

Leeds Studies in English

Article:

Arnold R. Taylor, 'Hauksbok and Ælfric's De Falsis Diis', *Leeds Studies in English*, n.s. 3 (1969), 101-9

Permanent URL:

https://ludos.leeds.ac.uk:443/R/-?func=dbin-jump-full&object_id=122550&silolibrary=GEN01



Leeds Studies in English
School of English
University of Leeds
<http://www.leeds.ac.uk/lse>

HAUKSBOK AND ÆLFRIC'S *DE FALSIS DIIS*

By ARNOLD TAYLOR

The first gathering of the Arnarnaganean 554 section of *Hauksbók*¹ contains a homily entitled "Um þat hvaðan otru hofst," the first part of which recalls Martin of Braga's *De Correctione Rusticorum*.² Most of the material to be found in *Hauksbók* is of Icelandic origin, but the experts have disagreed about this particular section, especially as there can be no doubt that its scribe was a Norwegian. Jón Helgason, in his facsimile edition (p. vi), admits that the first two gatherings of AM 554 may not originally have belonged to *Hauksbók* but adds that they must, at any rate, have been inserted into it very early "by Haukr himself or others." He also sees no reason to believe that it was first translated for insertion into *Hauksbók*, as some of the items in this section also exist in other Icelandic manuscripts, some of which are older than *Hauksbók*. Both Finnur Jónsson and Jón Þorkelsson give it as their opinion that the homily was of Icelandic origin, and this seems very probable.

Already in 1883 Caspari makes it clear that Martin's *De Correctione Rusticorum* has some connection with the earlier part of Ælfric's Old English sermon *De Falsis Diis*,³ and he further points out that the *Hauksbók* homily strongly recalls Ælfric's version, which in his opinion gave to Scandinavia its sole knowledge of Martin in the Middle Ages. He was, however, only able to compare the early sections of the three versions, since the sole text of Ælfric available to him was that of Unger.⁴ His suggestion of this relationship was accepted by Finnur Jónsson, Max Förster,⁵ and Jón Helgason. Jónsson thinks that the Icelandic author used both Ælfric's Old English and Martin's Latin.⁶ Förster suggested the existence of a Latin intermediary for both vernacular versions. Jón Helgason, like Jónsson, quotes parallel wording to illustrate the author's knowledge of Ælfric, but he adds that Ælfric may not have been his main source.⁷ Unfortunately both Jónsson and Helgason seem to have known of only the one defective manuscript version of Ælfric (W). Kluge's extract in his *Angelsächsisches Lesebuch* was of little help, and Warner's edition of the Daniel episodes from Cotton Vespasian D xiv was for a long time not recognized as belonging to *De Falsis Diis*, as in that manuscript it is appended to the homily for the Twelfth Sunday after Pentecost. But the recent publication by J. C. Pope of a supplementary collection of Ælfric's homilies makes it clear that there are at least seven surviving manuscripts which contain extracts from *De Falsis Diis*, of which Corpus Christi College Cambridge 178 (R) is reasonably complete.

As a result of the lack of a definitive text of Ælfric it was long thought that only the first part of the *Hauksbók* homily, down to 159,16, was dependent upon Ælfric, and that the latter part, which consists of biblical material from the *First Book of Kings* (*I Samuel*) and the *Book of Daniel*, was derived from Petrus Comestor's *Historia Scholastica*.⁸ But a comparison with

Petrus Comestor shows that he could not have been the only source, as the Icelandic text, in several places, contains Vulgate material not quoted by him.

Pope's edition of the complete text of *De Falsis Diis* demonstrates conclusively that the *Hauksbók* version is basically a translation of Ælfric with a few omissions, in particular of the last 176 lines, which are ignored. As Pope says: "So long as comparisons were limited to the early part of the Norse homily there was perhaps some room for doubt. Now that the whole homily can be put beside Ælfric there can hardly be further question."⁹ It is the purpose of this article to summarize the results of a comparison of the two texts, taking note of all important additions and omissions. The present availability of both texts makes it unnecessary to reproduce them in full, though a short extract is appended in order to illustrate the use made of Ælfric by the Icelandic author. Like his famous predecessor in translation, King Alfred, he has on the whole preferred to translate "sense for sense," but on occasion he is not above a "word for word" rendering. Where his version follows the original closely, use has been made below of the word "translation"; where his version is more clearly an adaptation, "paraphrase" has been preferred. A short title has been arbitrarily added to each section in order to aid identification.

Correspondences between the two texts and their nature:

Ælfric 1-10	The opening address	<i>Hauksbók</i> 156, 16-18
	It is noteworthy that the <i>H</i> version is nearer to Ælfric's Old English than to the Latin version (from <i>Ephesians</i> iv) which precedes it.	
Æ 10-27	The Nature of the Godhead and the Trinity	<i>H</i> —
	This section is omitted in <i>Hauksbók</i> .	
Æ 28-55	Adam and Eve in Paradise and its loss	<i>H</i> 156, 19-157, 9
	Paraphrase. <i>H</i> adds a reference to the Fall of the Angels.	
Æ 56-58	The Fading of the Sun and Moon	<i>H</i> —
	Omitted in <i>H</i> as it only anticipates what follows.	
Æ 59-71	Recovery of the Sun and Moon after Judgment Day	<i>H</i> 157, 9-17
	Mainly paraphrase though nearer translation.	
Æ 72-73	The Flood	<i>H</i> 157, 17-23
	Paraphrase. <i>H</i> adds the reasons for the Flood.	
Æ 74-77	The Tower of Babel	<i>H</i> 157, 23-31
	Paraphrase. <i>H</i> adds "en þeir menn voro .ij. oc lxx. En af því ero nu sua margar tungur i þessum heimi." This thought is a commonplace of biblical exegesis. It is probably inserted here from the piece which follows in <i>Hauksbók</i> on "Where the sons of Noah settled." (<i>Hauksbók</i> , 165, 23-25).	
Æ 78-103	The worship of False Gods	<i>H</i> 157, 31-158, 10
	Paraphrase.	
Æ 104-140	Saturn and his Offspring	<i>H</i> 158, 10-159, 1
	Paraphrase but much closer translation. This passage, with its correlation of Mercury and Óðinn, is the one which first drew attention to the relationship between the two texts.	
Æ 141-149	A Pagan error	<i>H</i> —
	This passage, in which Ælfric denies that Jove (Þórr) was the son of	

Mercury (Óðinn) — which the heathen Danes maintain — is naturally omitted in the Icelandic. Curiously enough it seems even in Ælfric to be a later addition, as it occurs only in manuscripts R and S and in Wulfstan's adaptation of Ælfric's homily (ed. Bethurum, pp. 221-224). However, there is little reason to doubt its presence in the version of Ælfric's homily used by the translator (see below).

Æ 150-165 Venus and Incest H 159, 1-10

Translation. Æ 158 is omitted and the last three lines are paraphrased.

Æ 166-180 The Days of the Week H 159, 10-15

Translation with slight adaptation. A curious partisanship is shown by both authors in this passage. Ælfric completely ignores the fact that the weekdays Tuesday to Friday are named after the old gods in English, though he does add for Friday "Venus gehaten and Frigc on Denisc." The Icelandic author characteristically omits all mention of Thursday which was allotted to Þórr, the favourite god of pagan Iceland. Ælfric includes him and makes the point that he was the most famous of the Scandinavian gods. The phrase "þann er ver kollum Oðenn" (H 159, 13) is not in Ælfric but is repeated from Æ 140 and H 158, 31-159, 1.

Æ 181-189 The Planets H —

This passage in Æ, which probably goes back to Bede's *De Temporum Ratione* and *De Natura Rerum* and which seems to have particularly interested Ælfric (see Pope's note to 181-6), was thought irrelevant by the Icelandic translator and omitted.

Æ 190-209 The Making of Idols H 159, 15-27

Translation. An interesting point here is the rendering of "sume of mislicum antimbre" by the common alliterative formula "suma (gerðo þeir) or steinum suma or stockum."

Æ 210-216 Wars between the Philistines and Israelites H 159, 27-33

Translation. H has the mistaken phrase "hinna cristnu manna" (159, 32), referring to the Jews. He was probably misled by Ælfric's emphatic "þa hæþenan" (215).

Æ 217-220 The Contents of the Ark H 159, 33-160, 9

Paraphrase. Though based on Ælfric and correctly positioned in the homily, this passage is considerably altered. Ælfric orders the contents as "manna, the rod of Aaron, and the tables"; this is no doubt taken from *Hebrews* ix, 4, though he omits the words "quae fronderat." The order of H is "the rod, the tables, and manna." The rod, however, is not Aaron's but that which God gave to Moses and with which he struck the Red Sea, thereby giving passage to the Israelites and drowning the Egyptians. The tables are represented as containing the laws which men should follow, and manna as the food for the forty-years sojourn in the wilderness.

Æ 221-239 The Fall of Dagon H 160, 9-21

Translation. The phrase in Æ 227, "swylce he friðes bæde," is literally translated "sem hann beði friðar" (H 160, 14). This is not in the Vulgate, but there is a reminiscence of it in Petrus Comestor "et quasi adorantem, ut dicit Josephus" (Migne, *PL* CXCVIII, col. 1300).

Æ 240-251 The Plague of Mice H 160, 21-27

Paraphrase. There are two interesting additions to the H text. H 160, 21-22 reads "Mys ok lemendr oc maðkar. . . ." "Ok lemendr" is added above the line in a different hand and is probably an alternative translation for

"mýs" (Latin *mures*), though in AM 764, 4to it clearly translates the Vulgate "locustae" (see K. Kaalund, *Arkiv för nordisk filologi*, XXV (Lund, 1909), 302). After "monnum" (*H* 160, 22) the words "oc gras retr oc viðar retr" are added in the margin, and there is of course no authority for this in Ælfric. The destruction of grass and tree roots could be regarded as typically Icelandic, in that such destruction is characteristic of the laying waste of land by volcanic eruption. The addition would seem therefore to indicate an Icelandic, rather than a Norwegian, provenance for at least this phrase, if not for the whole of the homily.

Æ 252-281 The Travels of the Ark *H* 160, 27-161, 5

Paraphrase. Both *Æ* and *H* paraphrase the Vulgate here, though Ælfric's version is closer than that of *H*. Æ's translation of "quinque anos aureos facietis" (*I Kings*, vi, 5) by "wyrcað fif gyldene hringas" is taken up by *H* and rendered "oc gerðu ringa or gulli" (160, 30). (See also Pope, note to Æ 256.)

Æ 282-291 God once more supports the Israelites *H* 161, 5-12

Translation except for one glossing phrase on Samuel, "er þeira var byskup oc hofuðs maðr" (*H* 161, 7). Jónsson (p. cxx) mistakenly attributes the whole of this passage to the author.

Æ 292-299 The Burning Fiery Furnace *H* 161, 12-16

Translation with the addition of the name Nabogudonosor and the omission of Æ 298.

Æ 300-313 Darius and Daniel *H* 161, 17-28

Part translation and part paraphrase. The *H* text is slightly confused here, and it would seem that some few words have inadvertently been omitted between "ser" and "goðs" (*H* 161, 20) corresponding to Æ "binnan þrittigum dagum." On 161, 24 *H* has the numeral "three" (biðia til guðs .iij. daga), and it seems likely that the confusion in *H*'s text arose in the first instance because its author added to Æ from the Vulgate account of this episode in *Daniel* vi, where Daniel is twice mentioned as praying to God three times a day.

The numeral seven is also added in *H* 161, 28, and since the number of lions is not mentioned in the Vulgate at this point it must be taken from Æ 460, where the lions are said to be seven in number (cf. Vulgate, *Daniel* xiv, 31).

Æ 314-322 Darius' Grief *H* 161, 28-34

Paraphrase. Curiously enough Æ 314-317 are not in manuscript R (see below).

Æ 323-349 Daniel released from the Lions' Den *H* 161, 34-162, 10

Translation with slight re-arrangement of the material. This section contains one of the very few instances where the Icelandic author seems to have misunderstood Æ. The Vulgate (*Daniel* vi, 21) reads: "Et Daniel regi respondens, ait: Rex in aeternum vive!" Ælfric translates, "And he andwyrde sona, þu leofa cining, leofa þu on ecnysse." The Icelandic modifies this to "En Daniel suaraðe. lifir þu konungr lifi ec harðla vel." It would seem that the homilist is here confusing Ælfric's use of the weak adjective *leofa* with its homonym, the verbal imperative. If so, the translation could only be from English. It is, of course, possible to construe the first *leofa* in Æ 327 as a verbal imperative, but the weak adjective is syntactically more likely.

Æ 350-358 Daniel and Cyrus *H* 162, 11-18

Paraphrase apart from the first sentence. There appears to be some confusion in the numerals. The forty sheep are common to both, but *Æ* has "wín . . . , six sestras to þam dæge, and twelf sestras melues," while *H* reads "hvern dag tolf sefsteri víns oc sald miols." Numerals can, of course, often be altered in transmission, but if the *H* reading is original, Jónsson's comment on *sald* (p. cxx), which he equates with "amphorae sex" is misleading, since the "amphorae" refer to wine and not wheaten flour (*Daniel* xiv, 2), though it is possible that the Icelandic homilist's "tolf sefsteri víns" for *Æ*lfric's "six" is due to a confusion with the Vulgate "similae artabae duodecim" and *Æ*'s "twelf sestras melues."

Æ 359-369 Daniel and the Worship of Bel *H* 162, 8-24

Translation except that *H* omits the last line and substitutes "hvat man ec biðia til Bels dauðs."

Æ 370-386 Daniel's Altercation with the King *H* 162, 24-31

Paraphrased and summarized.

Æ 387-431 The Justification of Daniel *H* 162, 31-163, 9

Paraphrased and summarized. *Æ*lfric, with his use of dialogue, is here the more vivid of the two and also nearer to the Vulgate text, though he also summarizes.

Æ 432-456 The Destruction of the Dragon *H* 163, 9-22

Mainly a translation. There is obvious adaptation in the passage on the preparation of the food, which would suggest that the translator had the same difficulty with "berode to welerum" as the modern editor (cf. Pope's note to 446). The characteristic saga addition of "buðu honum koste tua" is noteworthy. The equally characteristic addition "oc alla hans ætt" is presumably a translation of the Vulgate "et domum tuam" (*Daniel* xiv, 28).

Æ 452-455 are paraphrased rather than translated.

Æ 457-463 Daniel once more in the Lions' Den *H* 163, 22-27

Translation except that *H* adds that the lions were starved beforehand for six days. This phrase is found only in one manuscript of *Æ*lfric's sermon and may be a non-*Æ*lfrician addition (see below). It is in this passage that *Æ*lfric, in accord with the Vulgate, mentions that there were seven lions in the den. The translator omits this figure as he had already introduced their number in 161, 28. The translator misunderstands *Æ*lfric's "twegen leapas" (Vulgate "duo corpora") and renders it "tua laupa brauðs," presumably equating it with the Norse word *laupr* "a basket," though if he also made use of the Vulgate it is curious that he should have disregarded the original "duo corpora." This point clearly puzzled Jónsson (p. cxx), who was unaware of the Old English original.

Æ 464-483 Daniel is fed by Habakkuk *H* 163, 28-164, 11

Translation. Pope (note to 483) points out that *Æ*lfric's addition to the Vulgate "ofer swiðe langne weg" is reproduced in *H* by "um mioc langan veg" (164, 11).

Æ 484-493 The King frees Daniel and praises God *H* 164, 11-20

Translation.

Æ 494-499 Comments on the False Gods *H* 164, 20-end

Paraphrase. *H* ceases to follow *Æ*lfric after the mention of Christ's coming in the sixth age of the world and adds a short account of the other five.

Parallel texts of Æ 432-475 and H 163, 9- 164, 5

Þa wæs on þære byrig gewunod an draca, and þa Babiloniscan bæron him mete, and hine for god wurðodan, þeah þe he wurm wære. Ða cwæð se cyning sume dæge to Danihele þuss: Ne miht þu nu cweþan þæt þes ne sy cucu god; gebide þe to him, þeah þe þu to Bele noldest.

Þa andwyrde Danihel (ðus eaðelice þam cyninge): Ic gebidde me æfre to þam ælmihtigon Gode, se þe is lyfigende God; and gif þu me leafe sylst, ic ofslea þisne dracan buton swurde and stafe.

Ða cwæð Cyrus se cyning þæt he cunnian moste gif he butan wæpnum mihte þone wurm acwellan. Danihel þa worhte þam dracan þas lác: he nam pic and rysel, and punode togædre, and mid byrstum gemengde, and berode to welerum, and seað hi swiðe, and sealde þam dracan.

Ða tobærst he sóna swa he abát þæs metes, and Danihel cwæð þa to þæs dracan biggengum, Nu ge magon geseon hwæne ge swa wurðodan. Þa wurdon geæbyligde þa Babiloniscan þearle, and cōmon to þam cyninge, and cwædon mid graman, þes ælþeodega Danihel hæfð þinne anwald genumen; he is cyning geworden; he acwealde þone dracan, and urne Bél he towéarp, and his biggengan he ofsloh;

betæce hine nú us, elles we þe ofsleað.

Ða ne mihte se cyning wiðcweðan him eallum, ac betæhte þone witegan þam witle^asum folce, and hi hine wurpon in to þam wilderon, þar wæron syfon leon, and he þar six dagas wunode.

Ælce dæge man sealde ærþan þam

þa var een i borg þeira dreki einn sa er þeir hofðu firir guð.

þa melti konungr við Daniel mant þu þess dylia at þessi se lifande guð er ver blotum nu þo at þu letír eigi Bel vera sua.

þa suaraðe Daniel hogla konungi.

ef þu læyfír mer þa man ec drepa þann dreka er þer kallet a guð sua at ec hafa ecki vapn við.

þa læyfði konungr honum sua at hann drepi þann orm og hafðe ecki vapn við hann.

Þa geck Daniel oc gerði honum mat. hann toc bic oc bustír oc istr oc veldi. alt saman oc gaf honum at eta.

þa bolgnaðe hann allr oc brast í sundr. En Daniel melti við hans embettis menn. nu megut þer sea a huern þer trúðu. Þeir vrðu reddir borgar menn aler oc letust vbota bol hafa fengit af Daniel. oc gengu aller til konungs.

oc buðu honum koste tua at hann seldi þeim i hendr Daniel. elligar skyllði þeir drepa hann sialfan oc alla hans ætt.

en sakar þessa nauðar kostz toko þeir hann oc kastaðu honum i hina somo dyra grof er hann var aðr firir dyrin oorgu. oc voro lion suelt aðr .vi. daga til.

huern dag skildu þau dyr lionen

leorum twa scéap to bigleofan and
twegen leapas oð ðæt; ac him næs
þa nan geseald, þæt hi tosliton
Danihel.

Þa wæs on Iudea lande an geleafful
witega, Abbacuc gehaten, se hæfde
rifteras abedene to his corne, and
bær him heora mete. Him cóm þa
fleogende tó færlice Godes engel,
and hét beran þone mete to
Babilonian hraþe, and syllan
Danihele, þa sæt on þam pytte.

Ða cwæð se Abbacúc to þam engle
þuss: La, léof, ic ne geseah þa burh
þe þu segst ne ic nát þone seað, ne
embe secgan ne gehyrde. Þa gelæhte
se engel Abbacúc be þam feaxe and
bær hine swiftlice to þære foresædan
byrig and to þær[a] leona seaðe
swiðe swiftum flyhte.

hafa. tua laupa brauðs. oc tíu
sauði til fœslu. en tolf dægr var
þeim ecki gefit til þess at þau
skilldu Daniel eta oc honum
grímlega bana.

Sa maðr uar einn i Iherusalem er
Abbacuc het. oc var propheta. En
hann skildi fœra verc monnum
sínun fœslu þeim er skoro akr
hans. þa kom engill guðus til hans
oc bauð honum at hann skildi
fœra Danelie fœslu þa er hann
hafðe þar til Babilon. oc til liona
grafar þeirar er Daniel la i.
Abbacuc suaraðe. huert skal ec þa
fara herra minn quað hann er ec sa
eigi þa borg eða hæyrða oc eigi
sogur til haft. þa greip engillin i
har honum. oc flaug með honum
oc með fœslu verc mannana til
grafar þeirar er Daniel la i.

It will be clear from the above comparison and parallels that the Icelandic homily is more a translation than an adaptation. Paraphrase and re-arrangement are most evident at the beginning, down to *Æ* 140. After that the author is much more dependent on his source until he reaches the Daniel and Cyrus episodes, and even then his interest in *Ælfric's* version revives with the introduction of the dragon. The main additions in *Hauksbók* concern references to the Fall of the Angels (*H* 156, 22ff.), Noah's Flood (157, 19-23), the Rod of Moses and the Passage of the Red Sea (159, 34-160, 4), the Tower of Babel (157, 28-29), the adding of the name Nabogudonosor (161, 13), and the comment on Samuel in 161, 7-8. For none of these need a definite source be posited. They could all be general reminiscences from the author's own knowledge of the scriptures. Indeed it is difficult to point to any passage which demonstrates conclusively the author's use of a separate written source. The paraphrase of *Æ* 300-313 seems at first to suggest the possibility of reference to the Vulgate text of *Daniel*, but the passage is so confused that it is impossible to be certain. Even the addition of "oc alla hans ætt" (*H* 163, 22), which translates the Vulgate "et domum tuam," is not necessarily taken from the Bible, as such a phrase could be a natural Icelandic addition in this context. However, if a secondary source was used, it would seem to have been either a translation of the Vulgate *Daniel* or the Vulgate itself, though the failure to note the Vulgate reading "duo corpora" in the section *Æ* 457-463 militates even against this supposition.

In minor detail there are a few characteristic additions of Icelandic or Norwegian traditional phrases. Apart from those already mentioned one might instance: (a) *H* 161, 4 "þeir hínir heiðnu menn fengu þa ar oc frið"; (b) *H* 161, 29 the legal "er fieri voro saman" (cf. Jónsson, p. cxx); (c) *H* 162, 31 "oc rœynum vit hvat satt er"; (d) *H* 158, 27 the alliterative phrase "i morðe

oc mann drape" (cf. also *H* 157, 21). Jónsson rightly comments on the excellence of the translation, which is both pleasant and idiomatic.

Pope has suggested in his edition that the *Hauksbók* homily is to be associated mainly with the CCCC 178 manuscript of *De Falsis Diis* (his R) on the grounds that both R and *Hauksbók* use the feminine forms *Vena* (R 115, 150 and 177; *H* 158.18, 159.1 and 159.14) for the goddess *Venus*. Of the surviving manuscripts of Ælfric's homily only R has this form. Pope adds, mistakenly however, "There are no other signs of kinship with R, and two persons of little Latin might have arrived at the same error."¹⁰ But there are other details which should be taken into account. Pope's manuscripts R and S, which are related, both omit the negative in *Æ* 72, and the paraphrase in *H* also makes it clear that it was not in the translator's manuscript. So far, then, it would appear that Pope's conjecture, that a manuscript of the R type was used, is correct. Nor is the argument refuted by the omission in the Icelandic homily of any reference to *Æ* 141-149, in which Ælfric questions the Danish assumption that Þórr (Iovis) was the son of Óðinn (Mercurius). These lines are peculiar to R and S, though they are partly to be found in Wulfstan's adaptation. Pope regards them as a later Ælfrician addition. Hence it is possible their omission may mean that the Icelandic author's exemplar was nearer to Ælfric's early versions of *De Falsis Diis*, which do not contain these lines. But in view of what has been said above about the clear connexion with a manuscript of the R and S group, the alternative explanation that they were deliberately omitted in the translation seems more likely.

However, there is some evidence to suggest that the Icelandic author could not have had a true copy of R, but must have had a copy in which there were contaminations from other manuscripts. Firstly, the lines *Æ* 314-317, which are paraphrased in *H*, are not in R but only in C, L, and G. Secondly, in 225 both C and L read "eodon to þam temple," which is translated "komo inn i hof sitt" (*H* 160, 13), whereas R omits "to þam temple." Thirdly, in 463 there is nothing in R corresponding to "oc voro lion suelt aðr .vi. daga til" (*H* 163, 24-25), whereas L alone adds "oftogen ælces fodan syx dagas." From this it may be concluded that the translator had before him a manuscript which showed characteristics of both R and L.

Finally there is one piece of external evidence. Reichborn-Kjennerud has demonstrated that one further chapter from this same gathering in AM 554 makes use of an Ælfric homily.¹¹ It is the short piece beginning "Hinn helgi byskup," and it is ostensibly based on a homily of Augustine. But Reichborn-Kjennerud shows that several passages are translated from Ælfric's *De Auguriis*,¹² which seems in manuscript often to be associated with the *Lives of the Saints*. It is to be found in both R and L.¹³ Probably, therefore, if both items were translated by the same man, they were brought to Iceland in the same manuscript volume of Ælfric's works.

The date of composition for the Icelandic homily on the False Gods is not known. Jónsson suggests c.1200 without giving reasons,¹⁴ but whether it be from the twelfth or the thirteenth century it is interesting to see that English vernacular manuscripts were still being taken to Iceland and still intelligible at so late a date. The fact that this small section of *Hauksbók* gives two instances of translation from Old English makes one suspect that there must be more.

NOTES

- ¹ *Hauksbók*, ed. Eiríkur Jónsson and Finnur Jónsson (Copenhagen, 1892-96). The homily is to be found on pp. 156-64. All references and quotations are from this edition. There is a facsimile edition of *Hauksbók*, with an introduction by Jón Helgason, in *Manuscripta Islandica V* (Copenhagen, 1960). The first two gatherings of AM 554 have also been edited by Jón Porkelsson, *Nokkur Blöð úr Hauksbók* (Reykjavík, 1865).
- ² Ed. C. P. Caspari, *Martin von Bracara's Schrift "De Correctione Rusticorum"* (Kristiania, 1883), and by C. W. Barlow, *Martini episcopi Bracarensis Opera Omnia* (New Haven, 1950).
- ³ Ed. J. C. Pope for the Early English Text Society under the title *Homilies of Ælfric, A Supplementary Collection*, Vol. I (1967), and II (1968). This is the only complete edition of the homily, and all references in this article are made to it. Extracts from various manuscripts were published earlier by C. R. Unger, F. Kluge, Max Förster, and R. Warner. For details see Pope, *op. cit.*, II, 676. Wulfstan's adaptation of the first part of Ælfric's homily is available in D. Bethurum, *Homilies of Wulfstan* (Oxford, 1957).
- ⁴ C. R. Unger prints lines 1-140 of the version of *De Falsis Diis* to be found in Cotton Julius E vii in *Annaler for nordisk Oldkyndighed og Historie* (Copenhagen, 1846), 67-81. This manuscript is Pope's W; his sigla are used throughout this article.
- ⁵ In Herrig's *Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen*, CXXII, 1909, 261-62.
- ⁶ *Hauksbók*, cxix.
- ⁷ *Hauksbók*, facsimile edition, xiii.
- ⁸ Ed. Migne, *Patrologia Latina*, CXCVIII.
- ⁹ Pope, *op. cit.*, II, 669-70.
- ¹⁰ Pope, *op. cit.*, II, 670.
- ¹¹ *Maal og Minne* (Oslo, 1934), 144-48.
- ¹² In W. W. Skeat, *Ælfric's Lives of the Saints*, I (EETS, OS 76, 82, 1881-85), 364-83.
- ¹³ See N. R. Ker, *Catalogue of Manuscripts Containing Anglo-Saxon* (Oxford, 1957), 41A item 8 and 18 item 38.
- ¹⁴ *Hauksbók*, cxx.