

Leeds Studies in English

Article:

Clare A. Lees, 'The Blickling Palm Sunday Homily and its Revised Version', *Leeds Studies in English*, n.s. 19 (1988), 1-30

Permanent URL:

https://ludos.leeds.ac.uk:443/R/-?func=dbin-jump-full&object_id=123691&silos_library=GEN01



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

The Blickling Palm Sunday Homily and its Revised Version

Clare A. Lees

The composite Old English anonymous homily is typically a pastiche of antecedent vernacular and Latin homiletic sources, bound together by a few original remarks from the compiler.¹ Judging from its catalogue descriptions, the version of Blickling Homily VI found in London, BL MS Cotton Faustina A ix appears to be yet another "scissors and paste" homily.² In comparison with other composite homilies recently investigated, however, the Faustina homily draws on only one direct source, Blickling Homily VI.³ The Faustina version thoroughly restructures this source: whilst Blickling Homily VI uses material appropriate to both Palm Sunday and Feria II (Monday) in Holy Week, the Faustina version is intended only for Holy Monday.

Liturgical and structural considerations apart, the two versions of this homily differ radically in their treatment of sources. Blickling Homily VI uses material conventional in the homiletic literature for Holy Week but also employs more unusual topoi. It has no clear message, and few direct sources have been identified. On the other hand, the Holy Monday homily is a careful re-reading and adaptation of its direct source, with little extraneous material. By comparing the techniques of these two writers, the Blickling Palm Sunday homilist and the Faustina reviser of the same homily, we can gain more general insights into the methodologies of the Old English anonymous homilists.

I. Blickling Homily VI: Structure, Sources and Contents

Blickling Homily VI translates and discusses two gospel lections (Matt. xxi 1-14, for Palm Sunday, and John xii 1-12, for Holy Monday) in a homily seemingly designed for Palm Sunday (Morris, 67/3-4, 13-14; and 71/32).⁴ Its structure, however, is chaotic since the relationships between the two lections, their exegetical

BLICKLING HOMILY VI: STRUCTURE

TABLE I

CONTENTS	COMMENTS ON METHODOLOGY
<p>INTRODUCTION (Morris, 65/1 - 67/22)</p> <p>The Triumphal Entry and the Significance of Palm Sunday</p>	<p>Christ's Act of Redemption Typology: raising of Lazarus</p> <p>Christ's Triumphal Procession into Jerusalem Typology: The Harrowing of Hell</p>
<p>THE PERICOPES</p> <p>1. John xii 1-12 for Holy Monday (Morris, 67/22 - 69/33) The gospel stories of Mary and Martha</p> <p>2. Matt. xxi 1-14 for Palm Sunday (Morris, 69/33 - 71/21) The Triumphal Entry of Christ into Jerusalem</p>	<p>Direct translation of biblical text, with extensions from Luke x 39-42, Matt. xxvi 10-13, Mark vii 6 cf. Isa. xxix 13, and John xiii, 29</p> <p>Direct translation, with minor variations</p>

CONTENTS	COMMENTS ON METHODOLOGY
<p>EXEGESIS</p> <p>1. John xii 1-12 for Holy Monday (Morris, 71/22 - 77/10) The gospel stories of Mary and Martha</p> <p>2. Matt. xxi 1-14 for Palm Sunday (Morris, 77/11 - 81/28) The Triumphal Entry</p>	<p>Typology: six ages of the world; six miracles of Christ before the Crucifixion.</p> <p>Commentary and Exhortation: Mary and Martha signify the Church; composition of spikenard; Mary signifies the Church; Lazarus and the weight of sin in the grave; Judas as an example of Christ's patience.</p> <p>Commentary: Bethphage; the two disciples; Jerusalem.</p> <p>Typology: The Siege of Jerusalem.</p> <p>Commentary: Ass and foal; Jerusalem; the crowd, Osanna.</p>
<p>CONCLUSION</p> <p>Morris 81/28 - 83/4</p>	<p>Significance and example of Christ's Act of Redemption; exhortation to faith in the face of Judgement</p>

analysis, and other commonplace material used in the homily are not made clear. Although both the introduction and the conclusion (Morris, 65/1-67/22 and 81/28-83/4) stress the significance and example of Christ's redemption of mankind, these themes are only hinted at in the Holy Week material that forms the body of the text.⁵ For clarification Table 1 (pp.2-3) presents a brief outline of the structure of the homily.

The idiosyncratic structure of Blickling Homily VI probably accounts for the lack of firmly identified direct sources. I know of no other single homily, Latin or English, which explicates lections for both Palm Sunday and Holy Monday. If, as Gatch suggests, the homilist has conflated two Latin homilies for these liturgical days, then those extant (Haymo, Hom. LXIII, *Dominica Palmarum*; Hom. LXIV, *In Die Sancto Palmarum*; Hom. LXV, *Feria Secunda Palmarum*; and Bede, *Dominica Ante Pascha* and *Maioris Hebdomadae*) furnish only useful analogues.⁶ The nature of the problem facing the modern source-analyst is exemplified by the introduction (Morris, 65/1-67/22) which, superficially at least, is explanatory in tone. In celebrating the Triumphal Entry of Christ into Jerusalem, the homilist mentions the commonplace signification of Palm Sunday:

Wel þæt gedafenode þæt Drihten swa dyde on þa gelicnesse;
forþon þe he wæs wuldres cyning. Þysne dæg hie nemdon siges
dæg; se nama tacnaþ þone sige þe Drihten gesigefæsted wiþstod
deofle, þa he mid his deaþe þone ecan deaþ oferswiþde . . .

(Morris, 67/12-15)

That the Triumphal Entry denotes Christ's victory over eternal death derives ultimately from Augustine, but the explanation is widely current in ecclesiastical handbooks such as Isidore's *De Ecclesiasticis Officiis* and in Latin Palm Sunday homilies.⁷ The theme of triumph is also fixed by the noting of other biblical proofs.⁸ Here, commonplace motifs have replaced spiritual explication. The introduction highlights the fact that palm branches are carried as signs of victory (Morris, 67/7-11), but the homilist does not associate this with the liturgical practices of Palm Sunday in his own age, as we might expect.⁹ Instead, the Triumphal Entry is framed by Christ's act of redemption in taking the form of man, in raising Lazarus, and in Harrowing Hell, all conventional topics for an Easter Week homily.¹⁰ However, the thematic contrast between humility and triumph is barely stressed: the homilist fails to make a logical connection between the feast of Palm Sunday, the Triumphal Entry and Christ's actions, and the introduction is without clear focus as

The Blickling Palm Sunday Homily

a result.

Equally unclear is the relationship between the introduction and the pericopes (see Table 1). The homily appears to announce its chosen pericope:

Iohannes, se deora þegn, us cýðde on þæm godspelle, & þus
cwæþ: 'Hælend cwom syx dagum ær Iudea eastrum, to Bethania
þær Lazarus wæs forþfered, & he hine awehte of deaþe.'

(Morris, 67/22-5; *cf.* John xii 1)

but then proceeds to translate as well a second lection from Matthew (Matt. xxi 1-14; *cf.* Morris, 69/33-71/21). Both lections are used to introduce commentary later in the homily (Morris, 71/24-5 and 77/11-12). Only the second lection, directly translated from Matthew, actually narrates the Triumphal Entry into Jerusalem, and accordingly is one of the normal homiletic passages for Palm Sunday.¹¹ By contrast, the first lection from John xii 1-12 tells the story of the anointing of Christ's feet by Mary, and is usually appropriate for Holy Monday.¹² This lection, as presented by the homilist, is modified to include the story of Mary and Martha from Luke x 39-42 (*cf.* Morris, 67/25-36). The homilist also substitutes quotation from Matt. xxvi 10-13 (*cf.* Morris, 69/15-21 and John xii 8) for one of the speeches of Christ, and supplies one further quotation, out of context, from Mark vii 6 (*cf.* Isa. xxix 13) to support the exegetical commonplace that the Jews sought Christ at the house of Lazarus from curiosity, not faith (Morris, 69/24-6).¹³ There is even one slight digression on the nature of Judas, loosely based on John xii 6 and xiii 29 (Morris, 69/9-15).¹⁴

Together the translated lections account for a significant proportion of the homily (see Table 1). The homilist is obviously motivated by the desire to narrate: he follows the fullest biblical account of the Triumphal Entry, from Matthew,¹⁵ and supplies extra narrative details to support and extend the Johannine lection. The sequence of these readings is revealing: by using the Johannine expanded lection and then the Matthew lection, the homilist has reconstructed the order of events up to and including the Triumphal Entry from both gospels, in a form similar to that of the synoptic gospels.¹⁶ This narrative order is flatly contradicted by the liturgical celebration of the lections where, as we have seen, the Johannine lection is used on Feria II of Holy Week and the Matthew reading on Palm Sunday. The Blickling homilist's choice of lection, whilst it has narrative logic, nevertheless obscures the relationship between the introduction (which concentrates on the Triumphal Entry) and the lections (which begin with the Mary stories). In the absence of any

straightforward connections between the lections and the introduction save their broad association with Holy Week, the homilist can now only structure the remainder of the homily by explicating first the Johannine and second the Matthew readings (see Table 1 above).

Old English homiletic exegesis normally comprises explication of selected verses from the chosen pericope in order to evaluate their spiritual significance.¹⁷ In the Blickling Palm Sunday homily, however, typological associations of the biblical material supported by popular motifs are ranked above moral exposition (see Table 1 above). Hence, the number six, drawn from the first verse of the Johannine lection (Morris, 71/24-5; cf. John xii 1) is typologically associated with the six ages of the world and with the six works of Christ before the Crucifixion. The six ages of the world are only briefly alluded to in this homily (Morris, 71/25-9), but it is a motif which draws on a body of traditional material popular in Old English homiletic literature.¹⁸ The specific association of the six ages with the six days prior to the Crucifixion is rare, but not without analogues: Alcuin in his *Commentary on John*, and Haymo's Hom. LXV make the same connection in lengthier discussions of the same verse.¹⁹

The second theme, the six works of Christ before the Crucifixion, has no comparable analogues in either the vernacular or the patristic literature. However, the association of the works of Christ with the last six days is a literal re-ordering of biblical statements, and at least two other Palm Sunday homilies refer to these events.²⁰ As is common in the numerous thematic lists in the anonymous tradition, the items themselves are taken from the relevant gospel verses with, in this case, no use of extra-scriptural material.²¹ Nevertheless, the Blickling homilist has miscounted the number of items in his list for, although he states that Christ performed "synderlic weorc" (Morris, 71/30) on the six days before the Passion (Morris, 71/29-30), he counts the days themselves from the Saturday before Palm Sunday and thus names seven items. Of these seven items, four have scriptural authority for association with the named day: the Triumphal Entry on Palm Sunday (Morris, 71/31-3; cf. John xii 12 *et al.*); the cursing of the fig tree on the following day (Morris, 71/33-6; cf. Mark xi 12-14); the Last Supper on the fifth day (Morris, 73/4-6; cf. Matt. xxvi 17-29 *et al.*); and the Crucifixion on the sixth day (Morris, 73/6-8; cf. Matt. xxvii 1 *et al.*)²² From scriptural statement it can be deduced that the remaining three items all took place on the named days: the raising of Lazarus on the Saturday (Morris, 71/30-1; cf. John xi 39-55); the speech of Christ on the third day (Morris, 71/36-73/1; cf. Matt. xxvi 1-2 *et al.*); and the anointing of Christ by Mary on the fourth day (Morris, 73/2-3; cf. Matt. xxvi 2-7), although the latter two

The Blickling Palm Sunday Homily

items demand some ingenious counting of the days actually mentioned in the gospels.²³ In addition, the raising of Lazarus, the Triumphal Entry, the Last Supper and the Crucifixion are all commemorated on their respective days in the liturgy for Holy Week. In view of the popularity of lists and the listing of biblical events in the anonymous homiletic tradition, together with this homilist's use of commonplace material in *Blickling Homily VI*, it would seem highly probable that the list of the six works was another popular theme, now lost.

Typology and the significance of numbers helps to account for passages of commentary elsewhere in the homily. The account of the Siege of Jerusalem interpolated into the homilist's exposition of the Triumphal Entry from Matthew (Morris, 77/25-79/27; see Table 1 above) is clearly prompted both by the discussion of Jerusalem which frames the account (Morris, 77/22-5 and 79/29-81/2), and by the homilist's statement that the Siege took place forty years after the Crucifixion (Morris, 79/1-3). Both the significance attached to Jerusalem and the numerology are common enough, particularly in the homiletic material associated with Easter;²⁴ and the "stone over stone" quotation from Matthew which prefaces the account (Matt. xxiv 2; cf. Morris, 77/36-79/1) is used also by Ælfric and his source, Gregory, in their discussion of the Siege.²⁵ Like other accounts, the *Blickling* narrative bears only a broad resemblance to the only known source, Eusebius / Rufinus, and appears to be an independent treatment of the story.²⁶ However, the length of the account of the Siege is disproportionate to the amount of attention paid to the entire Matthew lection, and thus interrupts the flow of its exposition (see Table 1 above). As with the homilist's discussion of the number six, we find ourselves sidetracked by material poorly integrated into the main concerns of the homily.

Such typological discussions are illustrative patternings of the scriptural material but are in no sense expository. But this homilist uses exegesis as well as typology and numerology. Whereas in Ælfric's homilies we find careful elucidation of Scripture based on the patristic authorities, in *Blickling Homily VI* we are given a tissue of commonplace exegesis and exhortation drawn together by a number of biblical allusions and quotations. This homilist's technique heeds neither authority nor accuracy. His exegetical discussion of the first lection (see Table 1 above) appears to rest on the distinction between Martha representing the Church (and the Christian community) in this world:

hwæt tacnaþ heo buton þa halgan cyricean, þæt synd geleaffulle
menn þa gearwiaþ clæne wununga on heora heortum Criste
sylfum?
(Morris, 73/10-12)

and Mary signifying Holy Church in the next:

heo tacnaþ þa halgan cyricean on þære toweardan worlde, seo biþ
gefreolsod fram eallum gewinum . . . (Morris 73/31-3)

But this is thrown into confusion by the homilist's prefatory statement that Mary and Martha signify "þis lænelic lif & þis gewitendlice" (Morris, 73/9), and by his later statements that imply an active role for Mary in this world:

Nu we sceolan onherian Marian þære þe smerede Hælendes fet,
& mid hire loccum drygde: þæt is þonne, þæt we sceolan god
weorc wyricean & rihtlice libban . . . (Morris, 75/11-13)

Patristic exegesis casts some light on this muddle: Mary is indeed commonly associated with *Ecclesia* in the commentaries and in Latin Palm Sunday homilies;²⁷ and, whilst the two women are generally held to represent the active and contemplative lives, Augustine at least extends this to include present and future worlds.²⁸ The contradictions in the Blickling homilist's account stem from a conflation of the two gospel stories concerning Mary that most commentators consider separately.²⁹ His discussion of the two episodes looks like a clumsy and inaccurate gloss on the patristic material. This impression is reinforced by the image of the burden of sin oppressing the body in the tomb (Morris, 75/7-11), an adaptation of the popular patristic image of the weight of sin, and by the superficial glosses on the roles of Lazarus and Judas.³⁰

The same attitude towards authority prevails in the explication of the second lection, the Triumphal Entry into Jerusalem (see Table 1 above). Key verses are selected and given their appropriate interpretation, which suggests that the homilist may be following a commentary, although the standard patristic material again only provides analogues and not specific sources. The reader is bewildered to discover that Bethphage also represents Holy Church (Morris, 77/14-17) since this signification has already been used of Mary and appears to be based on a misreading of the Latin literature.³¹ Other popular statements include the discussion of the ass, and the crowd that go before Christ (Morris, 79/29-33 and 81/14-15).³² More particularly, the homilist's explication of the two disciples:

We gehyrdan ær þætte Hælend sende his twegen þegnas: þa
tacniaþ halige lareowas, þæt hie sceolan þurhwunian on rihtum

The Blickling Palm Sunday Homily

geleafan & on fulfremedicum weorcum, and hie sceolan læran
Godes lufan & manna, buton þæm twam ne mæg nan man
becuman to þæm ecean life . . . (Morris, 77/17-21)

is close to statements found in two Latin and one English Palm Sunday homilies, once more indicating the traditional content of the homily.³³

The employment of traditional material without strict derivation from sources accounts not only for the unfocussed nature of the homilist's exegesis, but also for his outright inaccuracies. The ointment used by Mary to annoint Christ is frequently discussed in the Latin tradition, but the homilist's assertion that it renders all it touches incorruptible, "& þæt næfre ne afulaþ þæt mid hire gesmered biþ" (Morris, 73/22-3), is a misunderstanding of the usual comment that the container (*alabastrum*) preserves the ointment.³⁴ Two further unusual statements are made: firstly that the ointment is composed of eighteen different herbs, and secondly that three of these are "ele, & nardus, & spica" (Morris, 73/21). The commentaries frequently refer to the composition of the ointment but without mention of a specific number, and only the apparent ultimate source, Pliny's *Naturalis Historia*, states that "nardus" can occur in twelve different varieties.³⁵ It is probable that the Blickling account is a garbled version of this tradition. "Ele" is best translated "oil" (the base for the ointment?), and "spica" and "nardus" are different parts of the same plant, spikenard, as *Smaragdus* clearly recognizes.³⁶ Our writer has read and mistranslated instead John xii 3 *et al.*, "unguenti nardi pistici pretiosi", giving rise to his three herbs. Unsure just what spikenard is, the homilist has failed to recognize his own uncertainty, producing yet another inaccurate gloss. There are further inaccuracies in the Blickling homilist's use of Scripture, as the following quotations indicate:

*Cwæþ se godspellere, Martha & Maria getacniað þis lænelice
lif & þis gewitendlice . . . (Morris, 73/8-9, my italics)*

and:

. . . þonne bringe we Drihtne swetne stenc on urum dædum &
larum. *Swa Paulus se apostol cwæþ*, "Drihtnes fet we magon
smerian, gif we willaþ oþrum geleaffullum teala don, & helpan
þæs earman se þe bet mæge, & beon symle efenþrowgende oþres

earfoþum, swylce eac on oþres gode beon swiþe gefeonde".

(Morris, 75/15-20, my italics)

Neither quotation has been identified, and both contain phrases more suggestive of interpretation than of Scripture. That these apparent quotations are attributed to "se godspellere" and "Paulus se apostol" indicates a hasty and inaccurate reading of a source, although it is possible that the reference to Paul is to be associated with the "swetne stenc" of the preceding line, which is an allusion to II Cor. ii 15-16 used earlier in the homily (Morris, 73/29-30). The normal pattern of quotation, however, is attribution to speaker and then quotation; there is no reason to suppose that the homilist has changed his practice simply for this passage.³⁷

The use of seven rather than six works of Christ before the Crucifixion, the misunderstanding of *spikenard*, and the lax attention paid to both quotation and interpretation of Scripture, all indicate that the homilist is not concerned with the careful articulation of his biblical lections. Rather Scripture is used to provide the authority for Christian precepts, and the homily is cast in the exhortatory tone typical of the *Blickling* collection.³⁸ However, although passages such as the narration of the lections, the Siege of Jerusalem, and the reference to the Harrowing of Hell are vivid enough to attract a congregation, their full moral implications are not examined. Even when the homilist stresses the value of faith and its practice, the examples he cites suggest only general models of behaviour:

Gemunon we symle þæt we þa god don þe us Godes bec læraþ,
þæt is þonne, fæsten and halige wæccan, & ælmessylena æfter
urum gemete . . . (Morris, 73/26-8)

Such moral imperatives are linked by implication to both the introduction and the conclusion, but are rarely emphasised. The homilist appears to have three main aims: to provide basic scriptural elucidation of the chosen lection; to use the lections as examples of Christian behaviour; and to provide memorable details to retain his congregation's attention. His lack of confidence in handling material specific to any of these, and his inability to integrate all three into one text, accounts for the diffuse structure of the homily.

The homilist wavers between a desire to narrate, to "tell the story" of his lections, and a desire to explicate.³⁹ As a result *Blickling Homily VI* has neither clear narrative nor clear exegesis. Whilst some sections of the homily have internal coherence, the text as a whole does not. Since there is no consistently applied

The Blickling Palm Sunday Homily

exegesis, it is not surprising that few direct sources have been identified. Rather the homilist relies on snatches of interpretation that are common currency in the Holy Week traditions of the early medieval period. It is possible that the material systematically fixed in a framework of specific pericopes in Hom. LXIII, *Dominica Palmarum*, and Hom. LXV, *Feria Secunda Palmarum* (from the homiliary of Haymo of Auxerre) was available in some form to the Anglo-Saxon homilist.⁴⁰ However, in the absence of other evidence, Blickling Homily VI must be described as free composition generated from commonplace themes and exegesis.⁴¹

The Blickling Palm Sunday homily is densely packed with material of an evident attraction for an unlearned congregation. As is common in the Blickling collection, it has a fondness for apocryphal material told in a highly descriptive manner. It also has an interest in the pastoral duties of the homilist shared by other homilies in the collection.⁴² This evidence, together with indications of a poor command of Latin found in many of these homilies, suggest a period of composition for the collection sometime before the Benedictine Reform.⁴³ However, the adaptation of such homilies for use in collections dating from the eleventh and twelfth centuries indicates that the demand for this kind of material did not peter out with the onset of the Reform but, indeed, continued throughout the Anglo-Saxon period.⁴⁴

II. The Revised Homily for Holy Monday

The revised text of Blickling Homily VI is extant in London, BL MS Cotton Faustina A ix (hereafter J), a collection of homilies for Sundays and feast days other than saints' days beginning imperfectly and now running from the second Sunday after Epiphany to Pentecost. This late copy of the Ælfrician *temporale* contains two blocks of anonymous items: Ker 153 items 4, 5, and 6 for the fifth, sixth and seventh Sundays after Epiphany or *Quando uolueris*; and items 23 and 24 for the Monday and Thursday in Holy Week. Indeed the manuscript contains a full complement of homilies for Holy Week:⁴⁵

Palm Sunday	item 21	Dominica in die palmarum (<i>In Dominica Palmarum</i> , Thorpe I, pp.206-19)
	item 22	Feria II de passione domini (<i>De Passione Domini</i> , Godden,

		pp.137-49)
Monday	item 23	Feria III (altered to II) euangelium (the Faustina homily, see below, pp.16-23)
Thursday	item 24	Feria V in cena domini (<i>In Cena Domini</i> , Assmann XIII, pp.151-63)
Easter Day	item 25	Die Dominica pasche resurrectionē. domini de euangelio (<i>Dominica Scti Pasce</i> , Thorpe I, pp.220-8)
	item 26	Sermo de Sacrificio in die pasche (<i>Sermo de Sacrificio in die Paschae</i> , Godden, pp.150-60)
	item 27	Alius sermo de die pasche (<i>Alius Sermo de Die Pasce</i> , Godden, pp.161-8).

Items 23 and 24 were evidently inserted into the manuscript to supplement the homilies by Ælfric for Holy Week, and the presence of Assmann XIII (item 24) suggests a remote connection with another group of anonymous Holy Week homilies inserted into some copies of the Ælfrician *temporale*.⁴⁶ In addition, three of the anonymous items in this manuscript, including the Holy Monday homily, include material from the Blickling collection.⁴⁷

Since all the subject-matter in the Faustina homily derives from Blickling Homily VI, there can be little doubt that the reviser saw a version of that homily. Lexical, stylistic and linguistic variations between the two versions, however, make it difficult to assess the precise relationship between the two homilies (as the collation notes, pp.16-23). Whether or not the reviser saw the version of Blickling Homily VI now preserved in the Scheide manuscript, or a later version, the nature of the revisions show that he approached his task with considerable independence. The Faustina homily is a "scissors and paste" homily of a high calibre and the adaptation of material from the Blickling text reveals an intelligent reviser anxious to make the best use of a confused vernacular source. His first step is to produce a homily written for Feria II (Holy Monday), thus minimalizing the problems of organization faced by the original writer. This is clearly shown by the title of the new homily, *Feria II in Evangelium*, and by its incipit, "Ante sex dies pasce uenit Iesus Beðaniam. *Et reliqua*" (1.2).⁴⁸ By retaining the introduction to the original homily,

The Blickling Palm Sunday Homily

simplifying the expanded narrative of the first lection, and omitting the second lection altogether (see collation, pp.18-20, ll.32-65), the reviser makes good sense of its confused lections and produces a new homily which concentrates primarily on the stories of Mary and Martha. The Faustina text is thus entirely appropriate for Holy Monday, using as its reading the conventional lection. Since there is no mention of the Triumphal Entry save in the introduction, the revised homily now fits well with other Holy Week homilies in the manuscript.

Possibly because the reviser actually re-writes very little, the interpolated episode of Mary and Martha from Luke is included, but the lection now concentrates on the anointing of Christ by Mary from John (see collation, pp.18-20, ll.32-64). By omitting the Blickling homilist's explication of most of the first lection, together with the complete omission of his discussion of the second lection, the reviser has dramatically remodelled the focus of the homily. In the Faustina text, the act of anointing becomes an example of good works with the death of Lazarus forming its counterpart (ll.71-87). Here, the oppressive burden of death is linked to the anger of God using a single line from the account of the Siege of Jerusalem (otherwise omitted from the Faustina homily, see collation, pp.21-2, ll.87-101):

Wæs þæt wite swa strang swa Godes gebyld ær mare wæs.

(ll.100-1; cf. Morris, 79/27)

The Faustina reviser of Blickling Homily VI uses no material extraneous to the original homily. Despite this apparent reluctance either to compile or to substantially re-write, the chosen sections from the original homily cohere surprisingly well in the Faustina text, with each section flowing naturally into the next. The effect produced by these revisions is startlingly different from that of Blickling Homily VI. The Faustina homily has a well-defined structure, with introduction, translation and discussion of lection, and moral conclusion. It has a clear message for its congregation, culminating both with a reminder of the wrath of God and suggesting ways of earning eternal bliss (ll.102-8).

The Faustina homily is very short by conventional homiletic standards – it amounts to only some one hundred or so lines – and this may be due to the fact that it is designed to be delivered on a Monday, a day for which homilies are not usually written.⁴⁹ Nevertheless, the rigorous cutting of Blickling Homily VI has produced in the Faustina text a more unified homily, entirely consonant with its chosen day. It is perhaps salutary to note that it is the earlier Blickling text which uses the composite pastiche techniques often associated with later composite homilies. The

Clare A. Lees

later Faustina revised homily, whilst being an important witness to the continued use of pre-Reform homilies in the later Anglo-Saxon period, is an equally important *reminder* that some anonymous homilists made intelligent use of their materials.⁵⁰

III. *The Faustina Homily for Holy Monday*

Editorial Conventions

The Faustina homily for Holy Monday is edited conservatively from London, BL MS Cotton Faustina A ix, ff.116-19 (hereafter J). The spelling is that of the manuscript, and the text is presented with only minimal alteration. All standard abbreviations are expanded and italicised without comment, except for 7 which is silently expanded to *and* (this includes the expansion of & in Morris's edition, sections of which are collated). Words or letters enclosed in square brackets, [], indicate emendations to the main text, where the reading is illegible or an error. Such emendations are based on the readings of the companion text, Blickling Homily VI (hereafter B). Editorial emendations are rare, since it is preferable to show the language of the manuscript however inconsistent it may be. Alterations and additions, sometimes by hands other than the main hand, are incorporated into the notes. There has been no attempt to identify these hands as this would require a full study of the manuscript.

Lineation and punctuation are editorial; however, sentence division accords closely with that of the manuscript. Proper nouns, together with nouns referring to the Deity and the Trinity, are capitalized, and capitalization of the first line of the homily is retained as in the manuscript. Accent marks are reproduced, although some are faint and many may have vanished altogether. Word division and paragraphing are my own. Biblical quotations are identified in the text by round brackets. Since the homily has not been printed before, a full collation with Blickling Homily VI is supplied. The collation uses Morris's edition, checked against the facsimile of B.

The following signs are also used:

- ' ' indicate additions and corrections to the main text
- < > indicate an erasure or deletion
- ... indicate the approximate number of letters lost
- > indicates altered to
-] follows a lemma.

f.116^v

FERIA II EVANGELIVM

ANTE sex dies pasce uenit Ihesus Beðániam. ET RELIQUA.

Ge magon gehýran secgan be ðære árwyrðnyssse þysse halgan
 tíde hú se ælmihtiga God and se mildheorta Drihten Hælend Crist
 se Ánlysend þyses menniscan lífes hine sylfne toþon geeadmedde 5
 þæt hé of þære hýhðo Fæderlices Þrynnesse to eorðan astáh, toþon
 þæt he wolde þrówian for ealra manna hælo, and ús alýsan fram
 deofles þéowdome, and ús ætywan ægðer ge his mihte ge his
 willan; and hé unforhtan móde genealæhte þære stówe þe hé
 onþrówian wolde, and hit nealæhte úre alysednesse and deofles 10
 genyðerunge.

On þysum dæge úre Drihten Hælend Crist wæs geweórðod and
 gehéred fram Iudea folce forþon þe hy ongeáton þæt he wæs

TITLE: *Feria II Evangelivm*

1 II] II(I). 3 halgan] *hal(.)gan*. 5 geeadmedde] second *d* over *e*.

Collation with B

TITLE: *Dominica VI in Quadragesima*.

2 B omits. 3-4 Ge magon . . . mildheorta] *her sægþ men þa leofstan be þisse
 halgan tide arwyrþnesse hu se mildheorta.* 4-5 Drihten Hælend Crist se
 Anlysend] *drihten and se alysend.* 5 þyses] *þysses.* lifes] *cynnes.* toþon
 geeadmedde] *geeaþmedde.* 6 he of þære hýhðo] *of hehþe þæs.* Fæderlices
 Þrynnesse] *fæderlican þrymmes.* astah] *astag.* 7 hælo] *hæle.* alysan fram]
grefreolsian from. 8-9 ætywan ægðer ge his mihte ge his willan] *æteowan his
 mihte and his willan.* 9 he unforhtan] *hu unforhte.* genealæhte] *he
 genealæhte.* 10 and hit nealæhte] B omits. alysednesse] *<....> <....>
 on<...>nesse,* Morris reads *for ure onlesnesse* (Morris, 67/2). 12 þysum]
þyssum. Drihten Hælend Crist] *drihten hælend.* 12-13 geweórðod and
 gehered fram] *weorðod and hered from.* 13 hy] *hie.*

The Blickling Palm Sunday Homily

f.117^r Drihten þurh þæt wúndorweorc þe he Lazarum of deaðe awrehte, þy feorðan dæge þæs þe Lazarus on byrgenne wæs. Ða bæron hy him 15
togeánes blo- / -wende palmtwiga forþon þe hit is Iudeisc þeáw
þonne heora cyningas hæfdon sige gefohton on heora feóndum,
þonne hy wæron háam fárende þonne éodon hy him togeanes mid
blówendum palmtwígon his sige to geweorðigenne. Wel þæt
gedáfenade þæt hé Drihten swa dyde on þa gelícnesse fórbán þe hé 20
wæs wuldres Cyning and eallum halgum he selleð écne gefeán in
worulda woruld.

Þyses dæges nama gerecednes is siges dáeg; se getácnað þone
sige þe Drihten sigefæst þam deófle ætstóð, þa hé mid his deaðe
þone écan deað oferswiðde, swa he sylf þurh þone witegan cwæð, 25
"Eala deað", he cwæð, "ic beo þin deað and beo þin bite on
helle" (cf. *Hos. xiii 14*). Micelne bite Drihten dyde on helle
þa he þyder astah, and helle bereafode, and þa halgan sawla

Collation with B

14 Drihten] *hælend crist*. wúndorweorc] *wundor-geweorc*. of deaðe awrehte]
awehte of deaðe. 15 Lazarus] *he*. hy] *hie*. 16 palmtwiga] *palmtwigu*. is
Iudeisc] *wæs iudisc*. 17 cyningas] *ciningas*. gefohton] *geworht*. 18 þonne
hy] *and hie*. ham farende] *eft ham hweorfende*. eodon hy] *eodan hie*. 19
palmtwígon] *palmtwigum*. his sige] *heora siges*. geweorðigenne]
wyorþmyndum. 20 gedafenade] *gedafenode*. he Drihten] *drihten*. forþan]
forþon. 21-22 and eallum. . .woruld] B omits. 23 þyses dæges . . .getacnað]
þysne dæg hie nemdon siges dæg se nama tacnaþ. 24 sigefæst þam deofle
ætstod] *gesigefæsted wiþstod deofle*. 25 witegan cwæð] *witgan sægde*. 26
Eala deað, he cwæð] *he cwæð eala deaþ*. and] *and ic*. 27 Miclene] *mycelne*.
28 astah] *astag*. sawla] *saula*.

þánon alædde, and generede of deofles anwealde and þa ðe to
þeowdome þider on frúman middaneardes gesómnode wæron. He hy þa 30
gelædde of helle grúnde on þa hean Þrymmas heofona ríces.

Þone cyððe Iohannes Drihtenes se déora þegen on þam
godspelle and þus cwæð, "Se Hælend cóm syx dagum ærðan Iudeiscan
Eastran to Bethánia, þær wæs Lázarus forðféred þone se Hælend of
deaðe awrehte" (*John xii 1*). Þa gegearwode his swustor Martha 35
þam Hælende æfengereord þa gesæt hyre swustor, þære nama wæs

f.117^v María, be þæs Hælendes fótum toþon / þæt heo wolde gehyran his
word and his láre (*John xii 2*; cf. *Luke x 38-9*). Martha wæs
geornful þæt heo þam Hælende to gecwéman geþénode, gestód hyre
æftoran þam Hælende and him to cwæð, "Nelt þu na gyman þæt mín 40
swustar me lét ána þénian? Cweð to hyre þæt héo me fylste"
(*Luke x 40*). Þa andswarode hyre se Hælend and cwæð, "Marða,
Marða, beo þu behydig and gemyndig Marían þinga, þæt þu scealt

33 dagum] *u over a.*

Collation with B

29 þanon] *þanon.* and] *and hie.* anwealde and] *anwalde.* ðe] *he.* 30
þider] *þyder.* middaneardes] *middangeardes.* gesómnode] *gesámnode.* 30-
31 hy þa gelædde] *hie eft alædde.* 32 Þone cyððe . . . þam] *iohannes se de'o'ra*
þegn us cyððe on þæm. 33 Se Hælend com] *hælend cwom.* ærðan] *ær.* 33-
34 Iudeiscan Eastran] *iudea eastrum.* 34 wæs Lazarus] *lazarus wæs.* 34-5
þone se Hælend of deaðe awrehte] *and he hine awehte of deaþe.* 35-7 Þa
gegearwode . . . heo wolde] *martha his sweostor þa gearwode þam hælende*
æfengereordu and hire sweostor gesæt big hælendes fotum þære nama wæs maria
forþon þe heo wolde. 39 þam] *þon.* 39-40 gecweman . . . Hælende]
gecwemnesse þegnode heo gestod beforan him. 40 Nelt þu na gyman] *hwy nelt*
þu geman. 41 swustar] *sweostor.* lét ana þénian Cweð] *læt ane þegnian*
cwæð. hyre] *hire.* fylste] *fultumie.* 42 Þa andswarode hyre se Hælend]
hælend hire þa andswarode. 42-3 Marða Marða beo] *martha, martha wes.* 43-4
þæt þu scealt æghwanan] *þæt is þæt þu scealt on æghwylce tid.*

The Blickling Palm Sunday Homily

æghwanan Godes willan gewýrcan þæt án þe is gyt behéflíc. María
hyre gecéas þone betstan dæl se ne bið næfre fram hyre aháfen" 45
(*Luke x 41-2*).

Lazarus þær wæs ána síttende mid þam Hælende and mid his
þegenum. María seo ymbfeng púnd deórwurðra smýrelsa and smýrede
þæs Hælendes fét mid and eft drígde mid hyre lóccum. And þa wæs
eal þæt hús gefylled mid þam swétan sténce þære deórwurðran 50
smýrelse. Þa wæs þæs Hælendes þegna sum se wæs gehaten Iudas
Scáriothisca, he wæs gehaten swa forþon þe he cóm of þam túne þe
Scárioth hátte, se wæs swyðe gebolgen and cwæð, "Tohwon sceolde
þeos smýrenes þús to forlore béon gedón? Mihte man gefýllan þrim
hund myneta and þæt béon gedæled þe[a]rfendum mannum" (*John* 55
xii 5). Ne cwæð he þis na forþon þe him wære ánig gemynd
þearfendra manna, ac he wæs sceaða and gitsere, and þa apostolas
hine léton forþon heora seodos béran þæt hy woldon mid þý his

54 gefyllan] 'to'. 55 gedæled] *æl* over erasure. þearfendum] *þe'a'rfendum*.

Collation with B

44 gewyrčan] *wercan*. gyt behéflíc] *selost þæt þu Gode licie*. 45 hyre]
hire. hyre ahafen] *hire afyrred*. 47 mid þam] *mid*. 48 þegenum] *þegnum*.
ymbfeng pund] *genam an pund*. deórwurðra smýrelsa] *deorwyrþre smerenese*.
smýrede] *smerede*. 49 fet mid . . . loccum] *fet and eft mid hire loccum drygde*.
And] B omits. 50 eal] *eall*. þam] *þon*. 50-1 deórwurðran smýrelse]
deorwyrðan smerenese. 51-3 Þa wæs þæs . . . and cwæð] *hælendes þegna*
sum þa wæs swyþe gebolgen se wæs haten iudas se scariothisca forþon he com of
þæm tune þe scariot hatte he cwæð. 54 to forlore beon] *beon to lore*. Mihte
man gefyllan] *eape heo mehte beon geseald to*. 55 hund myneta] *hunde penega*.
beon] B omits. þearfendum] *þearfedum*. 56 þis] *þæt*. 57 ac] *ah*. sceaða
and gitsere and] *gitsere and se wyrsta sceaþa forþon*. 58 leton forþon] *letan*.
seodos] *seodas*. hy] *hie*. woldon] *woldan*. þý] *þon*.

f.118^r gýtsunga cunnian, ac he wæs / gitsiende and þy he gesealde wið
 feo þone Hlaford heofonas and eorðan. Þa andswarode him se 60
 Hælend and þus cwæð, "Tohwón synd ge þyses weorces swa hefige?
 Gód weorc heo wæs wýrcende on mé. Symle ge habbað þearfan gif ge
 willað tela don, ac ne hæbbe gé me symle; ac lætað þis wésan to
 cyðnesse minre gebýrgednyse" (*Matt. xxvi 10-12; cf. John xii*
7-8). 65

Þeos smýrenes wæs geworht of eahtatyne wýrtum, þara þreo þa
 bétstan án wæs ele, and oðer wæs nardus, and þridde wæs spíce
 seo is brúnes hiwes and godes stences and þæt næfre ne áfulað
 þæt héo mid gesmýred bið. Gif we willað úre sawle smýrewian mid
 þy ele mildheortnyss[e], þonne mágon wé Drihtne bringan 70
 unforwýrdne wæstm] góðra weorca. Gemunan we eac þæt wé þa góðan
 weorc þe us Godes béc lærað, þæt is þonne fæsten, and hálige
 wáccan, and ælmessan syllan æfter urum geméte, and mid mánegum

70 mildheortnyss[e] *mildheortnyss*(.) final *e* lost in trimming, *cf. mildheortnesse*
 B. 71 wæstm] *wæst*(.) final *m* lost in trimming, *cf. wæstm* B.

Collation with B

59 gytsunga] *gitsunga*. ac he wæs gitsiende and þy] *he wæs eac se wyresta*
gitsere þe. 60 þone Hlaford heofonas and eorðan] *heof'o'nes hlaford and ealles*
middangeardes. 60-1 Þa andswarode him se Hælend] *hælend him þa*
andswarede. 61 þus] B omits. synd] *syndon*. ge] *we*. 63 tela don ac ne
 hæbbe ge] *teala don ah ge nabbað*. þis] *þis' þus*. 64 gebyrgednyse]
bebyrgednesse. J omits Morris, 69/81-73/20. 66 smyrenes] *smerenes*.
 eahtatyne wýrtum þara] *ehtatene cynna wýrtum þær wæron*. 67 an wæs ele . . .
 spíce] *ele and nardus and spica*. 68 hiwes] *heowes*. 69 heo mid gesmyred]
mid hire gesmered þis wæs us gedon to lifes bysene and. we] *we nu*. sawle]
saula. smyrewian] *smerian*. 70 þy ele mildheortnyss[e] *mildheortnesse*
ele. 70-1 Drihtne bringan unforwýrdne wæstm] *bringan drihtne*
unforwealwodne wæstm. 71 Gemunan] *gemunon*. eac] *symle*. 71-2
 godan weorc] *god don*. 73 ælmessan syllan] *ælmessylena*.

The Blickling Palm Sunday Homily

oþrum gastlicum mægnum þæt we magon geearnian þæt wé úrum
Drihtne bringon gódra weorca swet[ne] sténc. Swa cydde 75
I[o]hannes se godspellere þæt he gehyrde engla þreatas Gode lóf
singan, and þus cwæðan, "þu ear[t] wyrðe Drihten God þæt þú onfó
wuldor, and áre, and mægen, and bletsunga, and dæda þáncunga
ealra þínra gesceafta þe þu gescéope æfter þinum willan þa þe
on héofonum syndon and eorðan" (*Apoc. iv 11*). 80

f.118^v Lazarus þone þe Crist awrehte þy feorðan dæge þæs þe hé on
býrgenne wæs ge- / -tácnað þysne middaneard, se wæs mid þam
gewinne þære hefegestan gewemmednesse ofsét. And eal swa seo
héfige byrðen sitteð on þam deadan lichaman on þære býrgenne and
þæs deaðes and hine festnað and seo eorðe þricgeð. Swa þonne sæt 85
unaréfnedlicu byrðen synna on eallum þisum menniscum cynne oþ
þone tócyne úres Drihtnes Hælendes Cristes.

þa cwæð Drihten to his apostolum, "Soð is þæt ic eow secge,

75 swetne] *swet*<..> final *ne* lost in trimming, *cf. swetne B.* 76 Iohannes]
I'o'ns. 77 eart] *ear*<.> final *t* lost in trimming, *cf. eart B.* 82 þysne] *y < s.*

Collation with B

74 mægnum þæt] *mægenum.* 75 bringon] *bringaþ.* stenc] J omits Morris,
73/30-36. Swa cydde] *þæt cyþde.* 76 gehyrde] *geherde.* 77 cwæðan]
cweþan. þu eart wyrðe] *wyrþe þu eart.* 79-80 æfter þinum . . . eorðan] *on*
heofenum and on eorþan æfter þinum willan. 81 þone] B omits. awrehte]
awehte. 82 byrgenne wæs] *byrgenne wæs ful wunigende.* getacnað] *he*
getacnaþ. middaneard] *middangeard.* þam] *þon.* 83 gewinne]
gewunon. þære . . . ofset] *þære heofogoston gewemmednesse synna and mana*
full. And eal] *efne.* 84 sitteð] *sitþ.* þam] *þæm.* lichaman]
lichoman. on] B omits. 85 hine festnað] *hie se stan.* þricgeð] *þrycce.*
þonne sæt] *sæt þonne.* 86 unarefnedlicu] *seo unaræfnedlice.* þisum
menniscum] *þysum menniscan.* 86-7 oþ þone tocyne] B omits. 87 Cristes] J
omits Morris, 75/11-77/32. 88 þa cwæð . . . apostolum] *drihten him þa*
andswerede and cwæþ hwæt ge nu geseoþ ealle þa fægernessa þissa
getimbra. secge] *seccge.*

þæt þæt geweorðeð þæt for þyses folces synnum and mándædum þa
 getimbru beoð to wórpenne, and hér ne bið forlæten stan ofer 90
 oðerne þæt ælc ne sy fram oþrum adón" (*Matt. xxiv 2*). Swa hit
 syððan gelámp embe feowertig wintra æfter þon þe Crist for
 manna hælo lichamlicne deað geþrowode. Abád hé á þurh his þa
 micclan geþyld feowertig wintra hwæðer hy to bóte gecyrran
 woldon, oððe ænige hreowe don and bóte þæs micclan yfeles and 95
 mánes þe hy wið hine úrne Drihten gedydon, and eac wið monige
 his haligra. Ða geseah hé þæt hy nane bóte ne hreowe don noldon
 ac hy on héora yfele þurhwunedon, þa sende hé Drihten máran
 wráce ofer þa þeode þonne on ænigre oþere gelímpe bútan Sodom
 warum ánum. Wæs þæt wíte swa stráng swa Godes geþyld ær máre 100
 wæs.

f.119^r We þonne synd þa þe æfter fyligdon; and we witon eal þis
 þus ge- / -worden we sculon þonne on hine gelyfan, and hine
 lúfian, and gelyfan eac þæt he is toward to démanne and þas

93 þurh his] *þurh(.) his*. 97 haligra] first *a* over erasure.

Collation with B

89 geweorðeð] *geo weorþeð*. þæt³] B omits. 89-90 þa getimbru] *þæt ealle þæs getimbro*. 90 worpenne] *worpenne*. 90-91 ofer oðerne] *ofor stan*. 91 Swa] *swa swa*. 92 syððan] *seoþþan*. embe feowertig] *xl*. þe Crist] *ðe hie crist on rode ahengon and*. 93 lichamlicne] *lichoman*. geþrowode] *(h)e þrowode* (Morris reads *he?*). Abad he a] *a he onbad*. his] B omits. 94 micclan] *mycclan*. geþyld] *geþyld þæt*. 94-5 hwæðer hy to bote gecyrran woldon] *hweþer hie gecyr'r'an woldan*. 95 don and bote] *and dædbote don*. micclan] *mycclan*. 96 hy wið hine] *hie wið heora*. urne] B omits. monige] *manige*. 97 þa geseah he] *þa he þa geseah*. hy nane] *hie nænige*. noldon] *noldan*. 98 ac hy on heora yfele] *ah hie forþon heora yfelum*. þa sende he Drihten] *drihten þa sende on hie*. 99 wráce] *wræce*. ofer þa þeode] B omits. 99-100 þonne . . . warum] *þonne æfre ær ænigu oþrum gelumpe buton sodom warum anum*. 100 anum] J omits Morris, 79/10-26. geþyld] *geþeld*. mare] *mycel*. 101 wæs] J omits Morris, 79/27-81/33. 102 synd] *synt*. þa þe] *þe þær*. fyligdon] *fylgeaþ*. eal] *eall*. 103 we sculon] *forðon we sceolan*. þonne] B omits. 104 and gelyfan eac] *and we eac witon*. he] *h'e'*. demanne] *demenne*.

The Blickling Palm Sunday Homily

worold to geendienne. Hwæt we habbað þonne mycele nyðþearfe þæt 105
he us gearwe finde. Wite wé fulgeare þæt wé sculon on þysse
worulde geearnian þæt wé móton on þære ænlican Drihtnes blisse
gefon mid úrum Drihtne, þær he leofað and rixað, á butan énde on
ecnesse. AMEN.

105 geendienne] *geendi(.)enne*.

Collation with B

105 worold] *world*. geendienne] *geendenne*. Hwæt] *nu*. þonne] B omits.
mycele nyðþearfe] *myccle nedþearfe*. 105-8 þæt he . . . urum] *þæt he us gearwe
finde we witon fulgeare þæt we sceolan on þisse sceortan tide geearnian ece ræste
þonne motan we in þære enge'llican blisse gefeon*. 108 butan] *buton*. 109
Amen] *a(.)en*.

NOTES

¹ For examples see M.R. Godden, "Old English composite homilies from Winchester", *Anglo-Saxon England* 4 (1975) pp.57-65; and D.G. Scragg, "Napier's 'Wulfstan' homily XXX: its sources, its relationship to the Vercelli Book and its style", *Anglo-Saxon England* 6 (1977) pp.197-211.

² N.R. Ker, *Catalogue of Manuscripts containing Anglo-Saxon* (Oxford, 1957) 153, item 23; and D.G. Scragg, "The corpus of vernacular homilies and prose Saints' lives before Ælfric", *Anglo-Saxon England* 8 (1979) pp.223-77 (pp.245-6). I follow Scragg's siglum J for the Faustina manuscript.

³ *The Blickling Homilies*, ed. R. Morris, EETS OS 58, 63, 73 (London, 1874-80; repr. as one vol. 1967) pp.64-83. All references to the Blickling Homilies are to this edition, by page and line number.

⁴ The most recent and most informative discussion of the Blickling (Scheide) manuscript is that by D.G. Scragg, "The homilies of the Blickling manuscript", in *Learning and Literature in Anglo-Saxon England. Studies Presented to Peter Clemoes*, eds. Michael Lapidge and Helmut Gneuss (Cambridge, 1985) pp.299-316. Blickling Homily VI is one of two homilies in the collection for Easter (the other is Blickling Homily VII), but Scragg (p.303) points out that there is no reason to assume that both were inserted into the collection at the same time. Indeed, since Blickling Homily VI is rubricated *Dominica Sexta in Quadragesima* (an alternative to the more usual designation for Palm Sunday of *In Dominica Palmarum* and its variants), the homily perhaps ought to be more closely associated with the Blickling Lenten homilies (see Scragg, pp.301-3).

⁵ Discussion of redemption and exhortation to faith appear to form a subtext to the homily; for examples see Morris, 73/26-30, 75/11-16, 75/35-77/7, 79/12-14, and 81/15-17.

⁶ M. McC. Gatch, "Eschatology in the Anonymous Old English Homilies", *Traditio* 21 (1965) pp.117-65 (p.120). For the homilies in the Haymo collection see *Patrologia Latina*, ed. J-P. Migne (Paris, 1800-75), hereafter PL; PL 118 cols. 353-8, 358-81, 381-92. The collection itself is discussed by H. Barré, *Les homélieires Carolingiens de l'école d'Auxerre*, Studi e Testi 225 (Rome, 1962) pp.49-70. For the homilies by Bede see *Beda Opera Pars III/IV*, ed. D. Hurst, Corpus Christianorum Series Latina (hereafter CCSL) 122 (Turnhout, 1955) pp.200-6 and 207-13.

⁷ *Aurelii Augustini Opera Pars VIII. In Iohannis Evangelium Tractatus CXXIV*, ed.

The Blickling Palm Sunday Homily

Augustino Mayer, CCSL 32 (Turnhout, 1954) p.440, §2, ll.7-9. See also Isidore, *De Ecclesiasticis Officiis*, Lib. I, cap. xxviii, PL 83, col. 763, and Haymo, *Hom. LXV*, PL 118, col. 384. For a further discussion of this commonplace see Clare A. Lees, "Liturgical Traditions for Palm Sunday and their Dissemination in Old English Prose", PhD thesis (University of Liverpool, 1985) pp.15-17.

⁸ Morris, 67/3-13. For a non-biblical analogue for the Jews carrying palm branches as signs of triumph see Hrabanus Maurus, *De Universo*, Lib. XIX, cap. vi, PL 111, col. 512.

⁹ A useful comparison is Ælfric's First Series Palm Sunday homily, *In Dominica Palmarum* (which uses Bede's *Dominica Ante Pascha* and Haymo's *Hom. LXIII*). See *The Homilies of the Anglo-Saxon Church. The First Part, Containing the Sermones Catholici or Homilies of Ælfric*, vol. I, ed. B. Thorpe (London, 1844) pp.206-19 (p.218). All references to the First Series of the Catholic Homilies are to this edition, by page and line number.

¹⁰ For a useful survey of the Harrowing of Hell see Jackson J. Campbell, "To Hell and Back: Latin Tradition and Literary Use of the *Descensus ad Inferos* in Old English", *Viator* 13 (1982) pp.107-58. A discussion of the Easter themes of redemption and harrowing may be found in Lees, "Liturgical Traditions", especially pp.247-62.

¹¹ Two readings were used by Old English homilists for Palm Sunday: either the Passion story (based on Matt. xxvi and xxvii), as evidenced by Ælfric's Second Series Palm Sunday homily, ed. Malcolm Godden, *Ælfric's Catholic Homilies. The Second Series Text*, EETS SS 5 (London, New York, Toronto, 1979) pp.150-60; or the Triumphal Entry from Matt. xxi 1-14. For a fuller discussion see Lees, "Liturgical Traditions", pp.17-32.

¹² As indicated by the marginal addition to the West-Saxon Gospels, for example. See *The Gospel According to Saint John*, ed. W.W. Skeat (Cambridge, 1878) p.114, "Ðys godspel seal on monan-dæg innan þære palm-wucan".

¹³ See, for example, Bede, *Maioris Hebdomadae*, CCSL 122, p.212, ll.178-9, "Curiositas hos, et non caritas adduxit ad Jesum", reiterated by Haymo, *Hom. LXV*, PL 118, col. 384.

¹⁴ The Faustina reviser evidently noticed the looseness of this passage for he simplifies it in the revised homily, see below pp.19-20, ll.56-60.

¹⁵ A practice shared by other homilists. The shorter gospel account of the Triumphal Entry

from John appears to be used in the liturgy because of the lengthier reading of the Matthew passion in the services for the day. See Lees, "Liturgical Traditions", pp.17-32 and 62-3.

16 The expansion of a gospel lection by adding extra details from other gospel accounts of the same event is not unusual in homilies. For an appropriate comparison see Paul E. Szarmach, "The Earlier Homily: *De Parasceve*", in *Studies in Earlier Old English Prose*, ed. Paul E. Szarmach (Albany, 1986) pp.381-99.

17 As characterized by Peter Clemoes, "Ælfric", in *Continuations and Beginnings: Studies in Old English Literature*, ed. E.G. Stanley (London, 1966) pp.176-209 (p.191).

18 For discussion see *The Prose Solomon and Saturn and Adrian and Ritheus*, eds. James E. Cross and Thomas D. Hill, McMaster Old English Studies and Texts 1 (Toronto, Buffalo and London, 1982) pp.81-3.

19 Alcuin, *Comment. in Joan.*, Lib. V, cap. xxviii, PL 100, col. 906; and Haymo, PL 118, cols. 381-2.

20 Ælfric's *In Dominica Palmarum* (Thorpe I, 214/27-30), and one of the Palm Sunday homilies in Cambridge, Pembroke College MS 25, f.61r, "Haec igitur dies in qua dominus noster multis miraculis huic se mundo manifestauit".

21 For other examples see Lees, "The 'Sunday Letter' and the 'Sunday Lists' ", *Anglo-Saxon England* 14 (1985) pp.129-51; and "Theme and Echo in an Anonymous Old English Homily for Easter", *Traditio* 42 (1986) pp.142-78.

22 The item dealing with the Crucifixion on the sixth day is popular in other anonymous lists; see Lees, "Theme and Echo", pp.157-9.

23 The straining of gospel statements is common and should be viewed simply as making the biblical evidence fit the required list. See Lees, "The 'Sunday Letter' ", pp.142-9.

24 For examples see Ælfric, *Dominica XI Post Pentecosten* (Thorpe I, 402/11-13); Assmann IV, *Angelsächsische Homilien und Heiligenleben*, ed. B. Assmann, Bibliothek der angelsächsischen Prosa 3 (Kassel, 1889; repr. Darmstadt, 1965), 62/239-45; Pseudo-Wulfstan LVII, *Wulfstan. Sammlung der ihm zugeschriebenen Homilien nebst Untersuchungen über ihre Echtheit. Text und Varianten*, ed. A.S. Napier (Berlin, 1883) p.296; Smaragdus, *Collectiones*, PL

The Blickling Palm Sunday Homily

102, col. 194; Haymo, *Historiae Sacrae Epitome*, Lib. III, cap. viii, PL 118, col. 833. For the etymology of Jerusalem see particularly Ælfric, *In Dominica Palmarum* (Thorpe I, 211/22-5) and Bede, *Dominica Ante Pascha*, CCSL 122, p.201, l.40. Tom Hall has kindly informed me that analogues also exist in the *Catechesis Celtica* (McNally typescript 14, ll.30-1 and ll.40-3), found also in Orléans, Bibliothèque Municipale MS 65 f. 197r and f. 196v respectively.

25 Ælfric, *Dominica XI Post Pentecosten* (Thorpe I, pp.402-4) and Gregory, *Hom. 39 in Evangelia*, Lib. II, PL 76, col. 1294, identified by M. Förster, "Über die Quellen von Ælfrics Exegetischen Homiliae Catholicae", *Anglia* 16 (1894) pp.9-10.

26 Compare, for example, the *Vindicta Salvatoris*, ed. Assmann, *Homilien und Heiligenleben* pp.184-7. For Eusebius/Rufinus see *Eusebius Werke*, Band 2, *Die Kirchengeschichte*, ed. E. Schwartz (*Die lateinische Übersetzung des Rufinus*, ed. T. Mommsen), *Die Griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte* (Leipzig, 1902) pp.197-213.

27 Haymo, *Hom. LXIV* and *Hom. LXV*, PL 118, cols. 360 and 382; see also Smaragdus, *Collectiones*, PL 102, cols. 175-6.

28 For the active and contemplative lives see, for example, *Bedae Opera Pars II, 3. In Lucae Evangelium Expositio*, ed. D. Hurst, CCSL 120 (Turnhout, 1960) p.225, ll.2313-32; and *Gregorius Magnus. Homiliae in Hiezechihelam Prophetam*, ed. Marcus Adriaen, CCSL 142 (Turnhout, 1971) Hom. II, Lib. II, pp.230-1, §§8-9. Compare Augustine, *Sermo CIV*, PL 38, cols. 617-18; and Ælfric, *Assumptio Sanctae Marię Virginis* (Godden, pp.255-9).

29 Although commentators take pains to stress the identity of the Mary of both stories; see, for example, Bede, *Maioris Hebdomadae*, CCSL 122, p.209, ll.82-92.

30 For the weight of sin see Cross and Hill, *The Prose Solomon and Saturn*, pp.114-15. Other examples of the image include Blickling Homily X (Morris, 109/30-1), and Ælfric's Second Latin Letter to Wulfstan, *Die Hirtenbriefe Ælfrics*, ed. B. Fehr, *Bibliothek der angelsächsischen Prosa* 9 (Hamburg, 1914) Brief 2, p.37, §18. For further discussion see Paul Willis, "The Weight of Sin in the York *Crucifixio*", *Leeds Studies in English* n.s. 15 (1984) pp.109-16. For Lazarus and Judas, compare Augustine, *In Iohannis Evangelium Tractatus CXXIV*, CCSL 36, pp.437-8; and Haymo, *Hom. LXV*, PL 118, cols. 382-4.

31 Compare particularly Haymo, *Hom. LXIII*, PL 118, cols. 353-4 (col. 354, "Spiritualiter Bethphage significat Ecclesiam primitivam"). See also Morris, 73/10-11 etc., discussed above,

pp.7-8.

32 Parallels are suggested with Haymo, *Hom. LXIII*, PL 118, cols. 354D, 356D, 357A for Morris, 79/29-32 and 81/8-12. The general discussion of *Osanna* (Morris, 81/15-27) also bears some similarities to Haymo, *Hom. LXIII*, PL 118, cols. 357-8.

33 Haymo, *Hom. LXIII*, PL 118, col. 354; cf. Bede, *Dominica Ante Pascha*, CCSL 122, p.202, ll.56-61. This is a passage of exegesis also used by Ælfric in his First Series Palm Sunday homily (Thorpe I, 206/22-9).

34 Haymo, *Hom. LXIV*, PL 118, col. 359; and Smaragdus, *Collectiones*, PL 102, col. 175C.

35 For the relevant section of Pliny's *Naturalis Historiae*, see *The Natural History of Pliny*, vol. III, trans. J. Bostock and H.T. Riley (London, 1904) Book 12, pp.119-20. For the commentaries see Smaragdus, *Collectiones*, PL 102, col. 175; and Isidore, *Etymologiarum*, Lib. XVII, cap. ix, §3, PL 82, col. 623.

36 Smaragdus, *Collectiones*, PL 102, col. 175. "Nardus" was certainly known in Anglo-Saxon England, see *The Old English Herbarium and Medicina de Quadrupedibus*, ed. Hubert Jan de Vriend, EETS OS 286 (London, New York, Toronto, 1984) pp.122, 258.

37 The punctuation of the manuscript affords little assistance; see *The Blickling Homilies*, ed. R. Willard, Early English Manuscripts in Facsimile 10 (Copenhagen, 1960), f.45v.

38 As discussed by Marcia A. Dalbey, "Hortatory Tone in The Blickling Homilies: Two Adaptations of Caesarius", *NM* 70 (1969) pp.641-58.

39 Note the many times that the homilist uses the verb "getacnian" when making only basic spiritual distinctions; Morris, 71/35; 73/8, 10, 31; 75/5; 77/15, 18; 81/3, 8, 14.

40 Whilst *Hom. LXIII* in its entirety furnishes analogues (PL 118, cols. 353-8), only the first section of *Hom. LXV* appears to be relevant (cols. 381-4) and *Hom. LXIV* only offers analogues for the story of Mary (cols. 359-60).

41 J.E. Cross reaches a similar conclusion in his analysis of the Blickling Ascension homily: "On the Blickling Homily for Ascension Day (no. XI)", *NM* 70 (1969) pp.228-40 (p.230).

The Blickling Palm Sunday Homily

- 42 For apocryphal themes in the Blickling collection see particularly Gatch, "Eschatology", pp.123-36, and Mary Clayton, "Blickling Homily XIII Reconsidered", *Leeds Studies in English* n.s. 17 (1986) pp.25-40. The pastoral nature of the collection was first proposed by Dalbey, "Hortatory Tone", pp.641-58.
- 43 Scragg, "The corpus of vernacular homilies and prose Saints' lives before Ælfric", describes the collection as "very significant in the study of the tenth-century tradition" (p.233). There is no shortage of evidence for poor Latinity: the most recent discussions are Clayton, "Blickling Homily XIII"; and J. Gaites, "Ælfric's Longer *Life of St Martin* and Its Latin sources: A Study in Narrative Technique", *Leeds Studies in English* n.s. 13 (1982) pp.23-41 (pp.36-9).
- 44 The best surveys of the dissemination of the homilies from the Blickling collection are those by Scragg, "The corpus of vernacular homilies and prose Saints' lives before Ælfric", pp.223-77 and "The homilies of the Blickling manuscript", pp.299-316.
- 45 For the manuscript descriptions see note 2 above.
- 46 See Scragg, "The corpus of vernacular homilies and prose Saints' lives before Ælfric", pp.238-40; and Lees, "Liturgical Traditions", pp.241-2.
- 47 Ker 153, items 5, 6, and 23. Scragg, "The corpus of vernacular homilies and prose Saints' lives before Ælfric", p.246, suggests that these items may have been added to the Faustina manuscript in the south-east.
- 48 The rubric of the Holy Monday homily has been altered from "Feria III" to "Feria II"; the former probably derives from the fact that there are three homilies all originally intended for Palm Sunday in J (Ælfric's Second Series Palm Sunday homily is rubricated "Feria II"), whilst the latter is more appropriate liturgically.
- 49 Shorter homilies were, however, more common by the late twelfth-century (J is dated early twelfth-century). See the Trinity homilies in *Old English Homilies and Homiletic Treatises (Sawles Warde, and Þe Wohunge of Ure Lauerd: Ureisons of Ure Louerd and of Ure Lefdi, etc) of the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries*, ed. R. Morris, EETS OS 53 (London, 1873; repr. New York, 1975); and J. Oetgen, "The Trinity College Ascension Sermon: Sources and Structure", *Mediaeval Studies* 45 (1983) pp.410-17.
- 50 I should like to thank Dr Joyce Hill for her useful comments and scholarly guidance during

Clare A. Lees

the preparation of this paper.