

Leeds Studies in English

Article:

Mary Swan, 'Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 198 and the Blickling Manuscript', *Leeds Studies in English*, n.s. 37 (2006), 89-100

Permanent URL:

https://ludos.leeds.ac.uk:443/R/-?func=dbin-jump-full&object_id=123815&silos_library=GEN01



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

Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 198 and the Blickling Manuscript

Mary Swan

In this essay I will describe one striking and hitherto undocumented feature of the relationship of a composite Old English text to its sources, and will consider what this implies about scribal activity and manuscript relationships.¹ The composite text in question is the homily on folios 311v-316r of manuscript Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 198 – article 62 in Neil Ker's description of the manuscript's contents.² Most of the contents of CCCC 198 are Ælfrician. The earliest part of the manuscript, Part I, was written in the early eleventh century. Article 62 is one of a group of what John Pope categorises as 'nearly contemporary additions in several hands' which constitute Part II of the manuscript.³

The main source text for article 62 is Ælfric's composition entitled 'In Quadragesima. De Penitentia'.⁴ Almost all of this homily is copied into article 62, and to it is added a lengthy excerpt from the anonymous homily Blickling X.⁵ The welding together of an Ælfrician composition with one from the Blickling collection might seem unlikely – and would certainly have alarmed the Abbot of Eynsham – but at least one other late Old English composite text makes just such a combination,⁶ and many of the re-uses of items from Ælfric's *Catholic Homilies* turn them into something closer in tone and rhetoric to parts of the anonymous corpus.⁷ Blickling X is assumed by Richard Morris to have been intended for Rogation Wednesday, although its title is erased in the Blickling manuscript. Morris gives it the editorial title 'Pisses middangeardes ende neah is'. Article 62 has the title 'Incipit de penitentia. in quadragesima', and it opens with the formula 'læwedum mannum is to witane þ', which is presumably the work of its compiler.⁸ This phrase is used to lead into Ælfric's 'De Penitentia', which article 62 follows from its opening to its penultimate word, reproducing its discussions of baptism,

repentance and confession, prayer, and the nature of the Trinity. The compiler of article 62 then changes Ælfric's final word, 'amen', into 'butan æghwīlcum ende'. Throughout its version of 'De Penitentia', article 62 shows minor differences of vocabulary which do not alter the sense of the text in any significant way.

After copying 'De Penitentia', the compiler of article 62 turns to a lengthy excerpt from Blickling X, corresponding to p. 111, line 15 to p. 115, line 8 in Morris' edition. In both the Blickling manuscript and article 62 this passage opens with the importance of Christian teaching, the division of the body and soul at death, the transitory nature of earthly things, human bones talking about earthly decay,⁹ and the beauty of the world when it was first created. From here, Blickling X begins its final section with an exhortation to reflect on the creation of the world and its original beauty,¹⁰ and moves into a rather confusing sequence: 'þa wisnode he on Cristes haligra heortum, & nu is on urum heortum blowende swa hit gedafen is'.¹¹ The description of the world shrivelling and then blooming is not anchored in any parallel account of moral decline and renewal, and even if this sequence were anchored in such a way, it would hardly fit the exhortatory theme of the homily, which relies on presenting the world as declining and sinful in order to stress the need to repent now. Blickling X carries on in precisely this vein; emphasising the misery and evil of current times, and reminding its audience of the transience of the world and of the necessity of obeying God.¹²

Article 62 reproduces most of the text described above, with relatively frequent small changes of vocabulary and turn of phrase, of the sort often seen in composite Old English homilies' treatment of their sources, and indeed in article 62's alterations to Ælfric's 'De Penitentia'. In the middle of the Blickling X description of the world being created beautiful, article 62 misses out several lines of text in the Blickling manuscript version, which continue the description of the newly-created world's beauty,¹³ and resumes copying the Blickling X text a little further on for a few short phrases from the end of the Blickling X description of earthly beauty.¹⁴ Article 62 alters its Blickling source text in one further way; by unscrambling the confusing sequence in Blickling X. In place of this, it has a description of a more predictable decline, '7 þa wæs he ealra godnyssa ful 7 nu he is wanigenne 7 scinddende',¹⁵ which is presumably the work of its compiler. After this reworking, article 62 copies the text of Blickling X, with a few minor alterations, to its end, which includes an account of the evils of the present world and the importance of rectifying them.¹⁶

Structurally, thematically and verbally, article 62 welds together its material intelligently to construct a powerful appeal to repentance. 'De Penitentia's closing account of Judgement and the torment the sinful will suffer provides a strong thematic lead-in to Blickling X's insistence on spiritual preparation for Doomsday. The addition of the Blickling X extract enables the compiler of article 62 to address many themes connected with Judgement in the anonymous Old English homiletic and poetic traditions, such as earthly decay as expressed in laments for what is past, and personified by speaking human bones. These popular features of anonymous vernacular writing on the end of the world add a lively, imperative tone to Ælfric's treatment of Judgement, and the end of Blickling X brings article 62 to a thematically and structurally striking close with a return to an exhortation to repentance.

The improvement of the confused passage in Blickling X, coupled with the many smaller changes made to the Blickling X text, led Donald Scragg to suggest that 'here the compiler of the piece in F [CCCC 198] is copying Blickling no. x with some freedom'.¹⁷ These aspects of the comparison of the two might seem on first consideration to indicate that it is more likely that Blickling X is not the direct source of article 62, but that the two are connected via a now-lost intermediate version, or that they draw independently from a common, lost, source-text. In fact, however, it is clear from other examples of the re-use of Old English prose that the process of recasting a source text into a new piece often entails a re-articulation of the source text which introduces minor changes and on occasion more significant alterations.¹⁸ It is entirely possible, then, that article 62 drew directly on a text identical to the only copy of Blickling X which now survives – the one in the Blickling manuscript – and altered it in the copying, and that its relationship to Ælfric's 'De Penitentia' is of the same order.

The physical and mental working practices required to re-cast source texts in this way are very well captured in an important analysis of medieval scribal practice by Michael Benskin and Margaret Laing. Benskin and Laing examine Middle English scribes who copy source-texts from manuscript exemplars and who introduce changes of the order of the more routine ones noted above. They describe the point of the copying process at which the words in a source text are transformed into the different words which the scribe copies out: '[i]nstead of reproducing a perhaps laboriously interpreted visual image, the visual image is now interpreted at a glance; and what is held in the mind between looking at the exemplar and writing down the next bit of text, is not the visual symbols, but the spoken words that correspond to them. What the scribe reproduces is then the

words that he hears, not the visual images from which they arose: regardless of whether his lips move, he is writing to his own dictation'¹⁹. Benskin and Laing call this technique 'copying via "the mind's ear"',²⁰ and it is an extremely useful model for conceptualising the process behind the production of a text like article 62 from direct source-texts like Ælfric's 'De Penitentia' and Blickling X, where the scribe is recasting each source here and there into a preaching text which retains many of the essentials of the sources, but which has been revoiced as an individual new address.

We cannot know whether in CCCC 198 we have the first or only version of article 62 to be made. No other copies of the text which is article 62 survive, but this does not preclude their having existed. In principle, then, the direct drawing on 'De Penitentia' and Blickling X argued for above could have taken place in an earlier and now-lost composite homily, and CCCC 198 article 62 could be a recopying of this. On balance of probability, it is more likely that this is not the case, since the very great majority of anonymous composite Old English homilies now exist in only one copy. It might be assumed that they would have circulated less widely than the work of such a well-networked author as Ælfric, and the dramatic contrast between the many multiple copies of Ælfrician homilies and the almost-always single copies of anonymous composites weighs in favour of most of the latter being unique.

If the question of whether the text which is article 62 was compiled for the first time in CCCC 198 or whether it had an earlier existence is therefore open, it follows that we do not know whether the scribe of CCCC 198 article 62 is also its compiler. With regard to this, it is important to note that if scribe and compiler are not one and the same, it is possible that they were not working in the same place, since the text could have been compiled in one centre and then either been taken to another for copying into CCCC 198 or been drawn on for copying into CCCC 198 which itself was then taken elsewhere. This notwithstanding, given what we can ascertain about the textual transmission of other composite homilies, as outlined above, the working assumption of this essay is that article 62 was written out fully for the first time in CCCC 198. This in turn means that its scribe in CCCC 198 can therefore be assumed to be its compiler, and that in the first half of the eleventh century the scribe of CCCC 198 article 62 was therefore working in a centre where a copy of Blickling X was available.

A pair of separate but similar issues – that of the precise version of Blickling X available to the compiler of article 62 and that of the relationship between the two manuscripts, which share two entire items in addition to the re-

use of Blickling X in article 62 – has been the subject of scholarly interest for some time.²¹ Scragg demonstrates the close connection between the manuscripts, and is convinced that '[i]f any further light is to be shed on the origin of B [the Blickling manuscript], it is most likely to come from F [CCCC 198]',²² but he does not judge the Blickling manuscript to be the direct source of CCCC 198 for the material they share. He proposes, rather, that 'F [. . .] is not dependent upon B but is so close to it that we must assume that they have a common ancestor lying no great distance behind them', and that 'the likelihood is that [the scribes of the two manuscripts] were working in the same scriptorium'.²³ Mary Clayton also believes CCCC 198 'to be close to B in its milieu of origin', and that Part II of CCCC 198 'was written in the same centre in which B was produced'.²⁴ The general assumption seems to be that the two manuscripts, in their shared items, are separated by only one or two stages in a chain of source- and product-manuscripts.

The whereabouts of their putative shared scriptorium is unknown: the Blickling manuscript's place of production has been the subject of debate for decades, and is still unresolved;²⁵ CCCC 198 is likely to have been in Worcester, or thereabouts, by the thirteenth century, when the 'Tremulous Hand' scribe annotated it; the place or places of production of its two parts are not securely known, and scholarly opinion has lined up for and against Worcester as the place of production of Part II.²⁶ The very limited range of Ælfric's work drawn on in CCCC 198, as well as its lack of similarity to known Worcester styles of script, led Pope to doubt that the manuscript was at Worcester in the eleventh century.²⁷ It is worth noting, in the light of this, the Office of St Guthlac added to the end of CCCC 198 in the late eleventh century. Scragg argues that this does not help identify a location for the manuscript, since 'the saint appears to have been widely popular',²⁸ but if an alternative Worcester-area origin and/or provenance is under consideration, St Guthlac's priory in Hereford might be a relevant candidate.

In the light of this question of place of production and/or use, I would like now to return to the analysis of the relationship between article 62 and Blickling X, to point to the precise nature of one of the differences between them, and to use this both to reinforce the argument for a very close relationship and to add to the speculation about the location of the Blickling manuscript by the second half of the eleventh century. As noted above, after the point where it describes the beauty of the world at its creation, CCCC 198 article 62 does not reproduce the short section of Blickling X which extends this description.²⁹ No obvious reason for omitting this very standard description of the delights of earth

after its creation is apparent; article 62 copies from its source-texts for long stretches without abbreviating them, and the theme of the omitted section is entirely in keeping with that of article 62; this does not appear to be an example of a compiler omitting a passage because it does not fit the theme or priorities of the composite piece. The material details of the omission prove to be more suggestive: comparison of the relevant manuscript folios reveals that the omission covers exactly seven lines of the Blickling manuscript text (fol. 69v ll. 15-21 of the Blickling manuscript). In the transcriptions which follow, manuscript line endings are marked by '/' and the folio ending by '//', and text which exists in both manuscript versions is underlined:³⁰

Blickling manuscript folio 69v, line 12 - folio 70r, line 1

gesceapen wæs þa wæs he ealre fægernes/
se full 7 he wæs blowende on him sylfū/
on swyþe manigfealdre wynsumnesse/
7 on þa tid wæs mannum leof ofor eorþan/
7 halwende 7 heal smyltnes wæs ofor/
eorþan 7 sibba genihtsumnes 7 tud/
dres æþelnes 7 þes middangeard wæs/
on þa tid toþon fæger 7 toþon wymsum/
lic. þ he teah men to him þurh his wlite/
7 þurh his fægernesse 7 wynsumnesse//
fram þon ælmihtigan gode 7 þa he þus fæger/

CCCC 198, folio 315v, lines 19 - 21

he ealra fægernyssa ful 7 he wæs blowende on him/
sylfum on swiþe manigfealdre wynsumnysse/
fram þam ælmihtigan gode 7 þa he þus fæger wæs/

As can be seen, the last word copied in article 62 before the omission is 'wynsumnysse', which is at the end of line 20 of fol. 315v of CCCC 198, and at the end of line 14 of fol. 69v of the Blickling manuscript; and the last word of the omission from article 62, at the end of line 21 of fol. 69v of the Blickling manuscript, is also 'wynsumnesse'.³¹ This, therefore, may be an accidental omission from article 62 rather than an example of the compiler deliberately editing the source text. If we assume that article 62 was copied from a manuscript which happened to have the same line-layout as the Blickling manuscript at this

point, then this could very well be an example of homeoteleuton – eyeskip – on the part of the scribe of article 62. The line-layout of CCCC 198 and the Blickling manuscript does not match in the lines surrounding this point, so it is not the case that the CCCC 198 scribe is slavishly following the line-layout of an exemplar which matches the Blickling manuscript for any length of time, but the coincidence of line-layout across the two manuscripts at the point of the eyeskip is very striking, and highly suggestive of the scribe/compiler of article 62 working from an exemplar whose line-layout was identical at this point to that of the Blickling manuscript. If this is the case, the exemplar of article 62 is very likely to be either a manuscript extremely close to the Blickling manuscript in terms of time and chains of copying, or the Blickling manuscript itself.

If Benskin and Laing's 'mind's ear' copying technique is postulated for article 62, it is necessarily the case that the scribe would take his or her bodily eye (to coin an Anglo-Saxonism) off the source text for whole phrases in order to process it into the text which would then be written out. Benskin and Laing identify scribal confidence and familiarity with the language of the source-text as necessary prerequisites for the use of the 'mind's ear' copying technique,³² and both attitudes are amply demonstrated by the smooth transitions between verbatim reproduction of and small changes to source-texts throughout article 62, and by the recasting of the muddled Blickling X passage. The deliberate and necessary disengagement from the text written out in a source manuscript by a confident scribe copying out from it using the 'mind's ear' technique would, then, lead to the sorts of minor verbal reworkings of the source texts seen throughout article 62. It would also, of course, provide precisely the conditions for a scribe to lose his or her way in a manuscript exemplar and to produce inadvertent scribal eyeskip of the sort described here.³³ If a scribe is from time to time taking their eye and their mind – and also, especially when the text being compiled is a preaching text intended for out-loud delivery, their ear – off the precise verbal detail of the source text, the likelihood of their resuming reading and copying it in the wrong place is increased. In such circumstances the scribe would not intend to copy out the source-text slavishly, but would rather set out to adapt it in small ways, and then might unintentionally omit a portion of it because his or her attention was taken off the source-manuscript whilst mentally reformulating a phrase before writing it down.

One further factor which would increase the likelihood of such error in the example under scrutiny is the strong possibility of a brief pause on the part of the scribe at the point of the eyeskip: 'wynsumnysse' – the trigger word for the

eyeskip – comes at the end of a line in CCCC 198, and if the CCCC 198 scribe wrote out the text a line at a time, the pause to check the exemplar either after writing this word or between writing 'wynsum' and 'nysse', which are separated by a space on CCCC 198 fol. 135v l. 20, might have created the conditions for the eyeskip. The sense of some sort of scribal pause or break at around this point is amplified by the aspect of the script of article 62, which changes in the course of fol. 315v, becoming horizontally and vertically tighter and more upright from towards the end of line 18 onwards, as if the scribe has recalculated how much space is left and has decided that it is necessary to compress script. Another shift or pause seems to happen in line 20, where the letter-size and spacing grow, with 'wynsumnysse', at the end of the line, being markedly widely spaced. By contrast, the start of line 21, 'fram þam', sees a new and distinct compression of letter-size and space. In sum, the impression is that the writing out of lines 18 to 21 of fol. 315v was done with a series of pauses or shifts in strategy. This, of course, would further increase the chances of eyeskip. It is also notable that the omitted passage takes up exactly the last seven lines of fol. 69v of the Blickling manuscript. If the scribe of CCCC 198 article 62 was working from an exemplar which mirrored the line- and page-layout of the Blickling manuscript at this point, and if at this point of the copying the CCCC 198 scribe was more prone to make mistakes, he or she would perhaps be unlikely to pick up on an accidental omission once 'fram þam' had been written and a new page of the exemplar was being consulted, as his or her eye would have travelled a long way from the point of the eyeskip, low down on the left-hand verso page of the exemplar, to the top of the right-hand recto page.

The apparent eyeskip in article 62, although a very small element of the text's production and relationship to its sources, offers an important piece of support to the evidence assembled to date which links CCCC 198 and the Blickling manuscript. It raises anew the question of whether the Blickling manuscript might have been the direct exemplar for CCCC 198 article 62 and adds weight to the argument that CCCC 198 Part II was made in an institution very directly connected to, if not identical with, the one which housed the Blickling manuscript in the first half of the eleventh century.³⁴ This in turn underpins the growing understanding that the identification of manuscript relationships, whether by content, codicology or palaeography or a combination of these aspects, is key to bringing into sharper focus our picture of where, with what resources, and under what conditions Anglo-Saxon books were made.³⁵

NOTES

¹ This essay is based on work done under Joyce Hill's supervision during my PhD studies. Although Joyce would no doubt be dismayed at the delay between its origins and its publication, it seems fitting to offer as my contribution to her birthday festschrift something which resulted from her invaluable guidance.

² Neil Ker, *Catalogue of Manuscripts Containing Anglo-Saxon* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1957; repr. with supplement, 1990), p. 81. All details of manuscript date, provenance and article numbers are taken from Ker, *Catalogue*, except where otherwise stated. For a diplomatic transcription of article 62, see Mary Swan, 'Ælfric as Source: The Exploitation of Ælfric's *Catholic Homilies* from the Late Tenth to Twelfth Centuries' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Leeds, 1993), pp. 266-77.

³ *Homilies of Ælfric: A Supplementary Collection*, ed. by John C. Pope, Early English Text Society, o.s. 259 and 260, 2 vols (London: Oxford University Press, 1967 and 1968), I, 21. See also Ker, *Catalogue*, p. 76.

⁴ This piece is included in Thorpe's edition of the Second Series of *Catholic Homilies* after the main run of the *CH* from manuscript Cambridge, University Library Gg. 3. 28: *The Homilies of the Anglo-Saxon Church: The First Part, Containing the Sermones Catholici, or Homilies of Ælfric*, ed. by Benjamin Thorpe, 2 vols (London: Ælfric Society, 1844-46), II, 602-08. Peter Clemons describes 'De Penitentia' as 'a piece on penitence in Lent, perhaps an extract from a letter' (*Ælfric's Catholic Homilies: The First Series: Text*, ed. by P. Clemons, EETS, s.s. 17 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997), p. 25). In his later rescensions of the Second Series of *Catholic Homilies*, however, Ælfric did not include this piece, and instead incorporated it into the *Lives of Saints* as part of the item numbered XII in Skeat's edition (*Ælfric's Lives of Saints*, ed. by W.W. Skeat, EETS, o.s. 76, 82, 94, 114 (London: Oxford University Press, 1881-1900; reprinted as two volumes, 1966)); Malcolm Godden does not include 'In Quadragesima. De Penitentia' in his edition of the Second Series of *Catholic Homilies* (*Ælfric's Catholic Homilies: The Second Series: Text*, ed. by Malcolm Godden, EETS, s.s. 5 (London: Oxford University Press, 1979)). For further discussion of the status of this piece, see Kenneth Sisam, *Studies in the History of Old English Literature* (Oxford, 1962), pp. 166-68, and D. G. Scragg, 'The Homilies of the Blickling Manuscript', in *Learning and Literature in Anglo-Saxon England: Studies Presented to Peter Clemons on the Occasion of his Sixty-Fifth Birthday*, ed. by Michael Lapidge and Helmut Gneuss (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), pp. 299-316 (p. 312).

⁵ Morris' edition is still the point of reference for the text of the Blickling Homilies: *The Blickling Homilies*, ed. by R. Morris, EETS, o.s. 58, 63 and 73 (London: Oxford University

Press, 1874, 1876, 1880; repr. as one volume, 1967), pp. 107-15. Article 62 is manuscript Princeton University Library, W. H. Scheide Collection 71 (hereafter referred to as the Blickling manuscript), fols 65r-70r. The pagination of the manuscript used by Morris in his edition and Ker in his *Catalogue* has now been superseded, and therefore in the present article I use the current manuscript pagination, as set out by Scragg, 'The Homilies of the Blickling Manuscript', pp. 299-316 (p. 301 note 12). The date of the Blickling manuscript is not certain, but it is generally thought to have been written in the late tenth or early eleventh century.

⁶ The other composite text in question is Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Junius 121 article 33 (fols 148v-54v), which combines an extract from *Catholic Homilies I* 'In Dominica Palmarum', material resembling part of Blickling Homily VII and substantial unsourced sections which are probably the work of its compiler. It is edited by Anna Maria Luiselli Fadda, "'De descensu Christi ad inferos': Una inedita omelia anglosassone", *Studi Medievali*, 13 (1972), 989-1011, and discussed in Scragg, 'A Late Old English Harrowing of Hell Homily from Worcester and Blickling Homily VII', in *Latin Learning and English Lore: Studies in Anglo-Saxon Literature for Michael Lapidge*, ed. by Katherine O'Brien O'Keefe and Andy Orchard, 2 vols (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2005), II, 197-211, and in Swan, 'Ælfric as Source', pp. 94-104.

⁷ For a survey of all re-uses of the *Catholic Homilies*, see Swan, 'Ælfric as Source'.

⁸ It is interesting to note that this phrase also opens the piece which follows 'De Penitentia' in CUL, Gg. 3. 28; Ker item 96, a passage on Lenten duties: Pope, *Homilies of Ælfric*, II, 608.

⁹ For discussions of the latter two motifs in Old English literature, see J. E. Cross, "'Ubi Sunt" Passages in Old English – Sources and Relationships', *Vetenskaps Societeten i Lund Årsbok* (1956), 25-44; and J. E. Cross, 'The Dry Bones Speak – A Theme in Some Old English Homilies', *Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, 56 (1957), 434-39.

¹⁰ *The Blickling Homilies*, p. 115, ll. 4-12.

¹¹ 'then it shrivelled up in the hearts of Christ's holy ones, and now is blooming in our hearts as it is fitting.'

¹² Morris, *The Blickling Homilies*, p. 115, ll. 15-25.

¹³ Morris, *The Blickling Homilies*, p. 115, ll. 8-12.

¹⁴ Morris, *The Blickling Homilies*, p. 115, ll. 12-13.

¹⁵ CCCC 198, fol. 315v, ll. 22-23: 'and then it was all full of goodness and now it is diminishing and shameful'.

¹⁶ Morris, *The Blickling Homilies*, p. 115, ll. 15-25.

¹⁷ Scragg, 'Homilies of the Blickling Manuscript', p. 314, note 73.

¹⁸ For discussion of the range of transformations performed by compilers on *Catholic Homilies* items, see Swan, 'Ælfric as Source' and also Swan, 'Remembering Veronica in Anglo-

Saxon England' in *Representations of Women in Medieval Literature*, ed. by Elaine M. Treharne (Woodbridge: Boydell and Brewer, 2002), pp. 19-39; 'The Catholic Homilies in the Twelfth Century', in *Rewriting Old English in the Twelfth Century*, ed. by Elaine Treharne and Mary Swan (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), pp. 62-82; 'Memorialised Readings: Manuscript Evidence for Old English Homily Composition', in *Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts and their Heritage*, ed. by Elaine M. Treharne and Phillip Pulsiano (Ashgate: Aldershot, 1998), pp. 205-17; and 'Old English Made New: One Catholic Homily and its Reuses', *Leeds Studies in English*, n.s. 28 (1997), 1-18.

¹⁹ Michael Benskin and Margaret Laing, 'Translations and *Mischsprachen* in Middle English Manuscripts', in *So meny people longages and tonges: Philological Essays in Scots and Medieval English presented to Angus McIntosh*, ed. by Michael Benskin and M. L. Samuels (Edinburgh: Middle English Dialect Project, 1981), pp. 55-106 (p. 66).

²⁰ Benskin and Laing, 'Translations and *Mischsprachen*', p. 66.

²¹ The other two shared items are Blickling Homily XIII (*The Blickling Homilies*, pp. 137-59) /CCCC 198 article 54 (fols 350r-59r) and XVIII (*The Blickling Homilies*, pp. 229-49) /CCCC 198 article 64 (fols 386r-94v). Article 54 is reedited by Mary Clayton in *The Apocryphal Gospels of Mary in Anglo-Saxon England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), pp. 239-45.

²² Scragg, 'Homilies of the Blickling Manuscript', p. 315.

²³ Scragg, 'Homilies of the Blickling Manuscript', p. 313.

²⁴ Clayton, *Apocryphal Gospels of Mary*, p. 240.

²⁵ Mary Clayton, *The Cult of the Virgin Mary in Anglo-Saxon England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), p. 210, notes the accepted view that 'the language of Blickling seems to point to Mercia'.

²⁶ As summarised by Scragg, 'Homilies of the Blickling Manuscript', p. 313.

²⁷ Pope, *Homilies of Ælfric*, I, 22.

²⁸ Scragg, 'Homilies of the Blickling Manuscript', p. 313, note 60.

²⁹ CCCC 198 fol. 315v, l. 20; Morris, *The Blickling Homilies*, p. 115, ll. 8-12.

³⁰ My transcription of Blickling X here follows the manuscript, not Morris' edition.

³¹ I am grateful to Professor R. I. Page, former Librarian of the Parker Library, Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, for checking my readings from CCCC 198, and to Ms Gill Cannell, the Sub Librarian, for her assistance.

³² Benskin and Laing, 'Translations and *Mischsprachen*', p. 66.

³³ It is interesting to note that all of article 62 is written by a single scribe; Ker's scribe 8, who completed the last of the homilies in Part I of the manuscript, and also wrote a block of miscellaneous homilies which end Part II: Ker's block II, iii, of which article 62 is the fifth of eight items. Ker also identifies five lines of a possible ninth text in this block, which are now erased and illegible apart from a large initial H, but which are identified by the

sixteenth-century table of contents in the manuscript as a homily, 'De Virginitate' (Ker, *Catalogue*, pp. 80-82. The possibility exists, then, that Ker's scribe 8 is the 'organiser' of the second version of the manuscript (i.e. Parts I and II; not Part III, which is of slightly later date).

³⁴ Kevin Kiernan's argument for a common place of production for the *Beowulf*- and Blickling manuscripts (Kevin S. Kiernan, 'The Legacy of Wiglaf: Saving a Wounded *Beowulf*', in *Beowulf: Basic Readings*, ed. by Peter S. Baker (New York and London: Garland, 1995), pp. 195-218 (p. 208)) is worth noting here. If it is reasonable to assume that, at the time Part II CCCC 198 was copied, the Blickling manuscript was still in its place of production, and if the above comparison with CCCC 198 suggests that this place might be in the West Midlands, and possibly Worcester or perhaps Hereford, then these places and their local networks of scriptoria are worth considering as the possible milieu of production of all three manuscripts: CCCC 198, the Blickling manuscript and the *Beowulf*-manuscript. For further comments on the Blickling manuscript and Worcester, and on the connection between the Blickling manuscript and Junius 121, see Scragg, 'A Late Old English Harrowing of Hell Homily', especially p. 204.

³⁵ I am grateful to Donald Scragg and Orietta Da Rold for their very helpful comments on this essay and on CCCC 198, respectively.