et anima dicit cum lacrimis et gemitu</u>. “<u>Magne sunt tenebre.</u>” <u>Et respondent demones et dicunt</u>. “<u>Maioresque erunt et tibi apud demones.</u>”</p>	<p>Et tres sunt in hoc mundo deteriora omni malo: <u>anima peccatoris</u>,</p> <p>quae <u>nigrior est coruo in septimo</u>; et maligni <u>demones qui eam adducunt</u>; et infernus, cui dicitur [<i>read ducitur</i>]: non est enim deterius his tribus ...</p>	

Oxford, Bodleian Library Junius 85/86,
fols. 33r–34v (ed. Luiselli Fadda,
Nuove omelie, 19, 21, Hom. I §§ 32–35)

Panne cweð seo saul eft: “Micel is ðeos unrotnes
þe ge me tolædað.” Ond þanne andsweriað hiere
þa deofle ond hie cweðað: “Maran gewin ond
mare unblis þe is gegearwod on helle.”

Ond þanne æfter bysum wordum hie lædað þa
saule on helle witu. (33) Ond þanne bið ðæs
halgan mannes saul wutodlice, þanne heo of
ðam lichaman gangeð, seofon siðum heo bið
beorhtre þanne sunne, and þa halgan Godes
ænglas hie lædað to Paradysum and þanne
cwvð seo saul to ðam ænglum þe hie lædað:
“Eala mycel is ðeos blis þe ic on gelædad eam.”
Ond þanne andswergeað hire þa ænglas and
cweðað: “Mare blis þe is on heofonum ge-
gearwad.” Ond þanne seo saul eft cweð:
“Micel is þes brym þe we on syndan.” Ond
þanne andswergeað hiere þa ænglas and
cweðað: “þu cymest ful ær to maran brymme.”
Ond þanne cwvð seo saul þridan siðe: “Mycel
is his leoht þe ic on eam.” Ond þanne andswer-
geað hiere þa ænglas and hie cweðað: “þu
gemetst mare leoht mid Gode.”

(34) Ond þanne syngað þa halgan ænglas
swiðe gæstlingne sang ond berað ða clænan
sawle to Gode on heora fæðmum ond hie
cwæðað to ðære sawle: “Beatus quem elegisti:
replebimur” [Ps 64:5]. Hie cweðað: “Eadig eart
ðu sawl, ðu name Gode eardunge in ðinum huse.
Ond we nu gefyllað mid gode ðin hus, ðin templ
his halig(re) ond wundorlicre ðrymnesse.”

(35) Ond hie cweðað eft be ðære sawle: “Eadig
eart ðu, sawl, ðu geheolde ðines Drihtnes
bebodu, ond ðu dydest geornlice æfter ðines
Godes willan.”

“Eala, ðu halige ðrymness, Fæder ond Sunu ond
Halig Gast ðu ðe æfre wære ond æfre bist...”

Engelberg, Stiftsbibliothek 44,
fol. 105vb

Dicit anima, “Asperum est iter.”

Demones dicunt, “Asperius tibi
futurum. Deducemus te ad
protoplastum nostrum Sathanam.”
Dicit tercio anima, “Magna angustia.”
Demones dicunt, “Maior est futura.
Deducemus ad locum terribilem et
tormenta impiorum et habitabis in
eis.” **Hec sunt uerba** demonum
quando **ducunt** hominem in
infernum.

Anima autem hominis sancti cum
exierit de corpore septies
splendidior est sole. †**Et sancti**
angeli qui ducunt eam et paradysus
in quo ducitur. †

Anima dicit, “Magna leticia.”

Et respondent angeli,
“**Maior est que tibi erit apud deum.**”
Et iterum dicit,
“**Magna est maiestas in qua**
sumus.” **Et respondent,**
“**Maior tibi erit.**”

Et dicit, “**Magnum est**
lumen.” **Et respo(n)dit,**
“**Maior est tibi futurum.**”

Videbis claritatem dei et leticiam
angelorum et tabernacula iustorum. Et
suscitatur [*read* suscitare] de corpore
suo leniter, et quod parauit sibi bo-
num uidet.” **Et diuident se angeli**
circa eam **cantantes**

et dicentes, “**Beatus quem eligisti**” et
reliqua.

Munich, BSB Clm 28135,
fol. 13r–v (ed. Wack and Wright, 189–90)

Vatican City, BAV Pal. lat. 556,
fol. 19v (Homily 4, ed. Maioli, 220)

Et iterum dicit anima, “Magna est tristitia.”

Et respondent demones, “Maiorque erit tibi apud demones.”

Haec sunt trea uerba peccatorum
quando ducuntur ad infernum.
Anima autem hominis sequitur; cum
exierit de corpore septiens splendor erit
quam sol. †Et sancti
angeli qui ducunt eam ad paradysus
quo dicitur. †
Et dicit anima, “Magna est laetitia.”
Et respondent angeli,
“Maiorque erit tibi apud deum.”
Et iterum dicit anima,
“Magna est magestas in qua sumus.”
Et dicunt angeli,
“Maiorque erit tibi apud deum.”
Et tertia dicit anima, “Magna est
lumen.” Et respondent angeli,
“{...}
apud deum.”

Tres sunt in hoc mundo meliora omni bono:
anima sancti
in septimo sole speci(osi)or;
et sancti angeli qui eam in sinu suo
suspiciunt [*read* suscip-]; et paradysus
cui dicitur [*read* ducitur] et expectatio
regni caelestis: his tribus non est
melius in hoc mundo.

Et sancti angeli cantabunt canticum spiritalem,
portantes eam in sinu suo.

et dicentes ad animam, “Beatus quem elegisti
domine et adsumpsisti, inhabitauit in taber-
naculis tuis. Replebimur in bonis domus tuae;
sanctum est templum tuum, mirabile in aequitate.
Et beatus es qui mandata seruasti dei tui et fecisti
ea diligenter secundum uoluntatem dei tui.”

Et sancti angeli dilectantur animam
spiritali cantico.

et dicunt: Beatus quem elegisti
et adsumpsisti, domine; inhabitauit in
tabernaculis tuis. Replebimur in bonis
domus tuae [Ps 64:5].

Oxford, Bodleian Library Junius 85/86,
fols. 35r–36r (ed. Luiselli Fadda,
Nuove omelie, 23, 25, Hom. I §§ 36–38)

(36) And nu, mæn ða leofestan, **ondrædan we us ðara awiergedra deofla** swearnesse **ond helle brogan**, ond hiora dracona fulnesse ond hiora wyrma grædignesse ond wildeora reðnesse and hiora susle micelnesse **ond hiora ða ecean witu, þær biþ eagena wop ond toba gristbitung** ond **welera ðurst** ond þær beoþ saula on miclum geflitum toslitene ond **þær biþ heortan fyrhtu** and þær biþ saula unrotnesse ond þrotena drygnesse ond þær biþ singallic cyrm **ond gelomlic geomrung and þær beoþ ða synfullan saula forgitene** ond heora **eardungstow bið mid deoflum ond þær biþ wite butan ænde** ond **ðeostra butan leohte** ond **cleopung butan gehernesse** ond micel wop ond micel geomrung ond þær biþ **ece sar**; ond **orwene** þæt him æfre ðæs sar linne ond him her næfre ne becymeþ **nænig frofor ne nænig help a butan** sarlic ænde; ond þæt beoð **ða arleasan** ðe simle **hiera deaðes wysceað, ond him na geseald ne bið** na ðy hraðor.

(37) ... **ond þær nænig god ætiewed biþ** on ðam grunde **ond þær biþ seo eorðe Gode ofergytan** ond **þær beoð þa earman tintrego** ond hie ðær þa wuniegað a worulda woruld. (38) **Bis ðonne is synfulra stow** onto eardianne ond hiera **gebunes. Ðær ðonne beoþ on þisum wutum ða forlegeran ond þa godwracon ond þa oferwelgan** þe mid unrihtnesse him a begeatan, ond **þa gitseras ond þa struderas ond þa ðeofas** ond þa ðeodsceaðan ond **ða mansworan** ond þa loge(þe)ras ond **þa gramheortan** ond þa lyblæccan ond þa ðe manige galdor cunnon ond þa ðe gelome galaþ ond þa unrihtfullan ond þa arleasan ond **þa hatheortan** ond **þa æfestegan** ond þa yfelan ond þa ofernioðan [*read* ofermodigan = superbi?] ond **þa ðe eall yfel wrohtan** ond **þa ðe deofle wæron simle gongende** on hiora eardungstowe, ðe **hie noldan nænige hreowe don** hyra synna ær hyra forðfore....

Engelberg, Stiftsbibliothek 44,
fol. 105vb and lower margin

Non est acceptio personarum apud Deum [Rom 2:11], sed [*read* seu] diues an pauper sit, sed reddet Deus unicuique secundum opera sua [Rom 2:6]. **Propterea timeamus regionem demonum et horrorem infernorum**

et eternitatem penarum.

Vbi fletus oculorum, ubi stridor dentium,

ubi timor et cecitas et odibilitas et **frequentia** gentium [*read gemitum = gelomlic geomrung*], ubi **sitis labiorum, ubi obliuio peccatorum, ubi cohabitatio demonum, ubi pene sine fine, tenebre sine luce, clamor sine auditu, eternitas in dolore; ubi desperatio sine consolatione,** ubi **nichil** speratur magis quam plaga,

ubi mors optatur et non datur.

Ibi religio oblita a deo, ubi non est fructuosa penitentia, **ubi cruciamenta membrorum.**

Hec sunt habitacula in quibus erunt fornicatores et scelerati et adulteri, cicipidi [*read cupididi*], auari, rapaces, latrones, periurii, iracundi,

inuidi, superbi, blasphemii, **mali factores cum principe eorum diabolo ubi penitentiam egerint.**

Predicatio cotidiana
(Vatican City, BAV Pal.
lat. 220, fol. 15r)

Sermo ad Reges
(ed. Atkinson, 418)

Visio Pauli, Redact. I.12
(ed. Silverstein, 155 =
W^A 40, ed. Jiroušková, 927)

Ubi fletus oculorum et
stridor dentium,

ubi erit eternitas poenarum;
ubi erit fletus oculorum;
ubi erit sitis labiorum;

eternitas penarum,
fletus oculorum,
stridor dencium, sitis labio-
rum,

ubi erit cohabitatio demonum;
ubi poena sine fine; ubi erunt
tenebrae sine luce;

habitacio demonum,
pena sine fine, tenebre sine
luce.

ubi mors optatur et non
datur ... Ubi nihil
speratur nisi pena ...
Ubi est sitis ardor
et terrae obliuionis

ubi nulla consolatio est;
ubi nihil speratur nisi poena
perpetua;
ubi mors ab impiis regibus
optatur, et non datur;
ubi omne malum abundabit,
et ubi omne bonum non ap-
parebit.

desperacio sine consolacione.

<p>Oxford, Bodleian Library Junius 85/86, fols. 36r–37r (ed. Luiselli Fadda, <i>Nuove omelie</i>, 25, 27, Hom. I § 39)</p> <p>(39) Þonne æfter ðon þa halgan ond þa soð-fæstan mid Criste mid hyra godum wyrcum, þæt þonne syndan ða unwæmman ond þa clænan ond þa rihtwisan ond þa godan ond þa manðwæran ond þa gecorenan ond þa medoman ond þa mildheortan ond þa geðyldegan ond þa getrewan ond þa eaðmodan ond ða ðe Gode herap on ealle tid ond þa rummodan ond þa snotran ond þa wisan ond þa þe wæron mid swiðe mycelre Godes lufan gefyllede, hie hæfdon mycle forhæfdnesse ond forwyrnednesse hiera lichaman lustes, ond hie nu eardiað mid Criste for hyra godum weorcum <u>ðær bið leohtes leoht ond willa ðæs leohtes ond þær bið ece gefea ond þer bið ængla breohtnes ond haligra lufu ond þer biþ seo ece ar ond þær ne bið nænig broga nefre gesewen ne ne gehered, ac ðær bið blis butan ænde ond iugoð butan ylðo ond þær næfre niht geðeostrað</u>, ac ðær simle awunað þæt heofonlice leoht ond þær ne beoð nænige tintrega geywed, ac ðær bið seo ece hæl ond syo ece lufu swiþe ungeswæncedu ond þær bið seo unawændelic eadignes ond þær wuniað his ða halgan on ðam hyhstan wuldra a in ealra worulda woruld.</p>	<p>Engelberg, Stiftsbibliothek 44, fol. 105v (lower margin)</p> <p>In uitam eternam ibunt sancti et iusti, immaculati, recti, boni, mansueti, electi, perfecti, mites, misericordes, patientes,</p> <p>abstinentes, caritatem dei implentes,</p> <p>ubi gaudium sempiternum, ubi caritas angelorum, ubi leticie sine fine, ubi ullam [read nullam] uideretur tormenta,</p> <p>ubi habundauit salus eterna, ubi beatitudo immobilis, ubi gloria seculorum sanctorum permanens in secula seculorum, ubi nullum bonum deest. Qui spem magnitudinis illius iocunditatis narrabit, ubi ille qui uiuit et regnat?</p>
---	---

It is immediately clear that Fadda I is closer to Clm 28135 than it is to Engelberg 44 for the portion of the homily containing the Three Utterances exemplum (from the middle of §31 to the beginning of §35). Engelberg 44, for example, includes several sentences that are not in Clm 28135 or Fadda I, such as the third utterance of the damned soul (“Magna angustia!”) and the response of the demons. Engelberg 44 also has the standard form of the second utterance (“Asperum est iter!”) instead of the unique “Magna est tristitia!” of Clm 28135. (Fadda I translates “tristitia” as “unrotnes” in the soul’s utterance, but with “gewin” and “unblis” in expanding the comparatives in the angels’ response.) Elsewhere the many passages in Fadda I that are underlined but not in bold indicate where it corresponds to Clm 28135 (sometimes also to

Vatican City, BAV Pal. lat. 556, fol. 27r (ed. Maioli, 231, Homily 11)	Cambridge, Pembroke College 25, fol. 119v (Sermon 50, ed. Hall)	<i>Sermo ad Reges</i> (ed. Atkinson, 418)
--	---	--

<u>et nox non apparebit</u> ... sed erit dominus deus lux aeter- nae	<u>Ubi est lux lucis et fons luminis. Vbi est gaudium sempiternum. ubi claritas angelorum et claritas sanctorum.</u> Ubi est honor perfectus et letitia sine fine.	ubi uita sine morte, gau- dium sine tristitia, <u>iuuentus sine senectute</u> , ... ubi <u>clari- tas angelorum</u> ; ubi uita perennis, ubi paradus dul- cis; ubi omne bonum abun- dabit, et nullum malum erit; ...
--	---	---

other Latin texts, or only to other Latin texts) rather than to Engelberg 44. There are just two minor readings that are in bold but not underlined, where Engelberg 44 preserves a reading closer to Fadda I: Engelberg 44 reads “sancti” instead of “sequitur,” paralleling “halgan” in the Old English at §33; and in the third utterance of the blessed soul, where Clm 28135 is defective, Engelberg 44 preserves the Latin translated by Fadda I at the end of §33. Yet even there, the remaining words in Clm 28135, “apud Deum,” which are not in Engelberg 44, are translated in Fadda I, “mid Gode.”

Were this all, Engelberg 44 would be of minimal significance for reconstructing the source of Fadda I. It is in the material preceding and following the Three Utterances section of Fadda I where Engelberg 44 becomes very

significant, for it provides close parallels for several paragraphs of Fadda I (§§23–24, 29–34 and 36–39) that are completely lacking in Clm 28135. The first Old English passage in bold (§§23–24) contrasts the sons of darkness and the sons of light in terms similar to the Latin of Engelberg 44. This is followed by an extended passage in Fadda I (§§25–31) about the food and drink of the body and of the soul and an extended list of virtues.³¹ Some of this material is paralleled in the so-called *Apocrypha Priscillianistica*, as Luiselli Fadda noted,³² but Engelberg 44 supplies some further parallels, and still more of the Old English can be paralleled in Pembroke 25 and the *Dicta Sancti Effram II*. Following the Three Utterances section, Fadda I continues (§§36–39) with extended descriptions of the pains of hell and a list of the sinners who will be punished there, and of the joys of heaven and a list of the virtuous who will be rewarded there. Once again, much of this material is paralleled in Engelberg 44, and once again some additional parallels for apparent additions in Fadda I can be found in other Latin texts.³³ We are dealing here with what James E. Cross called “disseminations,” which he defined as “certain sequence[s] of words recorded in a number of Latin texts.”³⁴ Such commonplace material might circulate in diverse contexts, often with minor variation in the wording, in some cases probably as a result of memorial transmission.³⁵ Yet the parallels between Fadda I and Engelberg 44 can hardly be coincidental occurrences, first because they are so extensive and combine

³¹ The list of virtues seems to have been influenced by the *Rule of the Master* 3.3–8, ed. Adalbert de Vogüé, *La Règle du Maître: Prologue–Ch. 10*, Sources chrétiennes 105 (Paris, 1964): “humilitas, oboedientia, taciturnitas; prae omnibus castitas corporum; conscientia simplex; abstinentia, puritas, simplicitas; *benignitas, bonitas* [Gal 5:22, which adds *longanimitas*] misericordia; prae omnibus pietas; temperantia; uigilantia, sobrietas; iustitia, aequitas, ueritas. . . .”

³² Luiselli Fadda, *Nuove omelie*, 2–3. On the *Apocrypha Priscillianistica*, which are probably an Irish compilation but in any case probably not Priscillianist, see my entry in *Sources of Anglo-Saxon Literary Culture: The Apocrypha*, ed. Frederick M. Biggs (Kalamazoo, 2007), 80–83.

³³ Further parallels for some of the phraseology for both the joys of heaven and pains of hell in the *Predicatio cotidiana*, *Dicta Sancti Effram II*, and *Sermo ad reges* are cited by O’Sullivan, “*Predicationes Palatinae*,” 288–90 nn. 71–76. As O’Sullivan notes, Cross already cited the passage in Pembroke 25 as a parallel for Fadda I (*Cambridge, Pembroke College MS 25*, 171–72).

³⁴ Cross, “The Literate Anglo-Saxon – On Sources and Disseminations,” *Proceedings of the British Academy* 58 (1972): 67–100, at 70.

³⁵ On memorial transmission, see Loredana Teresi, “Mnemonic Transmission of Old English Texts in the Post-Conquest Period,” in *Rewriting Old English in the Twelfth Century*, ed. Elaine Trehearne and Mary Swan, Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England 30 (Cambridge, 2000), 98–116.

multiple disseminations in the same order both preceding and following the Three Utterances, and second because the Three Utterances section in Fadda I translates a very distinctive and rare recension currently witnessed only by Engelberg 44 and Clm 28135. The thirteenth-century Engelberg text, then, must be a late variant copy of the source used by the author of Fadda I. The Engelberg text is probably more than one branch removed stemmatically from the text of the Latin sermon that was translated by the homilist, and in the process of transmission some material has been added or omitted. But the Engelberg sermon can be characterized as a congener of Fadda I’s lost source for this part of the homily. That lost source incorporated the abbreviated recension of the Three Utterances in a form closer to the one in Clm 28135 than to the one in Engelberg 44, but it also included extended framing material preserved partially in Engelberg 44 but not at all in Clm 28135.

As always, the discovery of Latin sources—even when the surviving text is at one or more removes from that of the manuscript actually consulted by the homilist—provides comparative evidence for assessing textual and lexicographical problems. In some cases a source may raise new textual and lexicographical problems. At the beginning of §28 occurs the apparently unproblematic phrase “Ðæs mannes saul bið liflic,” which Luiselli Fadda translates as “L’anima dell’uomo è vitale.” The Latin parallel in the *Apocrypha Priscillianistica*, however, reads “Anima de celestibus uenit,” which is confirmed not only by the parallels in Pembroke 25 and *Dicta Sancti Effram II* but also by the logic of the context, which contrast the soul’s celestial origin with the body’s earthly origin (“de terra exiuit”/“exiit”; cf. “de terra orta est” in Pembroke 25).³⁶ The contrast is skewed in the Old English, where “liflic” (“vital”) is opposed to “fram eorðan” (“from the earth”). Yet the homilist seems to have understood that the soul is being defined in relation to the element of air, since he goes on to say that the soul is the “breath” of God (“Godes oroðes”). A paleographically close OE equivalent for the Latin that would restore the balanced contrast lies to hand: “lyftlic” (“aerial”), a term used also in the OE Seven Heavens homily, where “se lyftlica heofon” translates the name of the first heaven (*Aer*), and “se oferlyftlica heofon” translates the name of the second heaven (*Aether* or *Aetherium* [sc. *Coelum*]).³⁷ Since

³⁶ Luiselli Fadda cites the parallel with the *Apocrypha Priscillianistica* (*Nuove omelie*, 2), without considering the potential bearing of the Latin on the reading *liflic*.

³⁷ See Willard, *Two Apocrypha*, 7, and the new edition by Nicole Vomering, “The Old English Account of the Seven Heavens,” in *The End and Beyond*, ed. Carey et al., 285–386, at 298. On the names of these heavens, see John Carey, “The Seven Heavens: Introduction,” in *The End and Beyond*, 155–70, at 160–62. On the terms, see Jane Roberts, “A Preliminary ‘Heaven’ Index for Old English,” *Leeds Studies in English*, n.s., 16 (1985): 208–19, at 209–10;

the Seven Heavens and Three Utterances sermons seem to have emerged from a common milieu,³⁸ and since “lyftlic” in the former designates an aerial heaven, the likelihood is strong that “liflic” in Fadda I is a scribal error for “lyftlic” = “de celestibus” (it is easy to see why a scribe might substitute “liflic,” for the soul was indeed the “vital” force).

Again, at the end of §37, the phrase “ond þær beoð þa earman tintrego” and Luiselli Fadda’s translation “e vi saranno tormenti miserabili” also seem entirely unproblematic until one compares the Engelberg text, where the phrase at the corresponding point is “ubi cruciamenta membrorum.” This raises the distinct possibility that “earman” (< *earm*, adj., “attended with misery, grievous”)³⁹ is a scribal substitution for “earma” (< *earm*, n., “arm”): “and there will be torments of the arms.” If so, it would seem to be the only case in which *membrum* is translated synecdochically by *earm* rather than by *limu*; yet such a rendering is at least as likely as the possibility that the near identity of OE *earman* to *earma* precisely where the Latin source has “membrorum” is purely coincidental.

Finally, in the list of sinners in §38 occurs the hapax legomenon “ofernioðan” (not recorded in Bosworth-Toller or Clark-Hall, or their respective supplements by Campbell and Meritt), which Luiselli Fadda translates as “ultrainvidiosi.” The OE sequence here is “þa hatheortan ond þa æfestegan ond þa yfelan ond þa ofernioðan,” corresponding to the Latin sequence “iracundi, inuidi, superbi, blasphemi” in the Engelberg text. Since “æfestegan” clearly corresponds to “inuidi,” and since there is no OE equivalent for “superbi” (“yfelan” seems to render “blasphemi”), “ofernioðan” may well be a scribal corruption of “ofermodigan.” It is of course possible that the homilist employed a doublet for “inuidi,” and that his text of the Latin did not include the word “superbi”; but the very fact that the second of the pair is a hapax increases the likelihood that it is a scribal error for the homilist’s original equivalent for “superbi.”⁴⁰

Thesaurus of Old English Online, s.v. *lyftlic*, defined there as “airy, aerial” (<<http://oldenglishthesaurus.arts.gla.ac.uk>>, accessed 25 January 2015).

³⁸ See Willard, *Two Apocrypha*; and Wright, *Irish Tradition*, 221. One OE homily, HomS 5, “*Be heofonwarum 7 be helwarum*,” ed. Teresi, conflates the Three Utterances exemplum with the Seven Heavens apocryphon. Another OE homily, Vercelli IV, has echoes of both the Three Utterances and Seven Heavens; see Wright, *Irish Tradition*, 264–65, and DiSciaccia, “*Due note a tre omelie anglosassoni*” (n. 6 above), 236–43. See also n. 42 below.

³⁹ As defined by the *Dictionary of Old English: A-G Online*, s.v. *earm* adj. sense A.2., citing this passage among others (<<http://tapor.library.utoronto.ca/doe/dict/>>, accessed 14 January 2015).

⁴⁰ The value of comparing source and target texts for textual criticism can of course work in the opposite direction as well. In the Engelberg text the nonsensical Latin phrase “frequentia

In addition to providing us with a Latin source for more of the Old English homily, the Engelberg sermon also allows us to conclude that the author of Fadda I found the Three Utterances already bundled with other material that he translated along with it. What it does not clarify is the extent to which the Anglo-Saxon homilist was expanding on that source with material of his own composition. The sections preceding and following the Three Utterances in Fadda I are somewhat extended in relation to the corresponding passages in the Engelberg sermon. Either the Engelberg sermon represents a reduction of the homilist’s lost Latin source, or else the homilist was expanding modestly as he translated essentially what we have in Engelberg 44. The homilist, however, expands very little in translating the Three Utterances exemplum and also very little when translating the other Latin sources he is known to have used, such as the Doomsday sermon and a pseudo-Augustinian nativity homily.⁴¹ Most of these apparent additions, moreover, are paralleled in other Latin sources. In §31, for example, the theme of the good works that refresh the soul is followed by the image of the just shining like the sun, supported by quotation of Matthew 13:43, but precisely the same addition occurs in the *Dicta Sancti Effram II*. This suggests that most of the remaining unsourced material may also reflect a lost variant text of the sermon surviving in Engelberg 44.

The homilist probably did make some modest additions of his own.⁴² Such additions can be comparatively trivial, though they are not without interest as evidence of what the homilist thought required clarification, thus affording insight about his intended audience. In §26, the homilist clarifies the opposition of “leohtes bearn” and “deofles bearn” by defining the conduct of the for-

gentium” can be corrected to “frequentia gemitum” by comparison with the OE, which reads “gelomlic geomrung” (§36). Again, the phrase “caritas angelorum” makes a kind of sense, but the OE rendering “ængla breohtenes” (§39) might lead an editor to suspect an error in the Latin for “claritas angelorum,” a superior reading that is supported by the parallel passage in Pembroke 25, Sermon 50 and the *Sermo ad reges*. The immediately following phrase, “ond haligra lufu,” suggests, at the same time, that the homilist’s source read “caritas sanctorum” where the Pembroke homily and *Sermo ad reges* read “claritas sanctorum.” Cf. Vercelli XXI, where “swete lufu” corresponds to “claritas sanctorum” in the same Pembroke Homily, and where Scragg suggest the homilist’s manuscript read “caritas” (*Vercelli Homilies*, 362).

⁴¹ On the homilist’s use of these sources, see Wright, “Doomsday Passage,” and “A New Latin Source for Two Old English Homilies (Fadda I and Blickling I): Pseudo-Augustine, *Sermo* App. 125, and the Ideology of Chastity in the Anglo-Saxon Benedictine Reform,” in *Source of Wisdom: Old English and Early Medieval Latin Studies in Honour of Thomas D. Hill*, ed. Charles D. Wright, Frederick M. Biggs, and Thomas N. Hall (Toronto, 2007), 239–65.

⁴² The phrase “dracona fulnesse,” for example, is closely paralleled in the Old English Seven Heavens homily (HomU 12.2): “ða fulnissa ðara dracena” (ed. Willard, *Two Apocrypha*, 6).

mer in this world (“þa mæn þa doð god and beoð ælmesfulle”) and the fate of the latter in the next (“þanne wuniað þara saula in ecum wuldre”).⁴³ Here the homilist amplifies the term “leohtes bearn” by singling out a virtue (alms-giving) that is not in the source and that is appropriate specifically to a lay audience. Similarly, the amplification of “geswigung” (= “taciturnitas”) in §30 by “þonne us mon on ðweorh to sprece” transforms the specifically monastic virtue *taciturnitas* in a way that makes it applicable to a lay audience: silence in the face of abuse by others is a very different kind of virtue than silence in obedience to the Rule. It also echoes the homilist’s exhortation in §9 not to repay evil words with other evil words “þeah man gehere oðerne him on ðweorh sprecaþ.”⁴⁴ Finally, in the list of sinners, the homilist clarifies that the “oferwelgan” (= “[cupidi],” “auari”) are those “þe mid unrihtnesse him a begetan,” so that the sin lies not in the mere possession of great wealth but in having acquired it unjustly.⁴⁵

Additions can be evidence of what the homilist thought important enough to justify departing from his source. The single longest apparent addition in this section of Fadda I is the trinitarian prayer in §35, “Eala, ðu halige ðrynness...” Luiselli Fadda’s punctuation makes it a continuation of the angels’ quotation of Psalm 64 (addressed to the blessed soul),⁴⁶ but the prayer seeks forgiveness for unrighteousness and admission to the community of heaven with the “elect angels,” so it must be focalized through the homilist (speaking for his audience) or through the blessed soul (speaking for all the blessed), or both, and I would therefore punctuate it as a separate quotation. The transition from the psalm verse to the prayer is abrupt (or rather there is no transition), and the prayer is not paralleled in any of the Latin texts of the Three Utterances that I have been able to consult, though it is of course possible that a lost variant text of the Engelberg sermon included such a prayer. I have found no close parallel for the prayer as a whole elsewhere,

⁴³ Luiselli Fadda, ed., *Nuove omelie*, 17.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 9.

⁴⁵ For similar examples in which condemnations of wealth in a Latin source are qualified by a vernacular homilist, see Malcolm Godden, “Money, Power and Morality in Late Anglo-Saxon England,” *Anglo-Saxon England* 19 (1990): 41–65; and Charles D. Wright, “Vercelli Homilies XI–XIII and the Benedictine Reform: Tailored Sources and Implied Audiences,” in *Preacher, Sermon and Audience in the Middle Ages*, ed. Carolyn Muessig (Leiden, 2002), 203–27.

⁴⁶ Luiselli Fadda, ed., *Nuove omelie*, 21: (§34) “‘Eadig eart ðu sawl...’ (§35) Ond hie cweðað eft be ðare sawle: ‘Eadig eart ðu, sawl, ðu geheolde ðines Drihtnes bebodu, ond ðu dydest geornlice æfter ðines Godes willan. Eala, ðu halige ðrynness, Fæder ond Sunu ond Halig Gast...’”

though many of the phrases that make it up (such as the doctrinal language about the Trinity) can easily be paralleled. It may well be the homilist’s own addition to his source, which is not to say that it did not have its own separate source. Generically the prayer is a *lorica*,⁴⁷ as it begins by invoking the Trinity and then seeks protection from spiritual danger (“ðæt us ne ðurfe sceamian ond ðæt us ure fynd ne gebismrian”),⁴⁸ the very danger that is exemplified by the fate of the damned soul, which is recounted immediately after the prayer. The purpose of this addition (if such it is) is twofold: first, to envision the first half of the Three Utterances exemplum, dealing with the fate of the blessed soul, as a desirable and possible fate for the homilist and his congregation or readership (“ðæt we motan becuman to ðinum rice ...”), suggesting how that good fate can be realized not only through good deeds, as the exemplum stresses, but also through faith in the Trinity (“on ðe we gelefað”);⁴⁹ and second, to fortify through the appropriate genre of prayer the hope that each auditor or reader may be protected from the evil fate of the damned soul.

In §38, the addition to the list of sinners of three consecutive phrases referring to those who use magic or incantations (“ond þa lyblæcean ond þa ðe manige galdor cunnon ond þa ðe gelome galap”) suggests that magic was a particular concern of the homilist that the source failed to include as a category of vice.⁵⁰ (The last sentence of the same paragraph is likely to be the homilist’s own summation, as betrayed by the clause “on ðisum bocum sægeð.”) An addition to the list of virtues in §30 (“ond mid sigefæstnesse ond gemetfæstnesse ond mid ar(fæst)nesse godcundre beboda”) could also be the homilist’s own, especially since it comes at the end of the list, though the virtues in question are rather miscellaneous.

At the beginning of §36, the addition “ond hiora dracona fulnesse ond hiora wyrma grædignesse ond wildeora reðnesse and hiora susla micelnesse” (followed shortly by “saula unrotnesse ond þrotena drygnesse”) seems likely to be original—or if borrowed, then borrowed from a vernacular source—since the sequence of rhythmically and syntactically parallel phrases is similar to

⁴⁷ On the form and function of the *lorica* (a distinctively Insular genre of prayer) and its use in Old English poetry, see Thomas D. Hill, “Invocation of the Trinity and the Tradition of the *Lorica* in Old English Poetry,” *Speculum* 56 (1981): 259–67.

⁴⁸ Luiselli Fadda, ed., *Nuove omelie*, 23.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*

⁵⁰ One would like to know what specific practices are covered by the homilist’s references to sorcerers and incantations. For an illuminating survey of the kinds of magic and superstitions that Ælfric might have been thinking of when he condemned “magic,” see Audrey Meaney, “Ælfric and Idolatry,” *Journal of Religious History* 13 (1984): 119–35.

that found in other OE anonymous homilies.⁵¹ The sequence makes the list of the pains of hell more vivid and concrete, and eschatological descriptions often inspired both homilists and poets to indulge in rhetorically heightened runs.

Three major Latin sources have now been identified for Fadda I, accounting for nearly all of the homily other than the introduction (§§1–11): the pseudo-Augustinian nativity homily (*Sermo* App. 125), the source for §§12–21; an earlier variant version of the Engelberg sermon, incorporating the distinctive abbreviated version of the Three Utterances, and additional material that can partly be reconstructed from other Latin texts, the source for most of §§23–39 (aside from the trinitarian prayer in §35); and a variant redaction of the pseudo-Augustinian Doomsday sermon (*Sermo* App. 251), the source for §§41–48. The homilist quotes a Latin passage from all three of these sources: in §13, he quotes a passage near the beginning of the nativity sermon; in §31 he conflates the Vulgate text of Matthew 13:43 with the incipit of the Three Utterances exemplum; and in §41 he quotes the incipit of the Doomsday sermon. Aside from the Latin quotation of the first few words of Psalm 64:5 in the address of the angels to the blessed soul in the Three Utterances exemplum (§34), his only other Latin quotation, Matthew 22:37–40 + Romans 13:8, comes in §21, immediately after the last material based on *Sermo* App. 125 and just two paragraphs before the first material paralleled in Engelberg 44. Since the homilist's method seems to be to quote a Latin tag when he turns to a new source, this may indicate that his version of the Engelberg 44 sermon began with this blended biblical quotation. The fact that the introduction, the only remaining unsourced block, does not include a Latin tag may therefore be an indication that in these paragraphs the homilist was not translating a single Latin source.

II

Oxford, Bodleian Library Hatton 114, fols. 102v–105v (Bazire/Cross Homily 9), one of the other Old English homilies incorporating the Three Utterances as an exemplum, affords a second case of bundling that was probably not original to the homilist. Here the Three Utterances is preceded by what

⁵¹ See in general Otto Funke, "Studien zur alliterierenden und rhythmisierenden Prosa in der älteren altenglischen Homiletik," *Anglia* 80 (1962): 9–36; and E. G. Stanley, "The Judgement of the Damned," in *Learning and Literature in Anglo-Saxon England*, ed. Michael Lapidge and Helmut Gneuss (Cambridge, 1985), 63–91. In poetry, compare Cynewulf's rhyming patches, which typically occur in eschatological contexts.

seems to have been another popular dissemination. This introduction compares the transitoriness and uncertain end of our life in this world to the condition of a person who lives in someone else’s house and does not know when he will be told to get out because the house does not belong to him. Cross found parallels for this introduction in a pseudo-Augustinian sermon and in an early medieval florilegium,⁵² Stephen Pelle has noted another in Einsiedeln, Stiftsbibliothek 27, and I have elsewhere cited an example from the twelfth-century English manuscript Hatton 26.⁵³ This dissemination, however, also serves as an introduction to the Three Utterances in the twelfth-century Homiliary of Opatowitz in Prague, Národní knihovna České republiky III.F.6 (509) (s. XII), fols. 177r–179v,⁵⁴ as the following table shows. The table includes on facing pages the closely similar text of the Three Utterances from Berlin, Staatsbibliothek Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Philipps 1716, with selected variants from Vatican City, BAV Pal. lat. 220 (edited by McNally) as well as from Munich, BSB Clm. 14446b.⁵⁵ For the opening paragraph the table gives parallels from other sources.

⁵² Bazire and Cross, *Eleven Old English Rogationtide Homilies*, 119, and Cross’s Preface to the second edition, King’s College London Medieval Studies 4 (London, 1989), viii. For the sermon (PL 40:1332), see Machielsen, *Clavis Pseudepigraphorum Medii Aevi, I: Homiletica*, no. 1176.

⁵³ I am grateful to Stephen Pelle for drawing my attention to the example in Einsiedeln, Stiftsbibliothek 27 (s. VIII/IX, Northern Italy or Switzerland; *CLA* VII, no. 827), fol. 120r <<http://www.e-codices.unifr.ch/en/list/one/sbe/0027>>. For Hatton 26, see Charles D. Wright “Old English Homilies and Latin Sources,” in *The Old English Homily: Precedent, Practice, and Appropriation*, ed. Aaron J. Kleist (Turnhout, 2007), 15–66, at 19 n.13. I take the opportunity to correct a wrong shelfmark in that footnote: in my reference to “Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Hatton 42, part II,” read “26, Part B.”

⁵⁴ The Homiliary of Opatowitz was edited by F. Hecht, *Das Homiliar des Bischofs von Prag. Saec. XII*, Beiträge zur Geschichte Böhmens I/1 (Prague, 1863), at 66–67; see “Manuscripts,” no. 36. The homily is now available online in a digital facsimile with transcription by Zdeněk Uhlíř, “Homiliarium quod dicitur Opatovicense,” <http://www.manuscriptorium.com/apps/main/index.php?request=show_teigidoc>. The homily, “Omelia cotidiana ad populum,” on fols. 177r–179v, begins, “Ideo diligamus dominum deum nostrum ex toto corde et ex tota uirtute, deinde proximum nostrum tamquam nosmetipsos; quia filii dei concordant, filii autem diaboli discordant. Custodite in uobis sacramentum baptismi, ebrietatem assiduam uelut inferni foueam fugite, cupiditatem et uanam gloriam, superbiam atque inuidiam quasi gladium diaboli pertimescite. Nolite detrahare neque maledicere neque falsum testimonium confirmare, sed ad ecclesiam frequenter conuenite, sacerdotes uestros honorate et amate” [for “Custodite . . .” see Caesarius of Arles, Sermon 171.2–3, ed. G. Morin, CCL 104:700–701].

⁵⁵ For the Berlin and Vatican manuscripts, see n. 10 above; for the Munich manuscript (s. IX^{1/4}, Regensburg), see Wright, “Manuscripts,” no. 11.

Oxford, Bodleian Library Hatton 114,
fols. 102v–103v (ed. Bazire and Cross,
121, Homily 9)

Leofan men, uton nu geþencan, broðor mine, hwylc ure eard is in þissum middan-earde. Efne he is þon gelic þe hwylc man hine gestaðelic in oðres mannes huse, nat he na hwylce dæge oððe on hwylce tid him bið to gecweden, “Gang ut, forþam þis nis þin hus þe þu on eardest. Næfst ðu her leng nænige wununge.” Ne we nytan þe geornor on hwylce tid we ðis læne lif alætan sceolon. We mihtan eaðe mid micclum egesan forhtian, forðam sceal anra manna gehwylces ende gewurðan; and him þonne bið eft þær his sylfes dædum demed, swa god swa yfel swa he ær gefremede godes oððe yfeles, ge soðfæstum mannum ge unsoðfæstum, gericum ge heanum.

Him cumað togeanes his sawle twegen englas: oðer bið Godes encgel, se bið swa hwit swa snaw; oðer bið deofles encgel, se bið swa sweart swa hræfen oððe Silharewa; and heora byð ægðer myccles geferscypes. Hi þonne habbað mycel geflit ymbe ða sawle on hwæðere geferræddene heo beon scule. Gyf þonne þa deoflu þæt ongytað, þæt heo sceal beon on heora geferscype, þonne beoð hi ealle efenhleopriende and swyðe bliðe, and þa englas beoð swyðe sarige and unrote gewordene. Donne cwepað þa deoflu þus, “Noster est ille homo.” Dæt is on ure gepeode þæt hi cwepað, “Ðis is ure mann, forðam þe heo larum gelefde...” Hi ðonne þa deoflu secgað and reccað eall þa yfel þe he æfre gefremede, and hi hit eall on heora bocum awriten habbað and ðus cwepað, “Suscite animam de corpore grauiter.” Dæt is, “Aweccað nu grimlice þa sawle of þam lichoman, and syllað hyre miccle fyrhtu and brogan ond ongrislán, and gelædað hi to þære egesfullan stowe þær heo gesyhð eall yfel and ealle tintrega and hellebrogan.”

Prague, Národní knihovna
České republiky III. F. 6 (509),
fols. 177v–178r

... Dispiciate ergo **fratres** mei hunc mundum et temporalem uitam, et **cogitate** diligenter, **quia habitatio nostra in mundo ita est, sicut aliquis fiat in domo alicuius, et nesciat qua hora dicitur ei, “Vade foras de domo mea”;** sic incertum est unicuique homini **quando** a tabernaculo corporis sui **exiturus est. Cum tamen pro certo scimus quod unusquisque hominum debet mortem accipere** qui uitam accipit.

Et tunc ueniunt duo exercitus obuiam unicuique anime, alius exercitus candidus fit ut nix, alter niger ut coruus,

et faciunt certamina circa animam uniuscuiusque hominis. Si uero inuenient demones eorum sociam esse,

cantant et gaudent, et angeli uehementer contristantur. Tunc dicunt demones, “Noster est ille homo.

Date illi tremores et timores, ut sciat qui eum ducunt.”

Einsiedeln, Stiftsbibliothek 27, fol. 120r	Ps.-Augustine, <i>Sermo ad fratres in eremo</i> 49 (PL 40:1332)	Oxford, Bodleian Library Hatton 26, fol. 74r
<u>Sic est uita ista quasi se sit</u> [<i>read sedit? or esset?</i>] <u>homo in domo aliena.</u> <u>nescit qua die uel qua hora</u> <u>dicatur ei, “Veni foras</u> <u>qui(a) non est tua domus in</u> <u>qua es.”</u>	<u>Sic enim est</u> vita nostra, quasi <u>homo in domo aliena.</u> <u>nesciens qua hora vel die</u> <u>patronus dicat: “Vade foras;</u> <u>quia non est tua domus in</u> <u>qua es.”</u>	<u>Fratres karissimi istam</u> <u>habitationem quem tenet in</u> <u>hoc seculo ita tenet si esset</u> <u>in domo aliena, quia</u> <u>nescit qua die uel qua nocte</u> <u>dicatur ei, “Vade foras,</u> <u>quia non est domus tua in</u> <u>qua es.”</u>

Three Utterances sermon
(Berlin, Staatsbibliothek Phillipps 1716,
fol. 17r)

... futurum est duos hostes uenire in obuiam
ei, hostis niger Ethiopum quasi corui uel
carbones extincti, et aliud exercitus in
uestimentis albis sicut nix.

Et faciunt certamina erga animam unius-
cuiusque hominis siue iusti siue iniusti, ut
ambo sciant cuius eorum est [sit socium CIm
14446b]. Si uero (in)ueniant demones eum
eorum socium esse, chacin`nan`⁵⁶ omnes
demones et angeli contristantur.

Demones dicunt:

“Noster (est) ille uir, qui inermis fuit in acie,
non fortis, non custodiens arma Pauli apostoli,
scutum fidei et gladium Spiritus Sancti, quod
est uerbum Dei, et lurica iustitiae et galeam
salutis [Eph. 6:16] que ad bellum contra nos
tenere oportebat.

Suscitate eam acerue

de suo corpore, et date ei timores et
horrores et deducite eam ad loca terribilia ubi
uidebit temptamenta omnia” [ubi tormenta
omnia CIm 14446b].

⁵⁶ Vatican City, BAV Pal. lat. 212 and 220 both read “chacinnant”; McNally incorrectly reads “concinant,” and Bazire and Cross (117) report “concinant,” which corresponds to “efenhleopriende” but does not appear in any of the Three Utterances manuscripts I have seen.

Oxford, Bodleian Library Hatton 114,
fols. 103v–105r (ed. Bazire and Cross,
121–22, Homily 9)

Ne mæg seo sawul þonne nawiht geseon in þas woruld, ac heo on þeostrum and on gedwolan swyðe unbliðe færð and ðus cweð, “Magna est ista angustia.” Ðæt is heo cweð, “Eala, hwæt! Þis is mycel nearones!” Hire þonne sona andswariað þa deoflu and ðus cweþað, “Mare þe is toward þonne we ðe gebringað mid urum ealdre deofle, se is gebunden in þam nyðemestan hellegrunde mid þære menigo his gemæccan.” **Donne cweð seo sawul** þus oðre siðe, “Magne sunt tenebre iste.” “Eala hwæt! **Þis syndon mycele þeostru!**” Hire þonne andswariað þa deoflu and ðus cweþað, “Maran þe syndon towardes þonne we þe gelædað in þa neoðemestan þeostru þær bið eagna wop and toða gristbitung.” **And heo þonne gyta seo sawul** þridan siðe þus cweð, “Asperum est iter.” “Eala, hwæt! **Þis is grimlic siðfæt þe we on syndon!**” Hyre þonne sona andswariað þa deoflu and ðus cweþað, “De is mycle grimlicre toward þonne þu gesihst þa grimnesse þines siðfættes, and ðu byst þæra soðfæstra husa benumen and ðu byst gelæded in þa witu hellecarcnes.” ...

Gyf þonne þa englas geseoð þæt seo sawl bið heora geferscypes wyrðe, hi þonne onginnað seggan and rædan swyðe freondlice eall þa god þe heo æfre fram frymðe hyre lifes oð hire daga ende gefremede; and heo hit eall on heora bocum awriten habbað. And Sanctus Michahel þonne þa sawle gelædeð to þam heahsetle ures Drihtnes Hælendes Cristes, þær heo gesihð eall þa god þe heo æfre ær gefremede. Donne sona þa awyrgeðan gastas swyðe unhyðige to helle in ece wite forðgewitað.

Prague, Národní knihovna
České republiky III.F.6 (509),
fol. 178r

Tunc dicit anima inmunda, “Heu me, magne sunt tenebre.”

Doemones respondent,
“**Maiores tibi futuri sunt,**

ibi erit fletus et stridor dencium et
multitudo impiorum.” **Tunc dicit iterum**
infelix anima, “**Asper est iter.**”

Demonos dicunt,
“**Asperius est tibi futurum.**
Deduci[<e]mus te ad locum terribilem,
ubi uidebis simulque sencies **tormenta**
impiorum.”

Quando **uero angeli inueniunt animam**
iustam et **eorum sociam esse**, gaudent
et **demonos contristantur**.

Three Utterances sermon
(Berlin, Staatsbibliothek Phillipps 1716,
fol. 17r–v)

Tunc anima nihil uidens in presenti seculo
dicit: “Magna angustia!”

Quasi ex more demones respondent:
“Maior tibi est futura. Alligauimus te cum
protuplausto Satanae, qui alligatus est in puteo
abyssi cum turba satellitum.”

Deinde dicit anima:
“Magna sunt tenebre!”

Demones respondent:
“Maiores tibi future sunt.”

Tunc dicit tertio:
“Asperum est iter!”

Demones respondent:
“Asperius tibi futurum est. Videbis
asperitatem generis [itineris Clm 14446b] tui,
carens tabernaculis iustorum.” Tunc dicent
demones: “Diuidite uos in [+ duos Pal. lat.
220] hostes....”

Michael tamen numquam dimittit....

Si uero angeli inueniant (eum)
eorum esse, gaudens
omnes demones uero constrictentur.

<p><u>Michael</u> tamen numquam dimittit animam donec <u>designet eam ante tri-</u> <u>bunal Trinitatis, ubi uidet omnia opera</u> <u>sua [+ quae fecit Pal. lat. 220] tenens</u> librum in manibus suis metari (e)a siue bona siue mala.</p>

Oxford, Bodleian Library Hatton 114,
fol. 105r–v (ed. Bazire and Cross,
122–23, Homily 9)

Donne cweþað þa halgan englas þus,
“**Noster est hic homo.**” “**Ðis is ure mann,**
forðam þe **heo wæs** gastlice [*read giestlic*
ond?] **mildheort** and heo **nawiht** to **yfele** ne
dyde, ac **heo wæs eall god donde** in fæstene
and on clænnesse, in geþylde and on soðre
lufu Godes and manna.” **Donne cweþað þa**
englas, “**Suscitate animam leniter de corpore.**”
“**Aweccað þa sawle liðelice of þam lichoman,**
þæt heo ne geseo nænine egsan ne næni sar, ne
heo nænne tweon næbbe ymbe hyre fare. **And**
todælað eow nu on twegen dælas. Oper hyre
sv beforan farende, oðer æfter fylende.”
And singað hyre þisne sang, þus cweþende,
“**Beatus quem elegisti et assumpsisti.**” **Ðæt**
is hi cweþað Drihtnes englas, “**Eadinesse þu**
ðe gecure and gename in þinum huse.”
Donne cweð seo sawul þus, “**Magna est**
lumen huius letitię.” “Eala, hwæt! **Þis is**
mycel leoht and ðis syndon fægere geferan!”
Hire þonne **andswariað þa englas** and ðus
cweþað, “**Leohtr e is toward þonne þu**
gesihst Godes beorhtnesse and his engla,
and þin **ansyn** bið to heora ansyne ecelice
gestaðelod.” **Donne cweð seo sawul oðre sibe,**
“**Magna est uius letitia.**” **Ðæt is,** “Eala, hwæt!
Þis is mycel bliss!” **Donne andswariað hyre þa**
englas and cweþað, “**Mare þe is toward þonne**
þu gesihst engla blisse, þa ðe cumað ongean
mid mycelre blisse and songe.” And hi þonne
mid heora **gegyrlan** ymbfoð þa sawle swiðe
hwite and beorhte. **Donne cweð seo sawul**
þridan siðe þus: “**Dulce est iter ad**
Dominum.” “Eala, hwæt! **Þis is swete siðfæt**
on to farenne and swiðe wynsum!” Hyre
þonne **þa englas andswariað** and cweþað, “**Ðe**
is mycele mare toward and wynsumre þonne
we ðe gelædað to þæra soðfæstra eardinge.”

Prague, Národní knihovna
České republiky III. F. 6 (509),
fol. 178r

Tunc dicunt angeli,
“**Noster est ille homo,** fidelis est amans
deum, ualde **misericos et hospitalis,**
omnia sustinuit temptamenta propter
deum omnipotentem.”

Tunc diident se eos angeli
in duos exercitus, alius
preueniens, alius consequens

Tunc dicit anima hominis iusti,
“**Magnum est lumen.**”

Angeli dicunt, “**Maius est tibi**
futurum, quando uidebis
claritatem dei

et magnam leticiam angelorum
ueniencium obuiam tibi.

Et deducimus te in tabernacula
sanctorum et habitacionem
iustorum.”

Tunc diident...

Three Utterances sermon
(Berlin, Staatsbibliothek Phillipps 1716,
fols. 17v–18r)

Et dicunt angeli:

“Noster est ille uir, qui fuit fortis in bello et stabilis in acie; et hospitalis erat et misericors est. Opitulatur, nihil mali commemorans, omne bonum custodiens, non repellens arma Pauli apostoli. . . .

Suscitate eam leniter de suo corpore ut nihil timoris, nihil doloris, nihil dubitationis uidens uel senciens.”

Tunc dicunt angeli: “Diuidite uos in duos exercitus, alius preueniens et aliter subsequens. Et cantate illi de canticis Daudid ubi manifestat beatitudinem anime et [*delete*] intransis in domum Dei. Dicent: ‘Beatus quem elegisti et adsumpsisti’ [Ps 64:5]”

Tunc dicit a’ni’ma: “Magnum (est) lumen!”

Angeli respondent:

“Maius tibi futurum est. Et uidebis claritatem Dei sicut facie ad faciem, non *per speculum* [1 Cor 13:12] neque per uelum, quemadmodum uidebant filii Israhel faciem Moysi.” Dicit denuo anima:

“Magna let(it)iae [sic] est!” Angeli respondent, “Maior tibi futura est.

Videbis let(it)iam angelorum uenientem obuiam tibi cum concentu diuino, ut omnibus sanctis dicent: ‘*Hii sunt qui uenerunt ex magna tribulatione et lauerunt stolas* suas et candidas eas fecerunt *in sanguine agni*’” [Apoc 7:14].

Et dicit tercio: “Suaue est iter!”

Et angeli respondent:

“Suauius tibi est futurum!”

Deducimus te ad tabernacula sanctorum carens iniustorum habitationibus.”

Tunc dicunt angeli: “Diuidite uos. . . .”

Oxford, Bodleian Library Hatton 114,
fol. 105v (ed. Bazire and Cross,
123, Homily 9)

Ðonne **gelædað** þa englas þa sawle in þone
wuldorlican gefean neorxnawanges, þær heo
forð wunað and ricsað mid Godes þam
gecorenan, buton ælcum yfelum and earfoðum
a oð ende, þær restað haligra manna sawla oð
domesdæg.

Prague, Národní knihovna
České republiky III.F.6 (509),
fols. 178r–179v

et **deducunt** eam de conuersacione huius
mundi ad spem future retributionis, ut
sine fine eterna premia percipiat, quę
preparauit deus diligentibus se....⁵⁷

The bundling of this single “dissemination” with the Three Utterances *could* be coincidental, but while some of the wording in Bazire/Cross Homily 9 is better paralleled in the Latin of text of Hatton 26 and pseudo-Augustine, more of it corresponds with the Prague sermon. (Hatton 26 also transmits a copy of the Three Utterances just one folio after this dissemination, though they are separated by another sermon.) Bazire and Cross stated that “A collation of the variant texts of the Latin [Three Utterances] compared with our sermon indicates, probably, that the composer substituted a new introduction and, quite clearly, that he did not have before him an exact equivalent of any one of the published Latin texts.”⁵⁸ While it is true that no surviving Latin text affords an “exact equivalent,” the parallel texts above show that Bazire/Cross 9 *is* quite close in most respects to the version published by McNally, albeit with some relatively minor variations. As Bazire and Cross state, “Some Latin quotations [in the Old English homily] ... do not correspond with the words of any one of the Latin texts.”⁵⁹

The Prague sermon also corresponds closely to McNally’s text (edited from Pal. lat. 220, with variants from Pal. lat. 212), reedited in the table from Berlin, Phillipps 1716, but unfortunately it has been drastically abbreviated. Where they overlap, there are some readings in Berlin, Phillipps 1716 that are closer to Bazire/Cross 9, but there is also a unique variant that is paralleled only in the Prague sermon. Bazire and Cross drew attention to two specific

⁵⁷ Prague, Národní knihovna České republiky III.F.6 (509), fols. 178r–179v continues with a version of Ps.-Augustine, *Sermo* App. 251. At the end of the homily (fol. 179v) is a brief passage based on Caesarius of Arles, *Sermo* 46 (CCL 103:205 and 206) that provides a parallel for a sentence in the introduction of Fadda I. Compare “Nullus alium in conuiuio suo cogat bibere amplius quam oportet, eo quod frequenter de ebrietate ueniunt lites et pugne atque adulteria et nonnumquam homicidia perpetrantur” with Fadda I, ed. Luiselli Fadda, *Nuove omelie*, 9, §7: “Ne he selfa ne he oðerne ne bidde ðy læs hiera begra saul þurh ðæt forloren weorþe, forþanþe se druncnesse manige synne weceð on fultum [*sic, read fulum (so Godden)*] fyrenlustum ond on unrihtum geflitum ond on gitsungum....”

⁵⁸ Bazire and Cross, *Eleven Old English Rogationtide Homilies*, 116.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*

readings not paralleled in any of the versions known to them: First, when the demons and angels claim the souls that belong to them, in Bazire/Cross 9 they say “Noster est ille [*or hic*] homo” instead of “Noster est ille uir.” Again, in Bazire/Cross 9 the third utterance of the blessed soul is “Dulce est iter” instead of “Suaue est iter.” The Prague sermon does not preserve the *iter* utterance, but when the demons and angels claim the souls they do say in each case “Noster est ille homo.”⁶⁰ In short, much like Engelberg sermon does for Fadda I, the Prague sermon provides us with a late congener of the lost Latin source translated by Bazire/Cross Homily 9, one that in this case has certainly been abbreviated but one that also does preserve additional Latin material translated by the homilist. The introduction, then, was probably not substituted by the homilist, as Bazire and Cross thought, but was already bundled with the Three Utterances in his source.

III

We know that originality, in the sense of not deriving ideas or wording from an existing text, was not greatly valued as a literary quality by Old English homilists.⁶¹ Nonetheless, we are often inclined to attribute unsourced passages to the homilists’ own composition, and we tend to assign to those

⁶⁰ While *homo* for *uir* is a trivial substitution, of the forty-four manuscripts of the Three Utterances I have been able to consult, only the Prague sermon makes that substitution.

⁶¹ On the relationship between Old English anonymous homilies and Latin sources, and on the methodology of source studies, see Wright, “Old English Homilies and Latin Sources,” and “Doomsday Passage.” The kind of originality I am immediately concerned with here is the combination by an Old English homilist of material translated or adapted from diverse Latin sources within a single homily. A related kind of originality in Old English homilies is when a homilist departs from a Latin model and inserts “unoriginal” (but often adapted) material from Old English sources, such as passages from other Old English homilies, or even from poetic texts. A prominent example is Vercelli Homily XXI, which adapts passages from a preexisting vernacular homily also used in Vercelli Homily II, from the surviving poem *An Exhortation to Christian Living*, and from a lost poem about the fall of the rebel angels. See Wright, “More Old English Poetry in Vercelli Homily XXI,” in *Early Medieval Texts and Interpretations*, ed. Treharne and Rosser, 245–62; and Samantha Zacher, *Preaching the Converted: The Style and Rhetoric of the Vercelli Book Homilies* (Toronto, 2009), 79–105. The notion of “originality” can of course easily be troubled. Every translation, no matter how “slavish,” is original in that the translator must choose words in the target language to represent (or misrepresent) those in the source text. Compare Susan Bassnett’s comments on originality and translation: “there can be no such thing as an ‘original’ ... translated text becomes an original by virtue of its continued existence in that new context” (*Comparative Literature: A Critical Introduction* [Oxford, 1993], 151; cited by Outi Paloposki, “Originality and the Defence of Translation,” *The Translator* 7.1 [2014]: 71–89, at 82).

passages greater interest and significance. Sometimes, of course, they may actually *be* original, but the continued discovery of new sources has continued to chip away at what relatively little there is left to regard as such, and this must give us pause when we assume that an unsourced passage does not have a source. When a new source is discovered, we may still be inclined to attribute any remaining divergences or unsourced phrases or sentences to the homilist's revision. Here we are on somewhat safer ground, especially when the Latin source in question is preserved in many manuscripts and a thorough collation of the variants fails to account for the apparently original material. Yet sometimes a variant text of a Latin source subsequently comes to light that accounts for some of those apparent revisions. This was the case in Fadda I for the Doomsday passage, which J. E. Cross first sourced from a pseudo-Augustinian sermon in the *Patrologia Latina*. He cautiously suggested that material the Latin sermon did not account for might be the homilist's contributions,⁶² but in a recent essay I have identified a variant form of the Doomsday sermon that accounts for many of those apparently original touches.⁶³

The same kind of uncertainty obtains when separate Latin sources have been bundled together in an Old English homily. We may be inclined to assume that the homilist made the selection himself and so was original at least in his choices and in his compilation of a new text from diverse sources. Source studies sometimes spoil that impression as well, for composite Latin homilies have been found to account even for the bundling of sources in a number of Old English homilies. The most well-known case is Vercelli Homily III, whose ultimate sources were pieced together by Joan Turville-Petre in a classic essay, "Translations of a Lost Penitential Homily."⁶⁴ Nineteen years later, Helen Spencer found and published that "lost" Latin sermon,⁶⁵ and four years after that J. E. Cross demonstrated that the manuscript from which Spencer edited it was a copy of the Homiliary of St.-Père de Chartres, which Cross demonstrated had been used extensively by other Old English homi-

⁶² "Cross, "Doomsday Passage," 107. In "Towards the Identification of Old English Literary Ideas," 84, Cross referred to additional manuscripts of the sermon and added, "My suggestions [in the *Anglia* article] should be refined or even, possibly, confirmed by a collation of manuscripts."

⁶³ Wright, "Doomsday Passage."

⁶⁴ Joan Turville-Petre, "Translations of a Lost Penitential Homily," *Traditio* 19 (1963): 51–78.

⁶⁵ Helen L. Spencer, "Vernacular and Latin Versions of a Sermon for Lent: 'A Lost Penitential Homily' Found," *Mediaeval Studies* 44 (1982): 271–305.

lists.⁶⁶ In the case of the Three Utterances in Fadda I and Bazire/Cross 9, I have argued that the homilists were not themselves responsible for the bundling of the exemplum with other material immediately contiguous with it. I do not suggest that we should assume that unsourced passages must always have immediate sources, or that bundled sources in Old English homilies were always first bundled in Latin. I do suggest that originality, insofar as that is taken to mean non-dependence on Latin sources, should not be a privileged measure of value or interest in reading Old English homilies. And I would also suggest that what the discovery of Latin sources takes away with its left hand it gives back with its right. To the extent that we are able to establish with reasonable confidence the wording of a Latin source used by an Old English homilist, comparison can throw into relief the homilist’s ideological and rhetorical responses to it: how “original,” as it were, he was with his originals. That is considerable compensation for having to abandon the possibility that the homilist made up that part of his text from scratch.⁶⁷

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

⁶⁶ Cross, *Cambridge Pembroke College MS 25*.

⁶⁷ An earlier version of this essay was presented at the Forty-Ninth Congress on Medieval Studies at Kalamazoo, Mich., in May 2014. I am grateful to Stephen Pelle for a number of suggestions and corrections.