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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. 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. In comparison with other composite homilies recently investigated, however, the Faustina homily draws on only one direct source, Blickling Homily VI. 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). Its structure, however, is chaotic since the relationships between the two lections, their exegetical
## BLICKLING HOMILY VI: STRUCTURE

### TABLE 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTENTS</th>
<th>COMMENTS ON METHODOLOGY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>INTRODUCTION</strong> (Morris, 65/1 - 67/22)</td>
<td><strong>Christ's Act of Redemption</strong> &lt;br&gt;<strong>Typology:</strong> raising of Lazarus &lt;br&gt;<strong>Christ's Triumphant Procession into Jerusalem</strong> &lt;br&gt;<strong>Typology:</strong> The Harrowing of Hell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Triumphal Entry and the Significance of Palm Sunday</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>THE PERICOPES</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The gospel stories of Mary and Martha</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Matt. xxi 1-14 for Palm Sunday (Morris, 69/33 - 71/21)</td>
<td><strong>Direct translation, with minor variations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Triumphal Entry of Christ into Jerusalem</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTENTS</td>
<td>COMMENTS ON METHODOLOGY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXEGESIS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. John xii 1-12 for Holy Monday (Morris, 71/22 - 77/10) &lt;br&gt;The gospel stories of Mary and Martha</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Matt. xxi 1-14 for Palm Sunday (Morris, 77/11 - 81/28) &lt;br&gt;The Triumphal Entry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CONCLUSION</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morris 81/28 - 83/4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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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. 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.

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 ða gelícnesse;
forþon þe he wæs wuldres cyning. Þysne dæg hie nemdon siges dæg;
se nama tacnab þone sige þe Drihten gesigefæsted wþstod deofle,
þa he mid his deaþe þone ecan deaþ oferswiþðe . . .
(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. The theme of triumph is also fixed by the noting of other biblical proofs. 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. 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. 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
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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 ṣege, us cybe on ṣaem godspelle, & ṣus cwæþ: 'Hælend cwom syx dagum ær Iuđea eastrum, to Bethania hær Lazarus wæs forþfered, & he hine awehte of deahæ.'

(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. By contrast, the first lection from John xii 1-12 tells the story of the annointing of Christ's feet by Mary, and is usually appropriate for Holy Monday. 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). There is even one slight digression on the nature of Judas, loosely based on John xii 6 and xiii 29 (Morris, 69/9-15).

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, 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. 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; \textit{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 Triumphant Entry on Palm Sunday (Morris, 71/31-3; \textit{cf.} John xii 12 \textit{et al.}); the cursing of the fig tree on the following day (Morris, 71/33-6; \textit{cf.} Mark xi 12-14); the Last Supper on the fifth day (Morris, 73/4-6; \textit{cf.} Matt. xxvi 17-29 \textit{et al.}); and the Crucifixion on the sixth day (Morris, 73/6-8; \textit{cf.} Matt. xxvii 1 \textit{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; \textit{cf.} John xi 39-55); the speech of Christ on the third day (Morris, 71/36-73/1; \textit{cf.} Matt. xxvi 1-2 \textit{et al.}); and the anointing of Christ by Mary on the fourth day (Morris, 73/2-3; \textit{cf.} Matt. xxvi 2-7), although the latter two...
items demand some ingenious counting of the days actually mentioned in the
gospels. 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;
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. 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. 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 tacnæþ heo buton þa halgan cyricean, þæt synd geleaffulle
menn þa gearwiþ clæne wununga on heora heortum Criste
sylfum? (Morris, 73/10-12)
and Mary signifying Holy Church in the next:

heo tacnab þa halgan cyricean on þære toweardan worlde, seo biþ
gefreolsod fram eallum gewinnum . . . (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;\(^\text{27}\) 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.\(^\text{28}\) The contradictions in the Blickling homilist's account stem from a conflation of the two gospel stories concerning Mary that most commentators consider separately.\(^\text{29}\) 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.\(^\text{30}\)

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.\(^\text{31}\) Other popular statements include the discussion of the ass, and the crowd that go before Christ (Morris, 79/29-33 and 81/14-15).\(^\text{32}\) More particularly, the homilist's explication of the two disciples:

We gehyrdan ær þætte Hælend sende his twegen þegnas: þa
tacnæþ halige lærowas, þæt hie sceolan þurhwunian on rihtum
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geleafan & on fulfremedlicum 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.\textsuperscript{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 afulæþ þæt mid hire gesmered bǐþ" (Morris, 73/22-3), is a misunderstanding of the usual comment that the container (\textit{alabastrum}) preserves the ointment.\textsuperscript{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 \textit{Naturalis Historia}, states that "nardus" can occur in twelve different varieties.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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:

\begin{quote}
\textit{Cwæþ se godspellere, Martha & Maria getacniþ} þis lænelice
 lif & þis gewitendlice . . . (Morris, 73/8-9, my italics)
\end{quote}

and:

\begin{quote}
. . . þonne bringe we Drihtne swetne stenc on urum dædum & larum. \textit{Swa Paulus se apostol cwæþ}, "Drihtnes fet we magon smerian, gif we willæþ oþrum geleaffullum teala don, & helpan þæs earman se þe bet mæge, & beon symle efenþrowgende oþres
\end{quote}
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 ðæt we þa god don þe us Godes bec lærap, ðæt is þonne, fæstæn and halige wæccan, ðæt ælmesylena 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
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. However, in the absence of other evidence, Blickling Homily VI must be described as free composition generated from commonplace themes and exegesis.

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. 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. 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.

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:

**Palm Sunday**

- item 21 Dominica in die palmarum
  
  *(In Dominica Palmarum, Thorpe I, pp.206-19)*

- item 22 Feria II de passione domini
  
  *(De Passione Domini, Godden,*
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 (In Cena Domini, Assmann XIII, pp.151-63)

Easter Day item 25 Die Dominica paschē resurrectionē. domini de euangelio (Dominica Šēi Pasce, Thorpe I, pp.220-8)

item 26 Sermo de Sacrificio in die paschē (Sermo de Sacrificio in die Paschae, Godden, pp.150-60)

item 27 Alius sermo de die pasche (Alius Sermo de Die Pasce, 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. In addition, three of the anonymous items in this manuscript, including the Holy Monday homily, include material from the Blickling collection.

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" (l.2). By retaining the introduction to the original 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):

\[ \text{Waes hæt wite swa strang swa Godes gelyld ær mare wæs.} \]

(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
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.
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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.
ANTE sex dies pasce uenit Ihesus Beðániam. ET RELIQVA.

Ge magon gehýran seégan be ðære árwyrðynysse þysse halgan tide hú se ælmihtíga God and se mildheorta Drihten Hælend Crist se Ánlysend þýses menniscan lífes hine sylfne toþon geeadmedde þæt hé of þære hýhðo Fæderlices Þrynnesse to eorðan astáh, toþon þæt he wolde þrówian for ealra manna hāelo, and ús álýsan fram deofles þéowdome, and ús aétýwan 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 geneýðerunge.

On þýsum dæge úre Drihten Hælend Crist wæs geweorðod and gehéred fram Iudea folce forþon þe hy ongeátôn þæt he wæs

**TITLE:** Feria II Evangelivm

1 II(l). 3 halgan] hal(.)gan. 5 geeadmedde] second d over e.
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**TITLE:** Dominica VI in Quadragesima.
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Drihten Þurh Þæt wûndorweorc þe he Lazarum of deaðe awrehte, þy feoðan ðæge þæs þe Lazarus on byrgenne wæs. Þa bærton hy him togeánes blo-/-wende palmtwiga forhôn þe hit is Iudeisc þeáw þonne heora cyningas hæfdon sige gefohton on heora feóndum, þonne hy wærion hám fârende þonne éodon hy him togeanes mid blôwendum palmtwigon his sige to geweorðigenne. Wel Þæt gedáfenade Þæt hé Drihten swa dyde on þa gelícnesse fôrþan þe hé wæs wuldres Cyning and eallum halgum he selleð écne gefeán in worulda woruld.

Þysses dæges nama gerecednes is siges dæg; se getácnað þone sige þe Drihten sigefæst þam deófe ætstód, þa hé mid his deaðe þone écan deað oferswiðde, swa he sylf Þurh þone witegan cwæð, "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
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\begin{align*}
\text{ðanōn alædde, and generede of deofles anwealde and } & \text{þa } ðe to } \\
\text{þeowdome }& \text{þider on frúman middaneardes gesōmnode wæron. He hy } \text{þa} \\
\text{gelædde of helle gründe on } & \text{þa hean ðrymmas heofona } \text{rices.} \\
\text{Þone cyðde } & \text{Johannes } \text{Drihtenes se } \text{dēora } \text{þegen on } \text{þam} \\
\text{godsplede and } & \text{þus cwæð, } \text{"Se } \text{Hælend cóm } \text{syx } \text{dagum } \text{ærðan } \text{Iudeiscan} \\
\text{Eastran to Bethánia, } & \text{þæ } \text{wæs } \text{Lázarus forðfēred } \text{þone } \text{se } \text{Hælend of} \\
\text{deaðe } & \text{awrehte" (John xii 1). } \text{Þa } \text{gegearwode his } \text{swustor } \text{Martha} \\
\text{þam } & \text{Hælende æfengereord } \text{þa } \text{gesæt hyre } \text{swustor, } \text{þære } \text{nama } \text{wæs} \\
\text{María, be } \text{þæs } \text{Hælendes } \text{fōtum } \text{tōpon } & \text{þæt } \text{heo } \text{wolde } \text{gehyran } \text{his} \\
\text{word and his láre (John xii 2; cf. Luke x 38-9). } \text{Martha } \text{wæs} \\
\text{geornful } & \text{þæt } \text{heo } \text{þam } \text{Hælende to } \text{gecwéman } \text{geþēode, gestōd } \text{hyre} \\
\text{æftorn } & \text{þam } \text{Hælende and } \text{him } \text{to } \text{cwæð, } \text{"Nelt } \text{þu } \text{na } \text{gyman } \text{þæt } \text{mín} \\
\text{swustar me lēt } & \text{ánæ } \text{bénian? } \text{Cwæð } \text{to } \text{hyre } \text{þæt } \text{héo } \text{me } \text{fylste"} \\
\text{(Luke x 40). } \text{Þa } \text{andswarode } \text{hyre } \text{se } \text{Hælend } \text{and } \text{cwæð, } \text{"Marða,} \\
\text{Marða, beo } & \text{þu } \text{behydig and gemynnig } \text{Marián } \text{þinga, } \text{þæt } \text{þu } \text{scealt} \\
\text{33 } & \text{dagum] } u \text{ over } a. \\
\end{align*}
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\begin{align*}
29 & \text{þanon] } \text{þonon. and[ and] hie. anwealde and[ anwalde. } \text{ðe[ he. } \\
30 & \text{þider[ pyder. middaneardes] middangeardes. gesōmnode] gesamnode. } \text{30-} \\
31 & \text{hy } \text{þa } \text{gelædde] hie eft alædde. } 32 \text{Þone cyðde } ... \text{þam[ iohannes se de'o'ra} \\
33 & \text{þegn us cyðde on } \text{þem. } 33 \text{Se } \text{Hælend com[ hælend cwom. } \text{ǽrðan[ ær. } \\
34 & \text{33-34 } \text{Iudeiscan } \text{Eastran[ iudea eastrum. } 34 \text{wæs } \text{Lázarus[ lazarus wæs. } \\
34-5 & \text{þone } \text{se } \text{Hælend } \text{of } \text{deaðe } \text{awrehte} ] \text{and } \text{he } \text{hine } \text{awrehte of } \text{deape. } \\
35-7 & \text{Þa } \text{gegearwode } ... \text{heo } \text{wolde] } \text{martha his } \text{swestor } \text{þa } \text{gearwode } \text{þam } \text{hælende} \\
\text{æfengereordu } & \text{and } \text{hire } \text{swestor } \text{gesæt } \text{big } \text{hælendes } \text{fōtum } \text{þære } \text{nama } \text{wæs maria} \\
\text{forþon } & \text{þe } \text{heo } \text{wolde. } 39 \text{þam[ ] } \text{pon. } 39-40 \text{gecweman } ... \text{Hælende} \\
\text{gecwenneses } & \text{þegnode } \text{heo } \text{gestod } \text{beforan } \text{him. } 40 \text{Nelt } \text{þu } \text{na } \text{gyman] } \text{hwy } \text{nelt} \\
\text{þu } & \text{geman. } 41 \text{swustar] } \text{swestor. let } \text{ana } \text{þenian } \text{Cwæð[ ] } \text{let } \text{ane } \text{þegnian} \\
\text{cwæð. } & \text{hyre] hire. fylste[ fultumie. } 42 \text{Þa } \text{andswarode } \text{hyre } \text{se } \text{Hælend[} \\
\text{hælend hire[ } & \text{þa } \text{andswarode. } 42-3 \text{Marða } \text{Marða beo[ } \text{martha, martha wes. } \\
43-4 & \text{þæt } \text{þu } \text{scealt æghwanan] } \text{þæt is } \text{þæt } \text{þu } \text{scealt on æghwylce } \text{tid.} \\
\end{align*}
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æghwanan Godes willan gewyrcan þæt án þe is gyt behéflic. Maria hyre gecéas þone betstan dæl se ne bið næfre fram hyre aháfén” (Luke x 41-2).

Lazarus þær wæs ána síttende mid þam Hælende and mid his þegenum. Maria seo ymbfeng þínd deówurðra smyrelsa and smyrede þæs Hælendes fét mid and eft drígde mid hyre lóccum. And þa wæs eal þæt hús gefylled mid þam swétan sténce þære deówurðran smyrelse. Þa wæs þæs Hælendes þéga sum se wæs gehaten Iudas Scáriðisc, he wæs gehaten swa forþon þe he cóm of þam tún þe Scárið háttte, se wæs swyðe gebolgen and cwæð, “Tohwon sceolde þæos smýrneses þús to forlore bǽon gedón? Mihte man gefylan þrim hund myneta and þæt bǽon gedæled þæ[a]rfendum mannum” (John xii 5). Ne cwæð he þís na forþon þe him wære áenig gemynd þærfendra manna, ac he wæs sceáða and gitsere, and þa apostolas hine léton forþon heora seodos brón þæt hy woldon mid þy his
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f. 118r

gýtsunga cunnian, ac he wæs / gitsiende and ðy he gesalede wið feo þone Hlaford heofonas and eorðan. Þa andswaroðe him se Hælend and þus cwæð, "Tohwôn synd ge ðyseye weorces swa hefge? Gód weorc heo wæs wyrccende on mé. Symle ge habbað þearfan gíf ge willað tela don, ac ne hæbbe gé me symle; ac látað þis wéasan to cyðnesse minre gebýrgerdnesse" (Matt. xxvi 10-12; cf. John xii 7-8).

Þeos smyrenes wæs geworht of eahtatyne wýrtum, þara þreo þa bêtstan án wæs ele, and oðer wæs nardus, and þridde wæs spice seo is brūnes hiwes and godes stences and þæt næfre ne áfulað þæt héo mid gesmyred bið. Gif we willað úre sawle smyrewian mid ðy ele mildheortynysse[e], bonne mágon we Drihtne bringan unforwyrdne wæstm[g] góðra weorca. Gemunan we eac þæt wé þa gódan weorc ðe us Godes béc lærð, þæt is þonne fæsten, and hálige wæccan, and ælmanessanyllan æfter urum geméte, and mid mánegum

70 mildheortynysse] mildheortynysse(,) final e lost in trimming, cf. mildheortynesse
71 wæstm] wæst(,) final m lost in trimming, cf. wæstm B.
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obrum gastlicum magnum haet we magon geearnian haet we urum
Drihtne bringon godra weorca swe[t]ne stenc. Swa cydde 75
Ifo]hannes se godspellere haet he gehyrde engla breatas Gode lof
sigan, and bus cwædan, "Pu ear[t] wyrde Drihten God haet p[u onfo
wuldor, and ære, and magen, and bleutsung, and dáda þancunga
eala þíra gesceafa þe þu gescéope æfter þinum willan þa þe
on heofonum syndon and eordan" (Apoc. iv 11).

Lazarus þone þe Crist awrehte þy feorðan daege þæs þe hé on
býrgenne wæs ge- / -tácnaþ þysne middaneard, se wæs mid þam
gewinne þære hefgestan gewemmednesse ofstét. And eal swa seo
hèfíge byrdæn sittde on þam deadan lichaman on þære býrgenne and
þæs deaðes and hine festnað and seo eordæ þricgeð. Swa þonne sæt
unaréfnedlicu byrdæn synna on eallum þisum menniscum cynne of
þone tócyne utes Drihtnes Hælendes Cristes.

Pa cwæð Drihten to his apostolum, "Soð is haet ic eów secege,

75 swe[t]ne] swet[..] final ne lost in trimming, cf. swe[t]ne B. 76 Iohannes]
l'o'ns. 77 eart[.] ear[..] final t lost in trimming, cf. eart B. 82 þysne] y < s.
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74 magnum haet[ maegenum. 75 bringon] bringap. stenc] J omits Morris,
73/30-36. Swa cydde] haet cybde. 76 gehyrde] geherde. 77 cwæðan]
cweþan. 79-80 æfter þinum . . . eordan] on
heofenum and on eordan after þinum willan. 81 þone] B omits. awrehte]
awehte. 82 byrgenne wæs] byrgenne wæs ful wunigende. getacnað] he
getacnap. middaneard] middangeard. þam] þon. 83 gewinne]
gewunon. þære . . . ofstæ] þære heofogoston gewemmednesse synna and mana
full. And eall] efne. 84 sitteð] sitep. þam|þam. lichaman]
þonne sæt] sæt þonne. 86 unaréfnedlicu] seo unaréfnedlice. þisum
omits Morris, 75/11-77/32. 88 Þa cwæð . . . apostolum] drihten him þa
andswered and cwæþ hwæt ge nu geseóp ealle þa fægernessa þissa
getimbra. secege] seccge.
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\[
\text{\textit{æt æt geweorðeð æt for ðyseol fólces synnum and mándædum ða getimbru beoð to wórpenne, and hér ne bið forlátan stan ofer oðerne ðæt ælc ne sy fram oðrum adón" (Matt. xxiv 2). Swa hit syððan gelámp embe feorwertig wintra æfter þon þe Crist for manna hælo lichamlicne deáð geþrowode. Abád hé á þurh his ða micclan geþyld feorwertig wintra hwæðer hy to bóté gecyrran woldon, oððe ánige hrowe don and bóté þæs micclan yfeles and mánes þe hy wið hine ðurh Drihten gedydon, and eac wið monige his haligra. Þa gesæah hé ðæt hy nane bóté ne hrowe don noldon ac hy on hérora yfele þurhwunodon, þa sende hé Drihten máran wráce ofer þa þeode þonne on ánigre oðere gelámpé bútan Sodom warum ánun. Wäs ðæt wite swa stráng swa Godes geþyld ér máre wær.}

We þonne synd ða þe æfter fyligdon; and we witon eal ðis

f.119r þus ge- / -worden we sculon þonne on hine gelýfan, and hine lúúian, and gelýfan eac ðæt he is toweard to démanne and þas

93 þurh his]\textit{purh(,) his}. 97 haligra] first a over erasure.
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worold to geendienne. Hwæt we habbað þonne mycele nyðþearfe þæt 105 he us geárwe finde. Wite wé fulgeare þæt wé sculon on þysse worulde geærmian 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.
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NOTES


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.


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


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, "Dys godspel sceal on monan-daeg 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
Clare A. Lees

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.


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".


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.
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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, II.30-1 and II.40-3), found also in Orléans, Bibliothèque Municipale MS 65 f. 197r and f. 196v respectively.


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


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, II.82-92.


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,
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pp.7-8.


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.


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.


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).
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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. Gaitses, "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.


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 Pe Wohange of Ure Lauerd: Ureisons of Ure Lauerd 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
the preparation of this paper.