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The subject of this paper is two late eleventh-century manuscripts in Durham Cathedral Library: A.III.29 and B.II.2, both of unknown origin but among the manuscripts recorded as a gift of William of St Carilef, Bishop of Durham (1080–96).¹ Gneuss describes them as companion volumes but, as we shall see, this statement needs careful qualification.² Each preserves, in part, versions of the homiliary of Paul the Deacon. They are of value for those studying the sources for the homilies of Ælfric because, although they post-date Ælfric, they are indicative of the manuscript traditions that might have been available in Anglo-Saxon England. Such manuscripts, taken in conjunction with what we can infer from Ælfric’s own output, assist us in building up an idea of the form of the homiliary that Ælfric knew.³

Ælfric’s extensive use of the Carolingian homiliary of Paul the Deacon was conclusively demonstrated by Cyril Smetana in 1959.⁴ No copies of Paul the Deacon’s original homiliary survive and the many recensions in circulation in the Middle Ages were much revised and augmented. In comparing the relationship between Ælfric’s Catholic Homilies and Paul the Deacon’s homiliary, Smetana therefore worked with the best account of the original that was then available: the reconstruction made by Wiegand in 1897.⁵ Once the case had been

² Helmut Gneuss, Handlist of Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts: A List of Manuscripts and Manuscript Fragments Written or Owned in England up to 1100, Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 241 (Tempe: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 2001), pp. 49 (no. 222) and 50 (no. 226) respectively.
³ The article is thus a contribution to the study of Old English literature, rather than of Middle English, on which Oliver Pickering’s research has focussed. However, Oliver has always worked with manuscripts, both in his own research and in his work as a librarian in the Special Collections of the University Library at Leeds, so I hope that the topic will be one that he will appreciate. Furthermore, since Oliver hails from County Durham, it seems appropriate to offer him a paper on two manuscripts which, for the past thousand years, have had their home in that county.
⁵ Friedrich Wiegand, Das Homiliarium Karls des Grossen auf seine ursprüngliche Gestalt hin untersucht, Studien zur Geschichte der Theologie und der Kirche, I.2 (Leipzig, 1897).
made for Ælfric’s use of this homiliary, it soon became clear that that the version in his manuscript was already modified and augmented to some degree (although probably to a far lesser degree than later came to be the case), and in 1985 Helmut Gneuss presented scholars with the resulting challenge: that ‘one of the foremost tasks of future research’ should be ‘to establish the version or versions of Paul’s Homiliary employed in the late Anglo-Saxon period’.\(^6\) In 2007 I responded to that challenge with a provisional analysis of Ælfric’s manuscript of Paul the Deacon’s homiliary.\(^7\) My point of comparison for the original form of the homiliary was no longer that of Wiegand mediated through Smetana (which is how Wiegand’s reconstruction has become familiar to scholars of Ælfric), but the much more reliable reconstruction published by Grégoire in 1980.\(^8\) In parallel with this I also made use of a number of manuscripts written or available in England by c. 1100 as a way of assessing the nature and extent of the range of modifications that could have been incorporated into Ælfric’s own copy.\(^9\)

Durham, Cathedral Library, MSS A.III.29 and B.II.2 are two of the significant pre-1100 survivals from England and their contents are itemized by Rud in his 1825 catalogue of the Cathedral’s manuscripts.\(^10\) Not surprisingly, given the state of scholarship at the time, he did not identify either of them as being recensions of the homiliary of Paul the Deacon. Now, however, we are able to analyse each in relation to the reconstructed original in order to demonstrate where they stand within the evolving traditions of this homiliary. The purpose of this paper is to augment Rud’s catalogue by cross-references to Grégoire’s reconstruction, and then to draw out some conclusions about the value of these particular manuscripts. In so doing, I will provide the detailed evidence that underlies the brief characterization of each manuscript in my 2007 study.

The method of presentation is the same for both manuscripts: the number of the folio (in the case of MS A.III.29) or page (in the case of MS B.II.2), rubric, incipit and author, all from Rud’s catalogue,\(^11\) followed by the modern folio number in the case of MS B.II.2, the homily number from Grégoire’s reconstruction of the original homiliary of Paul the Deacon, the roman numeral of the homily as given in the manuscript of MS B.II.2, the homily number from Grégoire’s reconstruction of the original homiliary of Paul the Deacon, the roman numeral of the homily as given in the manuscript (intermittently, and only in MS


\(^8\) Réginald Grégoire, Homéliaires liturgiques médiévaux: analyse des manuscrits, Biblioteca degli Studi Medevali, 12 (Spoleto: Centro Italiano di Studi sull’alto medioevo, 1980). The analysis of the homiliary of Paul the Deacon is on pp. 423–79, with the pars hiemalis being on pp. 430–49 and the pars aestiva on pp. 453–78. Where it is necessary in the following analysis to refer to supplementary information provided by Grégoire in relation to a given homily, I do not give individual footnotes, since the PD homily number is itself a precise location.

\(^9\) Further use is made of these manuscripts in the analysis of MS A.III.29: see below.


\(^11\) In each case the author’s name is that given by Rud, who follows the identification in the manuscript. Modern identifications may differ, in some cases because we recognize that many medieval attributions are pseudonymous. For each homily Grégoire provides the modern identification and details about where the printed text is to be found. Rud’s record of the rubric and his incipits are not always accurate to modern standards but are followed here (with expansions of his inconsistent abbreviations) in order to facilitate cross reference with his catalogue. Rud used modern foliation for MS. A.III.29, giving the folio number alone for the recto and using b for the verso. For MS B.II.2 he followed the old pagination, centrally positioned in the top margin of the right-hand pages only (thus odd numbers only). In the analysis below, I add the modern pencilled foliation.
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B.II.2., not recorded by Rud), and any further comment that may be needed. The roman numeral I, preceding the arabic number for the homily, indicates the *pars hiemalis* (Advent to Easter, the first half of the liturgical year) and II the *pars aestiva* (Easter to the end of the period after Pentecost, the second half of the year). PD will be used throughout as the standard abbreviation for Paul the Deacon’s homiliary in its (reconstructed) original form. Additional comments will be added at the relevant point to note such matters as lacunae, which are not dealt with by Rud and are not reflected in the numbering of the folios/pages, which run without breaks in each manuscript. Although Rud’s catalogue predates the present Victorian binding of both manuscripts, the degree of correspondence between his account of their contents and what is now extant suggests that any loss of leaves had already occurred by Rud’s time. MS B.II.2 will be treated first because it covers the first half of the liturgical year. It is also closer to the original than MS A.III.29 and so, in standing first in this analysis, serves as a reference point for the manuscript tradition and a basis for contrastively characterizing the stage of evolution reached by MS A.III.29.

**Durham, Cathedral Library, MS B.II.2**

The manuscript as it now survives is of 92 folios, written in two columns of between thirty-three and forty-five lines per page, in several hands. The present binding is of 1846. It is incomplete, being a sequence of homilies arranged in liturgical order now covering the period from Christmas to Holy Saturday (homily incomplete), although it is clear that it was originally a copy of the entire *pars hiemalis* of the homiliary of Paul the Deacon.

LACUNA Not noted by Rud, whose description starts with an item that begins on fol. 1v (equating to page 3 in Rud’s usage). The present fol. 1r begins part way through PD I 15, a homily by Pseudo-Origen for the Vigil of the Nativity. It ends on fol. 1v immediately before Rud’s first reported item.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Natalis Domini Dies</th>
<th>Lectio 1</th>
<th>Lectio 2</th>
<th>Lectio 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Isidorus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rud has here conflated and confused two separate items. The first item (for which Rud does not give a page number) should properly be *Natalis Domini: In Nocturno: Lectio 1, Lectio 2, Lectio 3*. This corresponds with Grégoire as follows:

PD I 15b *In Natale Domini. Nocte. Lectiones de esaia propheta*:

a) *Primo tempore adleviata est*: Is. 9. 1–8
b) *Consolamini, consolamini*: Is. 40. 1–17
c) *Consurge, consurge*: Is. 52. 1–10

PD I 15b lections (a) and (b) both begin on fol. 1v, corresponding to Rud’s page 4. Lection (c) begins on fol. 2r, corresponding to Rud’s page 5. There is a fourth lection from Isaiah in Grégoire’s reconstruction, which he evidently found in some of his relatively good witnesses. He is of the view, however, that it was not in the original. The fact that it is also not in MS B.II.2 is thus one of the indications that this manuscript is close to the original. *Natalis Domini Dies:*
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*Isidorus*, which begins on fol. 2v, Rud’s page 6, is a separate item, corresponding to PD I 16 (xvi).

Page 16  
*Homilia alia: Salvator noster dilectissimi.*  
*Leo papa*

Fol. 2v  
PD I 17 (xvii). Rud’s page number should read 6.

Page 8  
*Homilia alia: Exultemus in Domino dilectissimi*  
*Id*

Fol. 3v  
PD I 18 (xviii)

Page 10  
*Homilia alia: Cujientes aliquid de hujus diei*  
*Fulgentius*

Fol. 4v  
PD I 19 (xviii)

Page 13  
*Homilia alia: Justissime fratres in festivitate*  
*Maximus*

Fol. 6r  
PD I 20 (xx)

Page 15  
*Homilia alia: Hodie fratres karissimi Christus natus est*  
*Id*

Fol. 7r  
PD I 21 (xxi)

Page 17  
*Homilia alia: In adventu Dominico fratres karissimi*  
*Id*

Fol. 9r  
PD I 22 (xxii)

Page 18  
*Homilia alia: Hodierni mysterij Sacramentum*  
*Id*

Fol. 8v  
PD I 23 (xxiii)

Very little of this homily is preserved before a lacuna begins, which is not noted by Rud.

LACUNA

Page 19  
Sancti Stephani: *Ad aquas Tibilitanas*  
*Augustinus*

Fol. 9r  
PD I 29 (xxviii [sic])

Although Rud does not note it, the text immediately preceding the opening of PD I 29 on page 19 is the end of PD I 28, which indicates that the now lost pages continued to follow the order of the original homiliary.

Page 22  
*Homilia alia: Ecce ego mitto ad vos prophetas*  
*e Com.Hieron.*

Fol. 10v  
PD I 30 (no MS number)

Page 24  
Sancti Johannis: *Johannes Apostolus & Evangelista*  
*Isidorus*

Fol. 11v  
PD I 31 (no MS number)

Page 25  
*Homilia alia: Audi fabulam, et non fabulam*  
*Ex histor.Eccl.*

Fol. 12r  
PD I 32 (no MS number)

Page 27  
*Homilia alia: Lectio Sancti Evangeliij que nobis lecta*  
*Beda*

Fol. 13r  
PD I 33 (no MS number)

Page 32  
*Natalis Innocentium: Zelus quo tendat, quo prosiliat livor*  
*Severianus*

Fol. 15v  
PD I 34 (xxxi)

Page 34  
*Homilia alia: Dedicatur novus ab infantibus sermo*  
*B.Joan.[Chrys]*

Fol. 16v  
PD I 35 (xxv)

Rud fails to list the next item, which begins on fol. 17v, corresponding to Rud’s p. 36. It is a homily by Bede, which is PD I 36, numbered xxvi in the manuscript.

Page 40  
*Octabæ Domini. Id. Kl. [Kalendæ] Januarij: Quanquam non dubitem*  
*Maximus*

Fol. 19v  
PD I 37 (xxxvii)

Page 41  
*De Circumcisione Domini: Quod mortuus est Christus peccato*  
*Origines*

Fol. 20r  
PD I 38 (xxxviii)

PD I 39, drawn from Ambrose’s *Expositio evangeli secundum Lucam*, with the lection Luke 2. 55–57, is omitted from the manuscript. There is no lacuna.
Rud’s itemization is here incomplete. The manuscript in fact agrees precisely with the original homiliary as reconstructed by Grégoire, who itemizes two parts:

PD I 41 (a) *Congregamus in unum*, which is Origen’s homily 16. This is followed by Origen’s homily 17, beginning *Lucas qui scriptit*, although it is not treated by Grégoire as a separate item, presumably because it was not so marked in his primary manuscripts.

PD I 41 (b) *Et ut perfecerunt omnia*, which is a homily drawn from Bede’s *In Lucae evangeliwm expositio*.

MS B.II.2 follows this exactly. PD 141 (a) begins on page 47 as noted by Rud (fol. 23r); the second element, *Lucas scripsit* (*qui* is omitted) begins on page 49 (fol. 24r); and PD I 41 begins on page 51 (fol. 25r). The three parts are written as one continuous text with nothing to distinguish where the respective elements begin. The manuscript has no roman numeral for this item.

PD I 44, a further homily for Epiphany by Leo, is omitted from the manuscript. There is no lacuna.

PD I 44, a further homily for Epiphany by Leo, is omitted from the manuscript. There is no lacuna.

LACUNA Not noted by Rud. The text immediately preceding the opening of PD I 54 on page 72 (fol. 35v) is the end of PD I 53, which indicates that the now lost pages continued to follow the order of the original homiliary.

Rud fails to list the next item, which begins on page 73 (fol. 36r). It is a homily attributed to Maximus. PD I 55 (iv)

Page 74  *Homilia alia: Justum et rationabile dilectissimi*  Leo

Page 76  *Homilia alia: Hodiernam festivitatem dilectissimi*  Idem
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Page 78  Octabæ Epiphanie [sic: recte Theophania]:
Lectio Sancti Evangij quam mode fratres  Beda
Fol. 38v  PD I 58 (lviii)

Page 82  Homilia alia:
Dominica 1° post Theophania [rubric not recorded by Rud]
Aperta nobis est fratres karissimi  Beda
Fol. 40v  PD I 59 (no MS number)

Page 85  Dominica 2° post Teoppania [Theo.] [sic]
[recte Theophania]
Quod Dominus noster atque Salvator  Idem
Fol. 42r  PD I 60 (no MS number)

Page 90  Tertia post Theophania: Docente in monte Domino  Origines
Fol. 44v  PD I 61 (lxi)

Page 96  Natalis Sancte Agnetis: Dum in toto mundo virgineus flos  Maximus
Fol. 47v  PD I 62 (no MS number)

Page 98  Homilia alia: Immaculatus Dominus  Ambrosius
Fol. 48v  PD I 63 (lxiii)

Page 99  Dominica 4° post Epiphania:
Ingredientae Domino in naviculo  Origines
Fol. 49r  PD I 64 (no MS number)

Page 102  Purificatio beate Marie: Exulient Virgines, Virgo Maria  Augustinus
Fol. 50v  PD I 65 (lx)

Page 103  Homilia alia: Non solum ab Angelis & Prophetis  Ambrosius
Fol. 51r  PD I 66 (no MS number)

Page 104  Homilia alia: Solennitatem nobis hodiernae  Beda
Fol. 51v  PD I 67 (no MS number)

Page 107  Septuagesima: Dignitas humanæ originis
Fol. 53r  PD I 68, a homily by John Chrysostom. Space has been left in the manuscript for the rubric and the identification of the author, but the blank means that the author is not identified by Rud. Dominica Septuagesima was added much later.

Page 108  Homilia alia: in explanatione sua multa  Gregorius
Fol. 53v  PD I 69 (no MS number)

Page 112  Sexagesima: de lapsu primi hominis:
Nemo est qui nesciat, in principio  B.Joan.[Chrys]
Fol. 55v  PD I 70 (lxx)

Page 113  Homilia alia: Lectio Sancti Evangeli quam modo  Gregorius
Fol. 56r  PD I 71 (no MS number)

Page 116  Quinquagesima: de fide Abraham & immolatione Isaac:
Fides et Religiones Sanctissime  B.Joan.[Chrys]
Fol. 57r  PD I 72 (lxxii)

Page 118  Homilia alia: Redemtor noster previdens  Gregorius
Fol. 58v  PD I 73 (lxxiii)

Page 120  Quadragesima: Licet nobis dilectissimi appropinquante  Leo
Fol. 60v  PD I 74 (lxxiii)

Page 121  Quadragesima: Homilia alia: Ante dies devotionem Sancte  Maximus
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fol.</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Homily</th>
<th>Author</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>61r</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>Homilia alia: Dubitari a quibusdam solet</td>
<td>Gregorius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>It is the homily proper that begins on page 123. The pericope begins the previous page.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61v</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>Homilia alia: Semper quidem nos diecstissimi</td>
<td>Leo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62r</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>Homilia alia: Predicaturus vobis diecstissimi</td>
<td>Idem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63r</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>Homilia alia: Apostolica diecstissimi doctrina</td>
<td>Idem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63v</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>Homilia alia: Audistis karissimi sicat Evangelica</td>
<td>Maximus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64v</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>Homilia alia: Conflictus iste mirabilis quem</td>
<td>Idem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65r</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>Homilia alia: Adverte fratres karissimi quanta nobis</td>
<td>Idem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65v</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>Homilia alia: Peractum ad Domino nostro Jesu Christo</td>
<td>Idem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66r</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>Homilia alia: quia nonnullorum est consuetudo</td>
<td>Idem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66v</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>Dominica 1\textsuperscript{st} Quadragesimae: de Jacobo et Esau. Portabat Rebecca geminos in utero</td>
<td>B.Joan.[Chry.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67v</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>Homilia alia: Miratur Evangelista: Ecce mulier</td>
<td>Idem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The author of this homily is not given in the manuscript. Rud’s idem attributed it to John Chrysostom. It is the only homily in the surviving parts of this manuscript that is not included in Grégoire’s reconstruction of the original homiliary of Paul the Deacon.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70r</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>Homilia alia: Evangelica Lectio diecstissimi</td>
<td>Leo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71r</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>Homilia alia: Quia Dominus et Redemtor</td>
<td>Beda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71r</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>Dominica 2\textsuperscript{nd} Quadragesimae: de Joseph: Mittitur a Jacob Patre Sanctissimo</td>
<td>B.Joan.[Chry.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73r</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>Homilia alia: de Conversione Peccati. Confitemini Domino quoniam bonus est</td>
<td>Idem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75r</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>Dominica 2\textsuperscript{nd} Quadragesimae: Homilie 3\textsuperscript{rd}: Daemoniacus iste apud Matheum</td>
<td>Beda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74v</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>Dominica 3\textsuperscript{rd} Quadragesimae: de Moyse. Stabat Moyses in monte, non armis</td>
<td>B.Joan.[Chry.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76r</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LACUNA Not noted by Rud. PD I 91 lacks its ending. The text immediately preceding the opening of PD I 93 on page 156, fol. 77v, is the end of PD I 92, which indicates that the now lost pages continued to follow the order of the original homiliary.

**Durham, Cathedral Library, MS A.III.29**

The manuscript as it now survives is of 346 folios, written in long lines across the width of the page, with thirty-five lines per page, in several hands. The present binding is of 1846. It is in two parts: first a *temporale* for the period from Easter to the Twenty-fifth Sunday after Pentecost (the *pars aestiva*) and a *sanctorale* for the period from May to December. Paul the Deacon’s original homiliary interwove *temporale* and *sanctorale* homilies in one sequence, as indeed we have seen to be the case with Durham, Cathedral Library, MS B.II.2. However, this mode of organization presented subsequent users with considerable difficulties because the calendrical basis for the *temporale* and *sanctorale* differ: the *temporale* for the most part using the lunar calendar, with feast-days being tied to the movable feast of Easter (Christmas and Epiphany being the exceptions); and the *sanctorale* using the solar calendar, with fixed dates for each of the saints’ days. The position of a given saint’s day relative to a given movable *temporale* observance would thus differ from year to year. One way of solving this problem was to separate out the *temporale* and *sanctorale* items. Durham, Cathedral Library, MS A.III.29 is a case in point. There are also other modifications in MS A.III.29 within the *temporale*, as will be noted. Additionally, the *sanctorale* element of this manuscript extends over a longer period of the year than the *pars aestiva* of Paul the Deacon’s homiliary, although its starting point, at 1 May, the Feast of Saints Philip and James, is the first of the saints’ days in the *pars aestiva* of the homiliary in its original form. I do not deal here with the extended *sanctorale*, which occupies folios 161–347, since the *temporale* alone provides an effective basis for comparison with MS B.II.2 and indicates the place that MS A.III.29 holds within the general manuscript tradition of Paul the Deacon’s homiliary.

In the course of the following analysis, reference will be made to three other manuscripts containing Paul the Deacon’s *temporale* homilies for this part of the year: Cambridge, Pembroke College, MS 23 (Gneuss no. 129, s. xi2, originating in France, perhaps Saint-Denis, provenance Bury St Edmunds); Cambridge, University Library, MS II.2.19 (Gneuss no. 16, s. xi/xii, provenance Norwich); and Worcester, Cathedral Library, MS F 93 (Gneuss no. 763.1, s.xi/xii or xiiin, provenance Worcester). They were all available in England by c. 1100 or very soon after. In all three cases the *sanctorale* material is separately presented.

All three of these manuscripts, in common with MS A.III.29, share one further major modification in that they rubricate the Sundays from Pentecost to the end of the liturgical year in one continuous numbered sequence, either from Pentecost itself or from its Octave. This method of dealing with the Sundays of Ordinary Time was an early ninth-century Carolingian innovation. The original homiliary of Paul the Deacon rubricates only three Sundays as *post Pentecosten*. For the remainder of the long post-Pentecost period, he followed the tradition,

---


13 Gneuss, *Handlist*, pp. 40, 28 and 762 respectively. I am grateful to the following for permission to consult these manuscripts: The Master and Fellows of Pembroke College Cambridge, the Librarian of the University of Cambridge, and the Dean and Chapter of Worcester Cathedral.
established by c. 600, of numbering Sundays in successive batches, counting from various fixed dates: Natale Apostolorum (29 June), Natale S. Laurentii (10 August), Natale S. Angeli (the Archangel Michael, 29 September).[^14] Natale S. Cypriani (14 September) was sometimes also used in this way, but not by Paul in his homiliary. However, as I have explained elsewhere, this was inherently problematic for subsequent users of the homiliary because Pentecost, to which the Sunday lections and thus homilies were tied, is a movable feast, dependent on the lunar calendar which determines the date of Easter and the following feast-days that are governed by it, whereas the dates from which the batches of Sundays were counted are fixed dates within the solar calendar. Their relative position one to the other thus changed year on year.[^15] Very soon after Paul the Deacon’s homiliary was issued, the compilers of Carolingian homiliaries realised that the problem could be solved by counting the post-Pentecost Sundays in one unbroken sequence. Not only were the new homiliaries rubricated in this way, but the new style of rubricating these Sundays replaced Paul the Deacon’s older method as copies were made. Ælfric likewise employed the method of continuous counting from Pentecost and, given his method of working, it is reasonable to suppose that his manuscript of Paul the Deacon’s homiliary also used the new-style rubrications.[^16] Grégoire’s reconstruction, of course, uses the older style.

**Folio 1**

*Præfatio*

This entry in Rud’s catalogue is a puzzle. Folio 1 begins with Rud’s second item. There is no prefatory material and no over-all heading.

**Folio 1b**

*Sic incipit: Juxta Matheum, Vespere*

PD II 1. Jerome. Rud’s catalogue is in error: the homily is the first item in the manuscript, and begins at the top of fol. 1 (that is, 1a).

**Folio 1b**

*In Paschate: Vigilias nobis hujus sacratissime noctis*

*Bedæ*

PD II 2

**Folio 4b**

*De die Pasche: Non immerito fratres hodierna die*

*Maximius*

PD II 3

**Folio 5b**

*De die Pasche Homilia alia: Magnum fratres et mirabile donum*

*Maximius*

PD II 4

Rud fails to list the next item, which has its rubric at the bottom of folio 6. It is PD II 6, a homily of Maximus. The *incipit* is at the top of fol. 6b and is heavily trimmed.

**Folio 7b**

*De Resurrectione: Multis vobis lectionibus fratres*

*Gregoriæ*

PD II 5

**Folio 9b**

*De Festi Paschalis Feria 2: Exultandum in hac die quam fecit Domino.*

*Maximius*

PD II 7

Rud fails to list the next item, which begins at the top of folio 11b, although it is heavily trimmed. It is PD II 8, a homily of Maximus.


[^16]: Hill, Ælfric’s Manuscript of Paul the Deacon’s Homiliary’, pp. 83–86.
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Folio 12  *Homilia altera: In cotidiana nobis solemnitate*  Gregorius
PD II 9

Folio 13  *3ª Gloriosam sue resurrectionis*  Beda
PD II 10

Folio 15b  *4ª Lectio Sancti Evangelij*  Gregorius
PD II 11

Folio 18  *5ª Maria Magdalene que fuerat*  idem
PD II 12

Folio 22  *6ª Evangelica lectio fratres karissimi*  Beda
PD II 13

Folio 25  *In Sabbato: Fractus longa molestia*  Gregorius
This is homily 22 of Gregory’s *Homiliae in Evangelia*. It was one of the small number of Gregory’s gospel homilies not included in the original homiliary of Paul the Deacon, but it seems to have been a relatively early augmentation since it is also found for this day in Pembroke 23, CUL II.2.19, and Worcester Cathedral F 93. Since these manuscripts are not related to each other, the inclusion of Gregory’s homily in all of them is particularly telling. As I have argued elsewhere, it is possible that it was already present in Ælfric’s copy of Paul the Deacon’s homiliary.17

Folio 28b  *In Dominica 1ª post Albas: Prima lectionis*  idem
PD II 15

Folio 32b  *2ª Audivimus Dominum Jesum*  Augustinus
Not sourced

Folio 35b  *Alia homilia. Audivimus fratres karissimi*  Gregorius
PD II 20. Rud does not provide a folio number.

Folio 37b  *2ª post Octavas Pasche: Læta Domini et Salvatoris nostri*  Beda
PD II 21

Folio 39b  *3ª Sicut ex lectione Evangelica*  idem
PD II 22

Folio 42b  *4ª Potest movere infirmos auditores*  idem
PD II 24. In fact, the rubric and pericope are on fol. 42a; it is the homily itself that begins on fol. 42b. PD II 23, for the Feast of Saints Philip and James on 1 May, is the first of the sanctorale items in the original *pars aestiva*. In this manuscript it stands as the first item in the separately constituted sanctorale part, beginning on folio 161.18

---

17 Hill, ‘Ælfric’s Manuscript of Paul the Deacon’s Homiliary’, pp. 74–79.
18 Most of the subsequent gaps in the PD numbering sequence within the temporale sequence in MS A.III.29 are because the items in question belong to the separated-out sanctorale sequence, which occupies the later part of the manuscript. They are not commented upon individually in the following analysis since their reason for their removal from the temporale is obvious from the information in Grégoire’s account of the original homiliary, where temporale and sanctorale items are interwoven.
Joyce Hill

**Folio 45**  
*In Feria 2
de, in Litania majore*  
*Quoniam Jejuniorum tempus est*  
Augustinus PD II 18  
It will be noted that PD II 18 and PD II 17 and 19, which follow, are moved out of sequence as a group. As I have shown elsewhere, this is because, for Paul the Deacon, the Major Litany, following the Roman tradition, was 15 April.\(^{19}\) In the original homiliary, therefore, as reconstructed by Grégoire, his choice of homilies for what he knew as the Major Litany was positioned closer to Easter, although, of course, 15 April does not stand in a constant relationship to Easter, which moves annually. However, in Francia and, following this tradition, also in Anglo-Saxon England, the term ‘Major Litanies’ was applied to the three days immediately preceding Ascension Day. We accordingly find manuscript recensions of Paul the Deacon’s homiliary in which an adjustment is made by moving the original choice of homilies for one day (that is, 15 April) to the days leading up to Ascension, where they can be distributed over the days in question. The present manuscript illustrates this very clearly. In the majority of manuscripts used by Grégoire for his reconstruction of the original, the attribution of PD II 18 is to Maximus, although he notes that it is attributed to Augustine in one of the Vatican manuscripts that he consulted. The Durham manuscript agrees with this, as also does CUL II.2.19. In fact, as Grégoire indicates, the homily used as PD II 18 is now identified as a Pseudo-Augustine homily.

**Folio 46**  
*In eadem Feria: Audivimus nos exhortatum Dominum*  
*idem* Not sourced. Rud reports the rubric incorrectly. It reads ‘In eadem die maioris letanie’.

**Folio 49**  
*In Feriâ 3
de, Legimus in Prophetis, cum Ninive*  
Maximus PD II 17. Rud reports the rubric incorrectly. It reads ‘Feria in letania maiore’.

**Folio 50**  
*In eadem [die]: Rogatus a Discipulis*  
*Beda* PD II 19

**Folio 53**  
*In Feria 4
de de Jejunio Ninivitarum*  
B.Joan.Episc.  
*Clementissimus, Omnipotens Deus*  
*Chrysostomus* PD II 130  
Rud reports the rubric incorrectly. Its opening reads *In Feria IIII in letania maiore*… This homily is brought forward from the end of the original homiliary, which provided items for the Common of the Saints and *quando uolueris* homilies. PD II 130 is one such: judging from the manuscripts on which Grégoire based his reconstruction, it bore the rubric *In Letania quando uolueris*.

**Folio 55**  
*In eadem, Vigilia Ascensionis: Glorificatum a Patre Filium*  
Augustinus PD II 25

An Unmatched Pair

Folio 57b  In Ascensione Domini:
Post beatam et gloriosam Resurrectionem  Leo
PD II 26

Folio 58  In eadem: Sacramentum dilectissimi salutis  idem
PD II 27

Folio 59b  In eadem: Hodie Dominus Jesus Christus ascendit  Augustinus
Not sourced

Folio 61  In eadem: Quod Resurrectionem Dominicum  Gregorius
PD II 28

[no fol.]  In Sabbato post Ascensionem:
Sacramentum dilectissimi v. supra  [No name]
This begins on fol. 63b. It is in fact an explanatory note that a certain Leonine homily is not being included at this point. As far as one can tell from the information provided, the homily in question is PD 27, already included at fol. 58. There is no recognition of this in the manuscript, however, the v. supra being Rud’s own note.

Folio 64  In Dominica post Ascensionem:
Ex multis Sancti Evangelij locis  Beda
PD II 29. The homily begins on fol. 64, but the rubric and pericope are on fol. 63b.

Folio 68  In Vigilia Pentecostes:
Quia Sancti Spiritus hodie celebramus  idem
PD II 30

Folio 72  In die Pentecostes: Hodiernam solennitatem dilectissimi  Leo
PD II 31

Rud fails to list the next item, which begins on fol. 73b. It is PD II 32, a homily of Leo. In Grégoire’s reconstruction, and here, it stands as the second of two Leonine homilies for Pentecost, without a separate rubric.

Folio 75  In eadem: Hodiernam dilectissimi festivitatem  idem
PD II 34

Folio 76  In eadem: Libet fratres karissimi Evangelice lectionis  Gregorius
[recte: verba lectionis]
PD II 33

Folio 79b  In Feria 2da: Nosse credo vos fratres que sit ratio  Maximus
PD II 35

Folio 80b  3a: Non incommode, ante dies complures  idem
PD II 36

Folio 81b  Dominica 1ma post Pentecosten: de Golia Davide victo:
Dominus Deus, cum David Regem  Chrysostomus
PD II 56. In the original homiliary this homily is one of two rubricated for the First Sunday after the Feast of the Apostles (that is, the Apostles Peter and Paul) celebrated on 29 June.

Folio 83  Dominica 1ma post Pentecosten:
Sicut ex lectione Sancti Evangelij  Beda
PD II 16
Folio 88b  
*In 2\textsuperscript{da}, de Absalone: Perdidit Absalon sceletissimus mentem*  
Chrysostomus  
PD II 59. Correctly fol. 88 (that is, 88a).

Folio 89b  
*In eadem: In verbis sacris eloqui*  
Gregorius  
This additional homily for the Second Sunday after Pentecost is homily 40 of Gregory’s *Homiliae in Evangelia*. It was one of the small number of Gregory’s gospel homilies not included in the original homiliary of Paul the Deacon, but it seems to have been a relatively early augmentation since it is found in Pembroke 23, CUL Ii.2.19, and Worcester Cathedral F 93. Since these manuscripts are not directly related, the inclusion of Gregory’s homily in all of them is particularly telling. As I have shown elsewhere, it is possible that Gregory’s Homily 40 was already present in Ælfric’s copy of Paul the Deacon’s homiliary.

Folio 95  
*Dominica 3\textsuperscript{a}: Hoc distare fratres*  
*idem*  
PD II 38. Correctly fol. 96.

Folio 100b  
*Dominica 4\textsuperscript{a}: Estivum tempus, quod corpori*  
*idem*  
PD II 39

Folio 107  
*Dominica 5\textsuperscript{a}: Misericors est Deus super ingratos*  
Beda  
This is drawn from Bede’s *In Lucae evangelium expositio*: the exegesis of Luke 6. 36–37. In Paul the Deacon’s homiliary this lection is used for the First Sunday after Pentecost. The homily, which is PD II 37, is likewise drawn from Bede’s Commentary. However, the correspondence with what we have in MS A.III.29 is not quite exact because the extract in the Durham manuscript begins slightly earlier than that in PD II 37. This earlier starting point, which agrees better with the lection, is also found in Pembroke 23, CUL Ii.2.19, and Worcester Cathedral F 93.

Folio 108b  
*Dominica 6\textsuperscript{a}: Stagnum Genersaret idem dicunt esse*  
*idem*  
PD II 57. In the original homiliary this homily is one of two rubricated for the First Sunday after the Feast of the Apostles (that is, the Apostles Peter and Paul) celebrated on 29 June.

Folio 110  
*Dominica 7\textsuperscript{a}: Qui putant precepta veteris Test.*  
*idem [sic]*  
This is not in the original homiliary of Paul the Deacon. The manuscript has a space for the rubric and attribution, but none is provided. There is no basis in the manuscript for Rud ascribing it to Bede (his *idem*: referring back to the homily beginning on folio 107). The same lection, beginning at Matthew 20. 5, is used for PD II 58, where the source is Augustine’s *De sermone Domini in monte*.

Folio 112b  
*Dominica 8\textsuperscript{a}:*  
*In hac lectione fratres carissimi consideranda est*  
*idem*  
PD II 60. The pericope begins on fol. 112 (that is, 112a).

Folio 114b  
*Dominica 9\textsuperscript{a}: Quod Paulo superius fratres, karissimi [punctuated thus]*  
Origines Catholice correctus  
PD II 61

---

20 Hill, ‘Ælfric’s Manuscript of Paul the Deacon’s Homiliary’, pp. 74–79.
An Unmatched Pair

Folio 118  Dominica 10\textsuperscript{ma}: Quis sit villicus iniquitatis  Hieronymus
PD II 62

Folio 120  Eadem: Lectionem brevem Sancti Evangelij  Gregorius
This additional homily for the Tenth Sunday after Pentecost is homily 39 of Gregory’s Homiliae in Evangelia. It was one of the small number of Gregory’s gospel homilies not included in the original homiliary of Paul the Deacon, but it seems to have been a relatively early augmentation since it is found in Pembroke 23, CUL II.2.19, and Worcester Cathedral F 93. Since these manuscripts are not directly related, the inclusion of Gregory’s homily in all of them is particularly telling. As I have argued elsewhere, it is possible that Gregory’s Homily 39 was already present in Ælfric’s copy of Paul the Deacon’s homiliary.\textsuperscript{21}

Folio 124b  Dominica 11\textsuperscript{ma}: Quia Parabolam Dominus qua semper  Beda
PD II 64

Folio 125b  Dominica 12\textsuperscript{ma}: Surdus ille et mutus quen mirabilit idem
PD II 69

Folio 128  Dominica 13\textsuperscript{ma}: Non oculi Scribarum & Phariseorum idem
This homily continues to the end of fol. 128b but is incomplete since there is a lacuna after this folio. The homily is drawn from Bede’s In Lucae evangelium exposition: the exegesis of Luke 10. 23–25. In Paul the Deacon’s homiliary this lection is rubricated for the Fourth Sunday after the Feast of the Apostles, using the old method of post-Pentecost rubrication. The homily, which is PD II 63, is likewise drawn from Bede’s Commentary. However, the correspondence with what we have in MSA.III.29 is not quite exact because the extract in the Durham manuscript begins slightly earlier than that in PD II 63. This earlier starting point, which agrees better with the lection, is also found in Pembroke 23, CUL II.2.19 and Worcester Cathedral F 93.

LACUNA Noted by Rud because, as his comment indicates, there is a comment in the manuscript: Homiliæ hæ desunt. This is written in the top margin in a hand of s.xiv/xv.

Dominicae 14\textsuperscript{a}, et 15\textsuperscript{a}: ‘Homiliæ hæ desunt: et defectus iste (ut nota adscripta indicat) recens non est
The ending of the homily for the Fifteenth Sunday after Pentecost is present on fol. 129, showing that it is PD II 75. In the original homiliary of Paul the Deacon it is rubricated for Dominica III post sancti Laurentii, following the older method of dealing with Sundays after Pentecost.

Folio 129b  Dominica 16\textsuperscript{a} post Pentecosten: Nam civitas est Galilee  Beda
PD II 76a only. The rubric actually begins on the last line of fol. 129 (that is, 129a). PD II 76b does not belong to the temporale, being a homily for the Nativity of the Virgin.

Folio 130b  17\textsuperscript{ma} post Pentecosten: Hydropis morbus ad aquoso humore idem
PD II 80

\textsuperscript{21} Hill, Ælfric’s Manuscript of Paul the Deacon’s Homiliary’, pp. 74–79.
Folio 131b  In Jejunio Septimi mensis:
Scio guidem, diletissimi, plurimos
PD II 85. The homily is by Leo, although there is no attribution in this manuscript and consequently no author is named by Rud. The rubric In Jejunio Septimi mensis is a post-medieval addition.

Folio 132b  In eodem die Sabbati mensis 7m:
Dominus et Redemtor noster Gregorius
PD II 86

Folio 134b  Rud notes a further homily by Augustine, following the manuscript’s attribution, on the same lection as the immediately preceding homily (Luke 13. 6–13). This is not in Paul the Deacon’s homiliary as reconstructed by Grégoire.

Folio 136b  18m post Pentecosten:
Convenerunt in multitudine vincerent Chrysost[o] [sic]
PD II 90

Folio 139b  19m post Pentecosten: Christum in humanis actibus divina idem
PD II 89

Folio 141  Rud notes a further homily on the same lection as the immediately preceding homily (Matthew 9. 1–2), beginning ‘Marcus non hoc in civitate ejus’. There is no attribution. This is not in Paul the Deacon’s homiliary as reconstructed by Grégoire.

Folio 142b  20m post Pentecosten: Textum Evanglicæ lectionis Gregorius
The homily for the Twentieth Sunday after Pentecost is homily 38 of Gregory’s Homiliae in Evangelia. It was one of the small number of Gregory’s gospel homilies not included in the original homiliary of Paul the Deacon, but it seems to have been a relatively early augmentation since it is found in Pembroke 23, CUL II.2.19. and Worcester Cathedral F 93. Since these manuscripts are not directly related, the inclusion of Gregory’s homily in all of them is particularly telling. As I have argued elsewhere, it is possible that Gregory’s Homily 38 was already present in Ælfric’s copy of Paul the Deacon’s homiliary.22

Folio 149  21m post Pentecosten: Lectio Sancti Evangelij quam modo Gregorius
The homily for the Twentieth Sunday after Pentecost is homily 28 of Gregory’s Homiliae in Evangelia. It was one of the small number of Gregory’s gospel homilies not included in the original homiliary of Paul the Deacon, but it seems to have been a relatively early augmentation since it is found in Pembroke 23, CUL II.2.19. and Worcester Cathedral F 93. Since these manuscripts are not directly related, the inclusion of Gregory’s homily in all of them is particularly telling. Ælfric does not make use of this homily but we cannot thereby deduce that it was not present in his copy of the homiliary since, as I have explained elsewhere, there are good reasons why he did not do so.23

22 Hill, ‘Ælfric’s Manuscript of Paul the Deacon’s Homiliary’, pp. 74–79.
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Folio 150b 22\textsuperscript{nd} post Pentecosten:

\textit{Cum Evangelium fratres karissimi amnonet}

Augustinus

Not sourced. It does not correspond exactly to PD II 93, which is also by Augustine and on the same lection.

Folio 153 23\textsuperscript{rd} post Pentecosten:

\textit{Querentes Dominum comprehendere Principes}

PD II 95. The homily is drawn from Bede’s \textit{In Lucae evanglium expositio}
although there is no attribution in this manuscript and consequently no author is named by Rud.

Folio 154 24\textsuperscript{th} post Pentecosten. Matheus Archisinagogum

This is not in the original homiliary of Paul the Deacon. There is no attribution in this manuscript and consequently no author is named by Rud.

The same homily, likewise unattributed, is found in Worcester Cathedral F 93. It is not included in Pembroke 23 or CUL Ii.2.19. The lection is the same as that of PD II 96.

Folio 157 25\textsuperscript{th} post Pentecosten: Hec secunda parabola est

PD II 92a. The homily is by Jerome and is drawn from his \textit{Commentaria in Evangelium Matthiae}, although there is no attribution in this manuscript and consequently no author is named by Rud. In Paul the Deacon’s original homiliary, which follows the older method of rubricating the Sundays after Pentecost, this is one of two homilies for \textit{Dominica III post sancti Angeli} (that is, the Feast of the Archangel Michael on 29 September). In MS A.III.29 it has been transposed to the last Sunday in the liturgical year. The same transposition is found in Pembroke 23. It is not in CUL Ii.2.19 or Worcester Cathedral F 93.

Rud notes another item under the same rubric, attributed to Jerome. As Grégoire shows, the original homiliary of Paul the Deacon had a two-part item for \textit{Dominica III post sancti Angeli}. The second item in A.III.29 corresponds to this: it is PD II 92b. The homily for the Last Sunday after Pentecost in Cambridge, Pembroke College MS 23 has the same two-part structure.

Conclusion

Durham, Cathedral Library, MS B II.2 is an extraordinarily faithful copy of the original homiliary of Paul the Deacon. From the parts that survive only two of the original homilies were omitted (PD I 39 and PD I 44); once the misbinding has been taken into account, we see that nothing was out of order; and there is only one homily that is not in the original as reconstructed by Grégoire, even though this homiliary was subject from the outset to ever-increasing augmentation and modification. What is also remarkable is that many of the homilies are numbered by the scribes as an integral part of the rubric and almost all of these bear the correct number according to Paul the Deacon’s original homiliary; in the four instances where the number is wrongly given the error is always with minims. Even more striking is the fact that, when the numbering begins again after a break, it is invariably accurate. This further confirms that the scribe was working from a good quality copy-text which was very close to the original. Yet the importance of this manuscript for the study of
the transmission of Paul the Deacon’s homiliary has not been recognized: Grégoire makes no reference to it even though he was not averse to using eleventh-century manuscripts.

Durham, Cathedral Library, MS A.III.29, by contrast, though not as heavily augmented as Paul the Deacon’s homiliary later came to be, includes some additional items which seem to have been relatively early augmentations. It is also radically restructured in that the *temporale* and *sanctorale* items are separated out. This accounts for many of the apparent ‘missing’ items in the analysis above since for the most part they are *sanctorale* homilies and so do not qualify for inclusion in the separated-out *temporale* sequence. There is also some re-ordering, most systematically in respect of the Major Litanies but also involving the movement of other individual items. Finally, this manuscript uses the new-style rubrication for the Sundays after Pentecost. In all of these ways, it illustrates a stage in the evolution of the homiliary of Paul the Deacon that has carried it some way from the original, as is also the case for the other recensions written or available in England by c. 1100. It is MS B II.2 that is the odd one out.

It was, of course, possible to use MS B II.2 and MS A.III.29 as companion manuscripts. The former provides for the *pars hiemalis*, from Advent at the beginning of the liturgical year to Easter (if we assume, as the evidence strongly suggests, that the material on the pages now missing from the beginning of the manuscript followed the original homiliary), and it furnishes material for both the *temporale* and *sanctorale*, interwoven as in Paul the Deacon’s original; and the latter provides for the *pars aestiva*, with the *temporale* and *sanctorale* separated out, the *temporale* covering Easter to the final Sunday after Pentecost, and the *sanctorale* extending from May to December, which in fact provides an overlap with MS B II.2. In one sense, therefore, it is reasonable for Gneuss to refer to each as a ‘companion’ of the other. But they were not designed that way, as we see from their differences in layout on the page and over-all organization. Indeed, the two Durham manuscripts derive from different traditions of transmission and occupy different positions within the evolution of Paul the Deacon’s homiliary. It would therefore be more accurate to describe them as ‘an unmatched pair’.

In this they are unlike some other recensions of this homiliary which are genuinely companion volumes: see my summary accounts in ‘Ælfric’s Manuscript of Paul the Deacon’s Homiliary’, pp. 91–92.