

Leeds Studies in English

New Series XLI

2010

Essays in Honour of Oliver Pickering

Edited by

Janet Burton, William Marx, and Veronica O'Mara



Leeds Studies in English

<www.leeds.ac.uk/lse>

School of English

University of Leeds

2010

An Unmatched Pair: Two Eleventh-Century Manuscripts of the Homiliary of Paul the Deacon in Durham Cathedral Library

Joyce Hill

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

¹ *Medieval Libraries of Great Britain: A List of Surviving Books*, ed. by N. R. Ker, 2nd edn, Royal Historical Society Guides and Handbooks 3 (London: Royal Historical Society, 1964), p. 258. I am grateful to the Dean and Chapter of Durham Cathedral Library for permission to consult these manuscripts.

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.

⁴ Cyril L. Smetana, 'Ælfric and the Early Medieval Homiliary', *Traditio*, 15 (1959), 163–204.

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).

An Unmatched Pair

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 (intermittently, and only in MS

⁶ Helmut Gneuss, 'Liturgical Books in Anglo-Saxon England and their Old English Terminology', in *Learning and Literature in Anglo-Saxon England: Studies Presented to Peter Clemoes on the Occasion of his Sixty-fifth Birthday*, ed. by Michael Lapidge and Helmut Gneuss (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), pp. 91–141 (p. 123).

⁷ Joyce Hill, 'Ælfric's Manuscript of Paul the Deacon's Homiliary: A Provisional Analysis', in *The Old English Homily: Precedent, Practice, and Appropriation*, ed. by Aaron J Kleist, Studies in the Early Middle Ages, 17 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2007), pp. 67–96.

⁸ Réginald Grégoire, *Homéliaires liturgiques médiévaux: analyse des manuscrits*, Biblioteca degli Studi Medievali, 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.

¹⁰ Thomas Rud, *Codicum manuscriptorum Ecclesiae Cathedralis Dunelmensis: catalogus classicus* (Durham: Andrews, 1825).

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.

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.

	<i>Natalis Domini: In Nocturno</i>	<i>Lectio 1</i>
		<i>Lectio 2</i>
<i>Page 6</i>	<i>Natalis Domini Dies</i>	<i>Isidorus</i>
		<i>Lectio 3</i>

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:*

An Unmatched Pair

Isidorus, which begins on fol. 2v, Rud's page 6, is a separate item, corresponding to PD I 16 (xvi).

Page 16 Fol. 2v	<i>Homilia alia: Salvator noster dilectissimi.</i> PD I 17 (xvii). Rud's page number should read 6.	<i>Leo papa</i>
Page 8 Fol. 3v	<i>Homilia alia: Exultemus in Domino dilectissimi</i> PD I 18 (xviii)	<i>Id</i>
Page 10 Fol. 4v	<i>Homilia alia: Cupienties aliquid de hujus diei</i> PD I 19 (xviii)	<i>Fulgentius</i>
Page 13 Fol. 6r	<i>Homilia alia: Justissime fratres in festivitate</i> PD I 20 (xx)	<i>Maximus</i>
Page 15 Fol. 7r	<i>Homilia alia: Hodie fratres karissimi Christus natus est</i> PD I 21 (xxi)	<i>Id</i>
Page 17 Fol. 9r	<i>Homilia alia: In adventu Dominico fratres karissimi</i> PD I 22 (xxii)	<i>Id</i>
Page 18 Fol. 8v	<i>Homilia alia: Hodierni mysterij Sacramentum</i> PD I 23 (xxiii)	<i>Id</i>

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

LACUNA

Page 19 Fol. 9r	<i>Sancti Stephani: Ad aquas Tibilitanas</i> PD I 29 (xxviii [sic])	<i>Augustinus</i>
	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 Fol. 10v	<i>Homilia alia: Ecce ego mitto ad vos prophetas</i> PD I 30 (no MS number)	<i>e Com.Hieron.</i>
Page 24 Fol. 11v	<i>Sancti Johannis: Johannes Apostolus & Evangelista</i> PD I 31 (no MS number)	<i>Isidorus</i>
Page 25 Fol. 12r	<i>Homilia alia: Audi fabulam, et non fabulam</i> PD I 32 (no MS number)	<i>Ex histor.Eccl.</i>
Page 27 Fol. 13r	<i>Homilia alia: Lectio Sancti Evangelij que nobis lecta</i> PD I 33 (no MS number)	<i>Beda</i>
Page 32 Fol. 15v	<i>Natalis Innocentium: Zelus quo tendat, quo prosiliat livor</i> PD I 34 (xxxiii)	<i>Severianus</i>
Page 34 Fol. 16v	<i>Homilia alia: Dedicatur novus ab infantibus sermo</i> PD I 35 (xxxv)	<i>B.Joan.[Chrys]</i>

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 Fol. 19v	<i>Octavae Domini. Id. Kl. [Kalendae] Januarij: Quanquam non dubitem</i> PD I 37 (xxxvii)	<i>Maximus</i>
Page 41 Fol. 20r	<i>De Circumcisione Domini: Quod mortuus est Christus peccato</i> PD I 38 (xxxviii)	<i>Origines</i>

PD I 39, drawn from Ambrose's *Expositio euangelii secundum Lucam*, with the lection Luke 2. 55–57, is omitted from the manuscript. There is no lacuna.

Joyce Hill

Page 42	<i>Homilia alia: Hanc tam venerandam</i>	<i>Beda</i>
Fol. 20v	PD I 40 (xl)	
Page 47	<i>Dominica post Natalem Domini: Congregamus in unum ea quæ</i>	<i>Origines Cath- olice correctus</i>
	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) <i>Congregamus in unum</i> , which is Origen's homily 16. This is followed by Origen's homily 17, beginning <i>Lucas qui scripsit</i> , 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) <i>Et ut perfecerunt omnia</i> , which is a homily drawn from Bede's <i>In Lucae euangelium expositio</i> .	
	MS B.II.2 follows this exactly. PD 141 (a) begins on page 47 as noted by Rud (fol. 23r); the second element, <i>Lucas scripsit</i> (<i>qui</i> 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.	
Page 52	<i>Epiphania: Celebrato proximo die</i>	<i>Leo</i>
Fol. 25v	PD I 42 (no MS number)	
Page 53	<i>Homilia alia: Gaudete in Domino dilectissimi</i>	<i>Idem</i>
Fol. 26r	PD I 43 (no MS number)	
	PD I 44, a further homily for Epiphany by Leo, is omitted from the manuscript. There is no lacuna.	
Page 55	<i>Homilia alia: In hac dilectissimi celebritate</i>	<i>Maximus</i>
Fol. 27r	PD I 45 (xlv)	
Page 57	<i>Homilia alia: Audistis, fratres, lectionem Evangelii</i>	<i>Leo</i>
Fol. 28r	PD I 46 (xlvi)	
Page 59	<i>Homilia alia: Nostis [sic] karissimi fratres quia dies iste</i>	<i>Fulgentius</i>
Fol. 29r	PD I 47 (xlvii)	
Page 63	<i>Homilia alia: sicut in lectione Evangelica</i>	<i>Gregorius</i>
Fol. 31r	PD I 48 (xlviii)	
Page 66	<i>Homilia alia: Johannes Baptista et precursor</i>	<i>Beda</i>
Fol. 32v	PD I 49 (xlviii)	
Page 70	<i>Homilia alia: Quamvis dilectissimi fratres Christus salutis</i>	<i>Maximus</i>
Fol. 34v	PD I 50 (no MS number)	
	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.	
Page 72	<i>Homilia alia: Licet fratres dilectissimi de solempnitate</i>	<i>Idem</i>
Fol. 35v	PD I 54 (liiii)	
	Rud fails to list the next item, which begins on page 73 (fol. 36r). It is a homily attributed to Maximus. PD I 55 (lv)	
Page 74	<i>Homilia alia: Justum et rationabile dilectissimi</i>	<i>Leo</i>
Fol. 36v	PD I 56 (lvi)	
Page 76	<i>Homilia alia: Hodiernam festivitatem dilectissimi</i>	<i>Idem</i>
Fol. 37v	PD I 57 (lvii)	

An Unmatched Pair

Page 78	<i>Octabæ Epiphaniæ</i> [sic: recte <i>Theophaniæ</i>]: <i>Lectio Sancti Evangelij quam mode fratres</i>	<i>Beda</i>
Fol. 38v	PD I 58 (lviii)	
Page 82	<i>Homilia alia:</i> <i>Dominica 1^a post Theophania</i> [rubric not recorded by Rud] <i>Aperta nobis est fratres karissimi</i>	<i>Beda</i>
Fol. 40v	PD I 59 (no MS number)	
Page 85	<i>Dominica 2^{da} post Teoppania [Theo.]</i> [sic] [recte <i>Theophania</i>] <i>Quod Dominus noster atque Salvator</i>	<i>Idem</i>
Fol. 42r	PD I 60 (no MS number)	
Page 90	<i>Tertia post Theophania: Docente in monte Domino</i>	<i>Origines</i>
Fol. 44v	PD I 61 (lxi)	
Page 96	<i>Natalis Sancte Agnetis: Dum in toto mundo virgineus flos</i>	<i>Maximus</i>
Fol. 47v	PD I 62 (no MS number)	
Page 98	<i>Homilia alia: Immaculatus Dominus</i>	<i>Ambrosius</i>
Fol. 48v	PD I 63 (lxiii)	
Page 99	<i>Dominica 4^{ta} post Epiphania:</i> <i>Ingrediente Domino in naviculo</i>	<i>Origines</i>
Fol. 49r	PD I 64 (no MS number)	
Page 102	<i>Purificatio beate Marie: Exultent Virgines, Virgo Maria</i>	<i>Augustinus</i>
Fol. 50v	PD I 65 (no MS number)	
Page 103	<i>Homilia alia: Non solum ab Angelis & Prophetis</i>	<i>Ambrosius</i>
Fol. 51r	PD I 66 (no MS number)	
Page 104	<i>Homilia alia: Solennitatem nobis hodiernæ</i>	<i>Beda</i>
Fol. 51v	PD I 67 (no MS number)	
Page 107	<i>Septuagesima: Dignitas humanae originis</i>	
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. <i>Dominica Septuagesima</i> was added much later.	
Page 108	<i>Homilia alia: in explanatione sua multa</i>	<i>Gregorius</i>
Fol. 53v	PD I 69 (no MS number)	
Page 112	<i>Sexagesima: de lapsu primi hominis:</i> <i>Nemo est qui nesciat, in principio</i>	<i>B.Joan.[Chrys]</i>
Fol. 55v	PD I 70 (lxx)	
Page 113	<i>Homilia alia: Lectio Sancti Evangelij quam modo</i>	<i>Gregorius</i>
Fol. 56r	PD I 71 (no MS number)	
Page 116	<i>Quinquagesima: de fide Abraham & immolatione Isaac:</i> <i>Fides et Religiones Sanctissime</i>	<i>B.Joan.[Chrys]</i>
Fol. 57r	PD I 72 (lxxii)	
Page 118	<i>Homilia alia: Redemptor noster providens</i>	<i>Gregorius</i>
Fol. 58v	PD I 73 (lxxiii)	
Page 120	<i>Quadragesima: Licet nobis dilectissimi appropinquante</i>	<i>Leo</i>
Fol. 60v	PD I 74 (lxxiiii)	
Page 121	<i>Quadragesima: Homilia alia: Ante dies devotionem Sancte</i>	<i>Maximus</i>

Joyce Hill

Fol. 61r	PD I 75 (lxxv)	
Page 123	<i>Homilia alia: Dubitari a quibusdam solet</i>	Gregorius
	PD I 76 (lxxvi)	
Fol. 61r	It is the homily proper that begins on page 123. The pericope begins the previous page.	
Page 124	<i>Homilia alia: Semper quidem nos diectissimi</i>	Leo
Fol. 61v	PD I 77 (lxxviii [sic])	
Page 125	<i>Homilia alia: Predicaturus vobis dilectissimi</i>	Idem
Fol. 62r	PD I 78 (lxxviii)	
Page 127	<i>Homilia alia: Apostolica dilectissimi doctrina</i>	Idem
Fol. 63r	PD I 79 (lxxviii)	
Page 128	<i>Homilia alia: Audistis karissimi sicut Evangelica</i>	Maximus
Fol. 63v	PD I 80 (no MS number)	
Page 130	<i>Homilia alia: Conflictus iste mirabilis quem</i>	Idem
Fol. 64v	PD I 81 (lxxx)	
Page 131	<i>Homilia alia: Advertite fratres karissimi quanta nobis</i>	Idem
Fol. 65r	PD I 82 (no MS number)	
Page 132	<i>Homilia alia: Peractum ad Domino nostro Jesu Christo</i>	Idem
Fol. 65v	PD I 83 (lxxxii[sic])	
Page 133	<i>Homilia alia: quia nonnullorum est consuetudo</i>	Idem
Fol. 66r	PD I 84 (lxxxiii)	
Page 134	<i>Dominica 1^{ma} Quadragesimæ: de Jacobo et Esau.</i> <i>Portabat Rebecca geminos in utero</i>	B.Joan.[Chry.]
Fol. 66v	PD I 85 (lxxxv)	
Page 136	<i>Homilia alia: Miratur Evangelista: Ecce mulier</i>	Idem
Fol. 67v	The author of this homily is not given in the manuscript. Rud's <i>idem</i> 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.	
Page 141	<i>Homilia alia: Evangelica Lectio dilectissimi</i>	Leo
Fol. 70r	PD I 86 (no MS number)	
Page 143	<i>Homilia alia: Quia Dominus et Redemptor</i>	Beda
Fol. 71r	PD I 87 (lxxxviii [sic])	
Page 147	<i>Dominica 2^{da} Quadragesimæ: de Joseph:</i> <i>Mittitur a Jacob Patre Sanctissimo</i>	B.Joan.[Chry.]
Fol. 73r	PD I 88 (no MS number)	
Page 149	<i>Homilia alia: de Conversione Peccati.</i> <i>Confitemini Domino quoniam bonus est</i>	Idem
Fol. 75r	PD 189 (lxxxviii)	
Page 150	<i>Dominica 2^{da} Quadragesimæ: Homiliæ 3^{tia}:</i> <i>Daemoniacus iste apud Matheum</i>	Beda
Fol. 74v	PD I 90 (no MS number)	
Page 153	<i>Dominica 3^{tia} Quadragesimæ: de Moyse.</i> <i>Stabat Moyses in monte, non armis</i>	B.Joan.[Chry.]
Fol. 76r	PD I 91 (xci)	

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.¹² 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).¹³ 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,

¹² For a more detailed discussion of these issues, see Joyce Hill, 'Coping with Conflict: Lunar and Solar Cycles in the Liturgical Calendars', in *Time and Eternity: The Medieval Discourse*, ed. by Gerhard Jaritz and Gerson Moreno-Riaño, International Medieval Research, 9 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2003), 99–108.

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: Vigiliis nobis hujus sacratissime noctis* *Beda*
PD II 2

Folio 4b *De die Pasche: Non immerito fratres hodierna die* *Maximus*
PD II 3

Folio 5b *De die Pasche Homilia alia:*
Magnum fratres et mirabile donum *Maximus*
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* *Gregorius*
PD II 5

Folio 9b *De Festi Paschalis Feria 2:*
Exultandum in hac die quam fecit Domino. *Maximus*
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.

¹⁴ For a diagram showing the older method of designating the Sundays after Pentecost, see Cyrille Vogel, *Medieval Liturgy: An Introduction to the Sources*, revised and translated by William G. Storey and Niels Krogh Rasmussen (Washington DC: Pastoral Press, 1986), p. 409.

¹⁵ Hill, 'Coping with Conflict', pp. 100–2.

¹⁶ Hill, 'Ælfric's Manuscript of Paul the Deacon's Homiliary', pp. 83–86.

An Unmatched Pair

Folio 12	<i>Homilia altera: In cotidiana nobis solennitate</i> PD II 9	Gregorius
Folio 13	<i>3^a Gloriosam sue resurrectionis</i> PD II 10	Beda
Folio 15b	<i>4^{ta} Lectio Sancti Evangelij</i> PD II 11	Gregorius
Folio 18	<i>5^{ta} Maria Magdalene que fuerat</i> PD II 12	<i>idem</i>
Folio 22	<i>6^{ta} Evangelica lectio fratres karissimi</i> PD II 13	Beda
Folio 25	<i>In Sabbato: Fractus longa molestia</i> This is homily 22 of Gregory's <i>Homiliae in Evangelia</i> . 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	Gregorius
Folio 28b	<i>In Dominica 1^{ma} post Albas: Prima lectionis</i> PD II 15	<i>idem</i>
Folio 32b	<i>2^{da} Audivimus Dominum Jesum</i> Not sourced	Augustinus
Folio 35b	<i>Alia homilia. Audivimus fratres karissimi</i> PD II 20. Rud does not provide a folio number.	Gregorius
Folio 37b	<i>2^{da} post Octavas Pasche:</i> <i>Læta Domini et Salvatoris nostri</i> PD II 21	Beda
Folio 39b	<i>3^{ta} Sicut ex lectione Evangelica</i> PD II 22	<i>idem</i>
Folio 42b	<i>4^{ta} Potest movere infirmos auditores</i> 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 <i>sanctorale</i> items in the original <i>pars aestiva</i> . In this manuscript it stands as the first item in the separately constituted <i>sanctorale</i> part, beginning on folio 161. ¹⁸	<i>idem</i>

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.

- Folio 45* *In Feria 2^{da}, in Litaniam 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 Feria 3^{ta} 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^{ta} 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

¹⁹ Joyce Hill, ‘The *Litaniae maiores* and *minores* in Rome, Francia and Anglo-Saxon England: Terminology, Texts and Traditions’, *Early Medieval Europe*, 9 (2000), 211–46.

An Unmatched Pair

<i>Folio 57b</i>	<i>In Ascensione Domini: Post beatam et gloriosam Resurrectionem PD II 26</i>	<i>Leo</i>
<i>Folio 58</i>	<i>In eadem: Sacramentum dilectissimi salutis PD II 27</i>	<i>idem</i>
<i>Folio 59b</i>	<i>In eadem: Hodie Dominus Jesus Christus ascendit Not sourced</i>	<i>Augustinus</i>
<i>Folio 61</i>	<i>In eadem: Quod Resurrectionem Dominicam PD II 28</i>	<i>Gregorius</i>
[no fol. no.]	<i>In Sabbato post Ascensionem: Sacramentum dilectissimi v. supra 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.</i>	[No name]
<i>Folio 64</i>	<i>In Dominica post Ascensionem: Ex multis Sancti Evangelij locis PD II 29. The homily begins on fol. 64, but the rubric and pericope are on fol. 63b.</i>	<i>Beda</i>
<i>Folio 68</i>	<i>In Vigilia Pentecostes: Quia Sancti Spiritus hodie celebramus PD II 30</i>	<i>idem</i>
<i>Folio 72</i>	<i>In die Pentecostes: Hodiernam solennitatem dilectissimi PD II 31</i>	<i>Leo</i>
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.		
<i>Folio 75</i>	<i>In eadem: Hodiernam dilectissimi festivitatem PD II 34</i>	<i>idem</i>
<i>Folio 76</i>	<i>In eadem: Libet fratres karissimi Evangelice lectionis [recte: verba lectionis] PD II 33</i>	<i>Gregorius</i>
<i>Folio 79b</i>	<i>In Feria 2^{da}: Nosse credo vos fratres que sit ratio PD II 35</i>	<i>Maximus</i>
<i>Folio 80b</i>	<i>3^a: Non incommode, ante dies complures PD II 36</i>	<i>idem</i>
<i>Folio 81b</i>	<i>Dominica 1^{ma} post Pentecosten: de Golia Davide victo: Dominus Deus, cum David Regem 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.</i>	<i>Chrysostomus</i>
<i>Folio 83</i>	<i>Dominica 1^{ma} post Pentecosten: Sicut ex lectione Sancti Evangelij PD II 16</i>	<i>Beda</i>

Joyce Hill

- Folio 88b* *In 2^{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.²⁰
- Folio 95* *Dominica 3^{ia}: Hoc distare fratres* *idem*
PD II 38. Correctly fol. 96.
- Folio 100b* *Dominica 4^{ia}: Estivum tempus, quod corpori* *idem*
PD II 39
- Folio 107* *Dominica 5^{ia}: 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^{ia}: 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^{ma}: 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^{va}:*
In hac lectione fratres carissimi consideranda est *idem*
PD II 60. The pericope begins on fol. 112 (that is, 112a).
- Folio 114b* *Dominica 9^{va}: 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	<i>Dominica 10^{ma}: Quis sit villicus iniquitatis</i> PD II 62	<i>Hieronymus</i>
Folio 120	<i>Eadem: Lectionem brevem Sancti Evangelij</i> This additional homily for the Tenth Sunday after Pentecost is homily 39 of Gregory's <i>Homiliae in Evangelia</i> . 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. ²¹	<i>Gregorius</i>
Folio 124b	<i>Dominica 11^{ma}: Quia Parabolam Dominus qua semper</i> PD II 64	<i>Beda</i>
Folio 125b	<i>Dominica 12^{ma}: Surdus ille et mutus quen mirabilit</i> PD II 69	<i>idem</i>
Folio 128	<i>Dominica 13^{ta}: Non oculi Scribarum & Phariseorum</i> 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 <i>In Lucae evangelium exposition: the exegesis of Luke 10. 23–25</i> . 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 MS A.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: <i>Homiliae hae desunt</i> . This is written in the top margin in a hand of s.xiv/xv. <i>Dominicae 14^{ta}, et 15^{ta}: 'Homiliae hae desunt: et defectus iste (ut nota adscripta indicat) recens non est</i> 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 <i>Dominica III post sancti Laurentii</i> , following the older method of dealing with Sundays after Pentecost.	<i>idem</i>
Folio 129b	<i>Dominica 16^{ta} post Pentecosten: Nam civitas est Galilee</i> 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 <i>temporale</i> , being a homily for the Nativity of the Virgin.	<i>Beda</i>
Folio 130b	<i>17^{ma} post Pentecosten:</i> <i>Hydropis morbus ad aquoso humore</i> PD II 80	<i>idem</i>

²¹ Hill, 'Ælfric's Manuscript of Paul the Deacon's Homiliary', pp. 74–79.

- Folio 131b* *In Jejunio Septimi mensis:*
Scio quidem, dilectissimi, 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 7^{mi}:*
Dominus et Redemptor 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* *18^{va} post Pentecosten:*
Convenerunt in multitudine vincerent Chrysosto [sic]
 PD II 90
- Folio 139b* *19^{ma} 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* *20^{ma} post Pentecosten: Textum Evangelicæ 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* *21^{ma} 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.

²³ Hill, 'Ælfric's Manuscript of Paul the Deacon's Homiliary', pp. 75–77.

An Unmatched Pair

- Folio 150b* 22^{da} post Pentecosten:
Cum Evangelium fratres karissimi ammonet 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^{ia} post Pentecosten:
Querentes Dominum comprehendere Principes
PD II 95. The homily is drawn from Bede's *In Lucae evangelium expositio* although there is no attribution in this manuscript and consequently no author is named by Rud.
- Folio 154* 24^{ta} 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^{ta} post Pentecosten: *Hec secunda parabola est*
PD II 92a. The homily is by Jerome and is drawn from his *Commentaria in Evangelium Matthaei*, 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 *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.
- Folio 159b* 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 *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.²⁴ 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'.

²⁴ 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.