

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

The Nativity of the Virgin and St Katherine: Additions to John Mirk's *Festial*

Susan Powell

The *Festial* is a late-fourteenth-century sermon collection by the Austin canon John Mirk.¹ Mirk's original text (extant in twelve full manuscripts) underwent an early recension (in eight full manuscripts) which resulted in comprehensive textual variation which firmly demarcates the two versions of the *Festial*. This recension was itself substantially revised and augmented (extant in two full and two partial manuscripts). In addition, *Festial* sermons and excerpts (particularly *narrationes*) were adopted, adapted, or survive in an incomplete state (of between one and nineteen sermons) in twenty more manuscripts.²

Mirk's original text and its recension were first studied, and designated Groups A and B, by Martyn F. Wakelin.³ Although the Group B text is a rewrite of Group A, the variants are in the main insignificant: minor additions, omissions, changes of phrase, changes of lexeme, and the like. This is very different from the Revision (designated with a capital R), whose author revises, rather than merely rewrites, and produces a very different final work, augmented, moreover, by thirty extra sermons.⁴ This paper will focus on Group B, not on the Revision.⁵

The nature of variation in the recension may be indicated by a brief comparison between two passages from a single Group A and a single Group B manuscript:

i) the sermon for the Nativity of the Virgin

Group A

Þe thrydde tyme oure Lady was borne to ioy passyng. For whan scheo passed oute of þis worlde, hure Sone Ihesus was redy wyth grete multitudo (*sic*) of angellus **and oþer seyntus** and broght hur wyth **grete worschep vp** into heven and þer crownd hur quene of heven and emperas of helle and lady of þe worlde, so þat scheo is **now** in blysse þat eure schal laste. **Wherefore I sette here þis** ensaumpul [...] (London, British Library,

¹ The previous EETS edition, *Mirk's Festial: A Collection of Homilies, by Johannes Mirkus (John Mirk)*, ed. by Th. Erbe, Part I, EETS e.s. 96 (1905), is in the process of being superseded by *John Mirk's Festial Edited from British Library MS Cotton Claudius A.II.*, ed. by Susan Powell, 2 vols, EETS o.s. 334, 335 (2009, 2011) (hereafter *Festial*).

² For details of manuscripts and sigla, see *Festial*, I, xiii–xiv.

³ M. F. Wakelin, 'The Manuscripts of John Mirk's *Festial*', *Leeds Studies in English*, n.s. 1 (1967), 93–118. See further *Festial*, I, xlv–v, lix–lxi.

MS Cotton Claudius A II, fol. 107v)

Group B

Þe iij tyme oure Lady was borne to ioi passing. For whan sche passid out of this world, her Son Ihesus was redy with a gret multitude of aungeles and brouȝt her with **moche ioy** into heven and þer crownyd her qvene of heven am (*sic*) emprise of helle and lady of **alle** þe worlde, so that sche is in **the** blisse that euer schalle last **without ende**. **An** ensample [...] (Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Rawlinson A.381, fol. 94ra–b)

ii) the sermon for the feast-day of St Katherine

Group A

Þan þis emperoure spake fayre to Katerine and **behatte** hure þat he wolde weddon hure **and done hur alle þe worchep þat he cowthe** if scheo wolde forsakyn Criste and levon **on** hys **god**. **But for** scheo sette noghte be hym ny be hys goddys, I he made to smyton of hure hedde. Þan **whan þe hed was off**, in stede of blode ran oute **whyte** mylke and anone **þerwyth** com angellys and tokon hur body and bere it **vp** into þe eyre and so **forth twenti dayes iurney** into þe mounte of Synay, and þere byried itte wyth grete worchep [...] (MS Cotton Claudius A II, fols 116v–17r)

Group B

Þan this emperoure spake fair to Kateryne and **hiȝt** here þat he would wed here ȝif sche woulde forsake Crist and I leve **vpon** his **goddis**. **And** sche sett nowȝt by hym ne by his goddis. **And whan he saw þat**, he made to smyte of hi[r]⁶ hede. **And þan in the** stede of bloode **þere** ran out **faire** mylke and **þan** anon come aungelis and toke her **soule into þe blisse and þei toke her** body and bere it⁷ into þe aiere and so into þe monte of Synay and þer beried it with gret worschip [...] (MS Rawlinson A.381, fols 104vb–5ra)

In the first set of passages above, from the sermon for the Nativity of the Virgin, the substantive differences are minor — the Group B text omits *and oper seyntus*, substitutes *moche ioy* for

⁴ The *temporale* of the Revision were edited as my doctoral thesis: 'A Critical Edition of the Temporale Sermons of MSS Harley 2247 and Royal 18 B XXV' (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of London, 1980). It was as a Ph.D. student that I first met Oliver Pickering, also a postgraduate medievalist at the University of London. Shortly after his appointment at the Brotherton Library, University of Leeds, I too came to Leeds as a research assistant to the Survey of English Dialects, led by Harold Orton, together with Stewart F. Sanderson and J. D. A. Widdowson. By the time I completed my Ph.D., Oliver had become Assistant Editor to the Middle English Texts series, for which he asked me to edit a selection of Revision sermons: *The Advent and Nativity Sermons from a Fifteenth-Century Revision of John Mirk's Festial*, Middle English Texts, 13 (Heidelberg: Winter, 1981). Later we co-edited *The Index of Middle English Prose, Handlist VI: A Handlist of Manuscripts Containing Middle English Prose in Yorkshire Libraries and Archives* (Cambridge: Brewer, 1989). More recently, Oliver discovered a sixteenth-century version of the Festial sermon for St Mary Magdalene in a composite manuscript in the British Library, on which we collaborated: 'A Neglected Copy of John Mirk's Mary Magdalene Sermon', *Medieval Sermon Studies*, 49 (2005), 59–68. We have been friends for nearly forty years now, meeting occasionally, almost always in the Brotherton, by chance or design, and keeping in touch with each other's lives and careers. Oliver has been a good friend, one whose integrity and scholarship have been constants throughout his career — I have been lucky to know him.

⁵ Martyn Wakelin (who died prematurely in 1988) was another good friend, also with connections with Leeds (through his edition of the Brotherton Collection manuscript of the *Festial* and his editorial work for the Survey of English Dialects). He and I were happy collaborators on a project to edit Group B of the *Festial*, and it is our transcription of our planned base-text, Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Rawlinson A.381, which is used in this paper.

⁶ -s is erased on *his* but not replaced.

⁷ *ber* it is preceded by *beried it*, caught by eyeskip from below.

The Nativity of the Virgin and St Katherine

grete worschep, adds the familiar tag *without ende*, and shortens the link to the *narratio*. There are a few insignificant functional variants: *vp*, *now*, *alle*, *the*, *þis/an*. In the second passage, from the sermon for the feast-day of St Katherine, variation is no more important: *behatte* becomes *hi 3t* and *whyte* becomes *faire*, the phrase *forth twenti dayes iurney* is omitted from Group B, while other omissions are most likely due to independent eyeskip from an *Ur*-text: *and done hur alle þe worchep þat he cowthe* and *whan þe hed was off* (omitted from Group B), *and whan he saw þat* and *soule into þe blisse and þei toke her* (omitted from Group A). Again, there are minor functional variants: *on/vpon*, *god/goddis*, *but forland*, *þerwyth/þan*, *vp*, and the Group B text has minor lexical items not in the Group A text (**And þan in the stede of bloode þere**).

These variants would, of course, be sufficient to create a sizeable *apparatus variorum*, even for so few lines (more sizeable if the variants within Groups A and B were taken into account), but they do not suggest a revising hand at work. However, there are passages in the *Festial* which do suggest such a hand at work, intermittently and in a way quite different from the wholesale Revision which was the subject of my doctoral thesis. These revisions (mostly additions to the original text and mostly dependent, like the original *Festial*, on the *Legenda aurea*) are not exclusive to Group B at first, but from approximately half-way through the sermon collection they do become exclusive.⁸ The most substantial additions are in the sermons for the Nativity of the Virgin and St Katherine.⁹ These additions are the subject of the current paper.

The Nativity of the Virgin

The first passage above, from the sermon for the Nativity of the Virgin, ends with the introduction of a *narratio*: ‘Wherefore I sette here þis ensaumpul’ (in the Cotton Claudius manuscript which forms the base-text of my edition). In the *narratio* a French Jew, travelling in England, is rescued from robbers by the Virgin Mary, whose visions of hell and heaven persuade him to baptism.¹⁰ The *narratio* concludes the sermon: ‘and was aftur an holy man and ful deuowte to oure Lady. Now 3e schal pray to oure Lady *et cetera*’ (MS Cotton Claudius A II, fol. 107v). The Group B manuscripts do not end at this point,¹¹ but, having noted that the Jew ‘was after a fulle holy man’, continue with details of the Virgin’s marriage to Joseph (see Appendix (i)).¹² When the Virgin reaches puberty, the bishop of the temple where she has

⁸ *Festial*, I, lxxvii–viii.

⁹ *Festial*, II, Explanatory Notes to 57/152–53, and 67/73–74. See further I, lxxvii–viii. For a substantive revision of the introduction to the 3 Lent sermon, see A. J. Fletcher and S. Powell, ‘The Origins of a Fifteenth-Century Sermon Collection: MSS Harley 2247 and Royal 18 B XXV’, *Leeds Studies in English*, n.s. 10 (1978), 74–96 (pp. 75–77) and *Festial*, II, Explanatory Note to 21/6–14.

¹⁰ One of the Group A manuscripts, London, Dr Williams’s Library, MS Ancient 11, provides an alternative *narratio* about a priest, devoted to the Virgin, whose doubt about the sacrament of the altar was resolved by the appearance of Mary and her Son on the altar in place of the Host (and the Son’s subsequent metamorphosis back into the Host).

¹¹ Nor does the Group A manuscript, Southwell Minster, MS 7, which adds an extra *narratio*: a monk-author traduced by his cousin suffers the punishment of having his arm cut off, but the rotting arm is restored by the Virgin (cf. Frederic C. Tubach, *Index Exemplorum: A Handbook of Medieval Religious Tales*, FF Communications 204 (Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedekatemia, 1969), no. 2419), after which the monk visits Jerusalem, where a scholarly Jew asks him to draw the Virgin and is converted on seeing her suckle the Child.

¹² Two Group B manuscripts are absent for this sermon, Leeds, University Library, Brotherton Collection, MS 502 and Hatfield House, Cecil Papers 280. The extant witnesses to this addition agree in the salient details of the text and in all significant readings. Textual variation is not great, with the exception of f, which expands and rewrites

been lodged by Joachim and Anna summons kings and nobles in order to find her a husband. For the right man an old worm-eaten ash rod will spring into flower. After two days no one has been successful, but on the third day an old man, Joseph, arrives in the temple and a white dove descends on his head. Despite his misgivings about taking on a young wife, he is persuaded to grasp the rod, which burgeons into life. They are married and Joseph takes Mary home with him. When the Virgin becomes pregnant, he wants to steal away from her (the assumption is that he knows it cannot be his child) but is told by an angel to return and look after her as a husband should a wife. The passage (and the sermon) ends in all the Group B manuscripts with the reminder that the continuation of the story is to be found in the sermon for the Annunciation of the Virgin.

Little of this is scriptural. Only her pregnancy ('antequam convenirent', that is, 'before they had come together') is recorded in the New Testament (Matthew 1. 18–25), together with Joseph's desire to send her away secretly (rather than leave himself) until an angel in a dream tells him the truth of the conception, at which Joseph takes Mary as his wife but does not enter into conjugal relations with her before the birth of Jesus. The details of the marriage of the Virgin are nowhere found in scripture but have their origin in the early Greek *Protevangeliium of James*,¹³ which was the source for the *Gospel of Pseudo-Matthew*.¹⁴

As noted above, Mirk's acknowledged source for the *Festial* is the *Legenda aurea* of Jacobus de Voragine (hereafter *LA*), where brief details of the Virgin's upbringing in the temple and her marriage to Joseph are included within the material for the Annunciation and fuller details in that for the Nativity of the Virgin.¹⁵ This is therefore the precedent for their inclusion in the *Festial* recension. The *LA* version of her marriage differs from that of the recension in several ways, however: the Virgin rejects marriage since she has vowed herself to God; after the prayers of the high priest and the elders of the temple, a voice announces the test for the Virgin's husband; each unmarried man of the house of David is to place a branch on the altar (the branch will flower and a dove settle on the head of the chosen one); when this miracle does not take place after two attempts, the voice announces that the true husband has not yet come forward, at which Joseph (reluctantly because of his age) appears and the miracle is effected; Joseph then returns to Bethlehem to prepare for the marriage, while Mary returns to her parents in Nazareth with seven virgins as handmaidens.

Clearly, the recension simplifies some of the material — Mary's reluctance is not mentioned; there is no deliberation in the temple, nor is there a voice from heaven; they are married there and then and both return to one place (Nazareth). However, the material is also elaborated by circumstantial detail, particularly in relation to the old worm-eaten ash stick which had been in the temple for many years and in the details of the test itself. (The further *Festial* material about Joseph's wish to abandon Mary, which is not in *LA*, is scriptural.) The

the Group B text (see further *Festial*, I, xlvi). The material is also found in two manuscripts of the Revision, London, British Library, MS Harley 2247 (fols 188v–189v) and Dublin, Trinity College, MS 428 (fols 41r–42r). On the relationships within Group B, see *Festial*, I, lxxviii–lxxxii; on the relationship of Group B to the Revision, see *Advent and Nativity Sermons*, ed. by Powell, pp. 25–32.

¹³ *The Apocryphal New Testament*, ed. by J. K. Elliott (Oxford: Clarendon, 1993), pp. 48–67, especially pp. 60–61 (8–9), 62 (14).

¹⁴ *Apocryphal New Testament*, ed. by Elliott, pp. 84–99, especially pp. 88–89 (8, 10, 11).

¹⁵ For the Annunciation material, see *Jacobi a Voragine Legenda Aurea vulgo Historia Lombardica*, ed. by Th. Graesse (Dresden and Leipzig: Libraria Arnoldiana, 1846), p. 217; *Iacopo da Varazze: Legenda Aurea*, ed. by Giovanni Paolo Maggioni, 2 vols (Florence: Sismel, 1998), p. 327. Jacobus notes that there are fuller details in the Nativity of the Virgin (for which, see Graesse, p. 589; Maggioni, pp. 905–06).

The Nativity of the Virgin and St Katherine

tension of the two days during which the kings and nobles compete is built up to the third day, when Joseph arrives for the first time, gives his pragmatic reasons for staying aloof from the ceremony, but is eventually forced to submit to the test. Here are classic elements of the 'chosen one' topos (the *Morte Darthur* offers several examples — Arthur, Gareth, Lancelot searching Sir Urry's wounds)¹⁶ — the most likely candidates for success in a competition fail in that test, while the most unlikely and/or most reluctant candidate succeeds. The material is presented simply and dramatically, providing a happy catharsis as the doubt and uncertainty are resolved (only for the situation to become again embroiled in doubt by the Virgin's untoward pregnancy, also swiftly legitimated).

The question is whether the Group B redactor was personally responsible for the version in the *Festial* recension or whether one must search for another source. The *South English Legendary* (hereafter *SEL*) is the most obvious candidate, but there is no material (as edited by d'Evelyn and Mill) for the Nativity of the Virgin, and what there is on the Annunciation barely mentions the Annunciation, let alone anything else.¹⁷ The *Gilte Legende* (*GL*), on the other hand, in its Annunciation material follows the brief synopsis in *LA*: Mary was in the temple from three to fourteen years of age; she vowed chastity; the flowering rod secured her marriage to Joseph; they then left for their separate homes.¹⁸ It also includes material for the Nativity of the Virgin, again based on *LA* and so with the same differences from the *Festial* version. Indeed, the number of attempts to find a marriage partner for Mary (in the *Festial*, the number of days) is not mentioned, which distances it further from the *Festial*.¹⁹

In 1975 Oliver Pickering inaugurated the Middle English Texts series with his edition (adapted from his doctoral dissertation) of *The South English Nativity of Mary and Christ* (*SEN*).²⁰ Under the general editorship of Manfred Görlach (and with Oliver first as assistant editor and then full general editor), Middle English Texts has become a foremost player in the editing of medieval texts. As Oliver Pickering has said, most of *SEN* follows either the *LA* or the *Pseudo-Matthew* (*P-M*) account.²¹ In the details of the marriage itself it follows *LA*,²² and so agrees with *GL*, but, in its addition of material on Joseph's reaction to Mary's pregnancy (in origin scriptural),²³ it follows *P-M* and differs from *GL* (which does not contain this material). *P-M* and *SEN* differ from scripture and from the *Festial*, however, in including the corroboration of Mary's purity by her handmaidens and of Mary's and Joseph's celibacy by a trial by water (drinking holy water) at the hands of the high priest.²⁴

¹⁶ The competition for Portia's hand in *The Merchant of Venice* is perhaps a more fitting parallel, since it includes a marriage contract. Joseph's reluctance is, of course, unusual in such contexts.

¹⁷ *The South English Legendary*, ed. by Charlotte D'Evelyn and Anna J. Mill, 3 vols, EETS o.s. 235, 236, 244 (1956, 1956, 1959), I, 127–28, II, 1–24.

¹⁸ *GL* 'is a close translation [...] of Jean de Vignay's *Légende Dorée* [...], which in turn is a close translation of Jacobus de Voragine's *Legenda Aurea*' (*Gilte Legende*, ed. by Richard Hamer with the assistance of Vida Russell, 2 vols of 3, EETS o.s. 327, 328 (2006, 2007), I, xi).

¹⁹ *Gilte Legende*, ed. by Hamer, II, 645–46, II, 157–94.

²⁰ *The South English Nativity of Mary and Christ*, Middle English Texts, 1 (Heidelberg: Winter, 1975).

²¹ *South English Nativity*, ed. by Pickering, p. 34.

²² *South English Nativity*, ed. by Pickering, pp. 64–68. *P-M* differs from the *LA* account in having the sticks left overnight in the Holy of Holies, where Joseph's short stick is deliberately ignored by the priests, and in the fact that the miracle occurs when a dove issues from the successful candidate's stick (there is no mention of the flowering stick which is essential in *LA* and English versions of the legend).

²³ *South English Nativity*, ed. by Pickering, pp. 71–76, cf. Matthew 1. 18–25.

²⁴ *Apocryphal New Testament*, ed. by Elliott, p. 89 (10, 12).

SEN does not, therefore offer a precedent for the *Festial* recension (except in Joseph's reaction to Mary's pregnancy, which is anyway scriptural). Indeed, it gives much more circumstantial detail (perhaps partly the result of its verse medium), while the *Festial* is more focussed on conveying the basic facts with a simple lucidity that suits *ad populum* preaching. For example, both follow *P-M* (and only *P-M* of the possible sources) in having Joseph voice his thoughts about the unsuitability of his marriage to Mary,²⁵ but the contrast between the loquacious Joseph of *SEN* and the taciturn Joseph of the *Festial* is marked. *SEN* reads:

'Lokeþ', he seide, 'my feblenesse, and habbeþ of me mylce and ore.
Nam ich old wiþ many childrene? My myght is me bynome,
And heo is 3ong and þat is synne to maken vs togadre come.'

'A3ein Godes wille', he seide, 'nel ich nout be, ac whanne it mot be so nede
Wedde ich er wolle, ac heo ne schal for me [her maydenhede schede].
Wardeyn ichille be hire to kepe — oþer þing ne may Y do nouht —
þat my sone mowe wedden hir after me, þat oure kynde [beþ] forþ brouht.'²⁶

and the *Festial* recension reads:

And þan he said to hymself: 'This maide is not for me.'

And Ioseph said: 'Nay, for sche is not for me. Sche is to yong, for Y mi3t not gouerne her astate.'

Indeed, the *Festial*'s presentation of Joseph, muttering to himself and then speaking aloud his thoughts brusquely to the bishop, is altogether different from that in the analogues. For example, the Mary Play in the N-Town cycle (the only play covering this material), has a Joseph who expresses much the same sentiments as the *Festial* Joseph but with less economy of speech:

'What, xuld I wedde? God forbede!
I am an old man, so God me spede,
And wyth a wyff now, to levyn in drede,
It wore neither sport nere game.

A, shuld I haue here, 3e lese my liff.
Alas, dere God, xuld I now rave?
An old man may nevyr thryff
With a 3onge wyff, so God me saue.
Nay, Nay, sere, lett bene!
Xuld I now in age begynne to dote?
If I here chyde she wolde clowte my cote,
Blere myn ey and pyke out a mote,
And þus oftyntymes it is sene.'²⁷

In contrast to this, the redactor appears to be merely interested in adding material that has been (to his viewpoint) neglected but with the aim of completeness, rather than asserting any literary or authorial aspirations. And, ultimately, I am inclined to say of the *Festial* addition, as Oliver Pickering said of *SEN* thirty-five years ago: 'it could conceivably have been written from

²⁵ *GL* presents Joseph's thoughts (but not his words) as he conceals his rod (*Gilte Legende*, ed. by Hamer, II, 646, ll. 177–79).

²⁶ *South English Nativity*, ed. by Pickering, pp. 66–67, ll. 166–68, 173–76.

²⁷ *The Mary Play from the N. Town Manuscript*, ed. by Peter Meredith (London and New York, Longman: 1987),

memory by someone widely acquainted with the apocryphal legends in general (as well as with the Gospels).²⁸ Indeed, I have said as much of the *Festial* compiler himself in relation to saints' legends, exemplary *narrationes*, and Marian legends: 'Mirk may well have been working from memory for much of this sort of material'.²⁹ The same may be true of the redactor, who very occasionally added extra information as and when it struck him, but with no concerted plan or overall aim such as that undertaken on his recension in the *Festial* Revision.

St Katherine

The second passage above, from the St Katherine sermon, concludes the details of the saint's life with the burial of her body on Mount Sinai, 'where God hath wrowte many grete miraclus and zitte doth into his day'.³⁰ The Group B text, however, continues with further material about Mount Sinai (see Appendix (ii)).³¹ Both Groups then conclude with a *narratio* about a man who gave up his devotion to Katherine until persuaded otherwise by a vision in which she turned her face from him.³²

The cult of St Katherine began *c.* 800 when relics of the saint were discovered near to the monastery at the foot of Mount Sinai. Both the cult and a relic were brought to Europe in the 1020s by a Rouen monk who had spent several years at the monastery, and not long afterwards a Latin life (the Vulgate version, based on a late-tenth-century text attributed to St Athanasius) was composed by another Rouen monk, whence the legend reached England.³³ In the later thirteenth century, *LA* has little to say about St Katherine and Mount Sinai, and Mirk, a century later, used only the *LA* details that milk flowed from her decapitated body and angels carried her on a twenty-day journey to Mount Sinai. He did not use the further detail (applied to many saints) that a healing oil still issues from her body.

These exiguous details were elaborated by the Group B redactor. According to the Group B text, St Katherine lies in an alabaster tomb in the crypt of a fortified abbey of strict monks at the foot of Mount Sinai. In the church above is Moses' burning bush. Each monk has an oil lamp which dims as the monk approaches death. On the death of the abbot the Mass of the Holy Ghost is sung for him, after which a letter naming the new abbot is to be found on the altar. At the vigil of St Katherine birds arrive with olive branches, out of which the monks produce enough oil for their lamps to last all year and even to sell. (The sale of the oil is omitted in Oxford, Bodleian Library MSS Rawlinson A.381 and Oxford, University College, D.102, and Hatfield House, Cecil Papers 280 reduces the material considerably.)

p. 59, ll. 841–44, 849–57.

²⁸ *South English Nativity*, ed. by Pickering, p. 34.

²⁹ *Festial*, I, xxiv.

³⁰ One Group A manuscript, London, British Library, MS Lansdowne 392, ends at this point; the sermon is missing in its close relative, London, British Library, MSS Harley 2420 and 2417.

³¹ This sermon is absent from two Group B MSS, Leeds, University Library, Brotherton Collection, MS 502 and Dublin, Trinity College, MS 201.

³² The Group B text differs from Group A in offering more circumstantial detail (not from *LA*) in this *narratio*.

³³ For an exhaustive discussion of the prose legends, see A. Kurvinen, 'The Life of St Catherine of Alexandria in Middle English Prose' (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Oxford, 1960); for a brief summary, see *St Katherine of Alexandria: The Late Middle English Prose Legend in Southwell Minster MS 7*, ed. by Saara Nevanlinna and Irma Taavitsainen (Cambridge: Brewer, 1993), pp. 4–6. For a diffuse and extensive account of the saint and her influence, see Katherine J. Lewis, *The Cult of St Katherine of Alexandria in Late Medieval England* (Woodbridge: Brewer, 2000), and for the texts, see Jacqueline Jenkins and Katherine J. Lewis, *St Katherine of Alexandria: Texts and Contexts in Western Medieval Europe* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2003).

Again, comparison may be made first with *SEL*, which adds only one detail to *LA*, that the saint was martyred AD 320.³⁴ Of other verse versions circulating at the time of the *Festial* recension, John Capgrave's life of St Katherine³⁵ and Osbern Bokenham's *Legendys of Hooly Wummen*³⁶ may be a little late (both are mid-fifteenth-century).³⁷ Bokenham's version is that of *LA*, while Capgrave has only a little more to say: angels carried the saint to the mountain where Moses received the Law, the occasion was a Friday, the healing oil fills the monks' lamps.

However, it is when we turn to *GL* that we find the most elaborate details of the invention story.³⁸ Hermits devoted to a life of abstinence had built a chapel to St Katherine near the top of Mount Sinai, close by the burning bush where God had appeared to Moses. Here an angel appeared to the hermits and offered to guide them to the saint's body: 'though it be so that ye see not me, the shadowe of the palme that y bere in myn honde shall neuer departe from youre sighte'. At the desolate summit they found the body, which had lain in a stone for 120 years, and brought it down, amazingly easily given the terrain, to their own chapel, where they instituted the feast of the invention (that is, the 'finding') of her body and where, despite the fact that the flesh had dried up, the bones exuded healing oil.

The *GL* version is that of all but the earliest of the four versions of the late Middle English prose legend.³⁹ Version (b) survives in thirteen manuscripts, seven of which are of *GL* or contain part of *GL*, and versions (c) and (d) offer similar material on the invention of the saint. Indeed, version (c), which survives in only one (early sixteenth-century) manuscript, London, British Library, MS Harley 4012 (fols 115r–123v), provides a unique introduction on the death of the saint and the finding of her body.⁴⁰ *GL* does not, however, contain all the details as in the *Festial* redaction: the alabaster tomb in the crypt of the fortified abbey; the abbey at the foot of Mount Sinai and the burning bush in the church above; the monks' prescient oil lamps; the procedure at the death of the abbot; the oil for the lamps, brought by birds with olive branches in their beaks.

In fact, all these details (and more) are found in *Mandeville's Travels*, first composed c. 1357 in French and based on several European itineraries together with other sources, principally Vincent of Beauvais's *Speculum historiale*, but compounded with the fiction that Mandeville was an Englishman recalling a world tour made in 1322.⁴¹ The version in London,

³⁴ *South English Legendary*, ed. by D'Evelyn, II, 542–43, ll. 295–310.

³⁵ *The Life of St Katherine of Alexandria*, ed. by Carl Horstmann, EETS o.s. 100 (1893), pp. 401–03, ll. 1898–1981.

³⁶ *Legendys of Hooly Wummen*, ed. by Mary S. Serjeantson, EETS o.s. 206 (1938), pp. 172–201, ll. 6312–7376.

³⁷ Capgrave's work was known to Bokenham. See too A. Kurvinen, 'The Source of Capgrave's Life of St Katherine of Alexandria', *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen*, 61 (1960), 268–324.

³⁸ *Gilte Legende*, ed. by Hamer, ll. 904–5, 834–77. For a discussion of Mount Sinai and the Katherine legend in text and image, see Lewis, *The Cult*, pp. 98–106.

³⁹ So Nevanlinna and Taavitsainen, *St. Katherine*, p. 14, but a slightly different account is given for the same three versions at p. 112, note to l. 931. The legend edited by Nevanlinna and Taavitsainen is a hybrid of the first and second earliest versions with a unique addition (p. 21). The details of the invention are the same as in *SEL*.

⁴⁰ These details, based on Kurvinen, are summarized by Nevanlinna and Taavitsainen, *St. Katherine*, p. 11. The new material in version (c) is not comparable to anything in the *Festial* addition. See too A. Kurvinen, 'Two Sixteenth Century Editions of the Life of St. Catherine', in *English and Medieval Studies Presented to J. R. R. Tolkien on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday*, ed. by Norman Davis and C. L. Wrenn (London: Allen and Unwin, 1962), pp. 267–79.

⁴¹ There are numerous versions of the text. The earliest edition is *Mandeville's Travels, Translated from the French of Jean d'Outremeuse*, ed. from London, British Library, MS Cotton Titus C XVI by P. Hamelius, 2 vols, EETS o.s. 153, 154 (1919, 1923), re-edited with modernized spelling by M. C. Seymour (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967), re-issued in The World's Classics series (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1968). Other versions have

The Nativity of the Virgin and St Katherine

British Library, MS Cotton Titus C XVI notes ‘an abbeye of monkes wel bylded and wel closed with 3ates of iren for drede of the wylde bestes’ (cf. Appendix (ii), ll. 1–2). The monks are described as hermits who drink no wine except on major feasts and ‘don gret abstynence and penaunce’ (cf. l. 1) and who burn many lamps in their church of St Katherine, the oil of which comes from olives brought annually as offerings by pilgrim-birds (cf. ll. 13–15). Behind the altar is Moses’ burning bush (cf. ll. 4–5), where the monks remove shoes and stockings. Alongside the high altar up three steps is the alabaster tomb of St Katherine (cf. ll. 2–3), where a monk stirs the bones to emit a little fragrant oil to give to pilgrims. When angels carried the saint’s body to Mount Sinai (cf. ll. 3–4), it was in a cloth which is shown to pilgrims, together with the saint’s head. The bush that burns and is not consumed (cf. ll. 5–6) is also shown to pilgrims. When the prelate of the abbey dies, his lamp goes out, and when a new one is chosen, his lamp lights up. Indeed, each monk has a lamp which grows dim when they are about to die (cf. ll. 7–10). If the new prelate is unworthy, his lamp goes out at once. And when the Mass is sung for the new prelate, the priest finds the name of the new prelate on the altar (cf. ll. 10–12).⁴²

However, while there are a few verbal parallels, the order of material and the facts both differ markedly.⁴³ Again, it seems likely that the redactor attempted a memorial reconstruction of the story or worked through a secondary source, rather than direct from a manuscript of *Mandeville’s Travels*. In fact, this is not the only use of Mandeville in the *Festial*, and, while the other occurrence is in a passage for which there is no reason to doubt Mirk’s authorship, the material is treated similarly to the way that it is treated in the recension.

The passage occurs in the sermon for the feast-day of St Thomas of India:⁴⁴

Pen crystemen buried hym in a tombe of crystal per God wroght mony wondur myraclus for hym, for **þe honde þat was in Crystes cyde hyt wol neuer into þe tombe but lay euer wythout** [...] For alle þe contre cometh þedur on hys day and takun hosul of þat hond in þys wyse: þe byschop of þat cyte synguth þe masse þat day, and, when he bygynneth þe masse, er he seye hys ‘*Confiteor*’, he takuth a branch of a vyne and puteth in Thomas hond and so goth forth to masse. Þen þys branch burgeneth out grapus, and so, by þat þe gospel be seyð, þe byschop takuþ þys grapus and wrengeth into hys chalis and synguth wyth þat wyn and hoseleth alle þe pepul þerwyth, and puteth þe ost in Thomas honde and so hoseleth alle þe pepul. But when any comuth þat ys vnworþy, anon þe hond closeth togedur and wol not opun tyl he be scryven klene, and þen hyt wol opun and hoselen hym. **Also when men ben in debate, þey ben brogh byfore þe tombe of Thomas and set on twyn. And when þe cause of debate ys rehersed, þen wol þe hond turne to hym þat ys in þe ryght, and so ben þey mad at on *et cetera*.** (MS Cotton Claudius A II, fols 14v–15r)

been edited by Seymour as EETS o.s. 253 (1963), 269 (1973), 319 (2002), and 336 (2010). Of these, the most relevant here is *The Bodley Version of Mandeville’s Travels*, ed. by M. C. Seymour, EETS o.s. 253 (1963).

⁴² *Mandeville’s Travels*, ed. by Hamelius, I, 38, l. 27–40, l. 9. Of the two main versions (MSS London, British Library, Cotton Titus A XVI and Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS e Museo 116), this has more (but not many) verbal parallels.

⁴³ For example, ‘an abbey of monkes’ and ‘gret abstinens’ are found in both versions. The Cotton Titus MS is verbally close to ‘for wilde bestes’, ‘spake to Moyses’, ‘a gret merveile’, ‘bridides in the cuntre’, ‘quenchiþ his lamp’ (‘for drede of the wylde bestes’, ‘foules of the contree’, ‘a gret meruaylle’, ‘spak to Moyses’, ‘his lampe quenched’, EETS o.s. 153, pp. 38, l. 29–39, l. 34); the Bodley manuscript is verbally close to ‘att þe fote of þis monte’ and ‘hye ywallyd’ (‘at the fot of Mont Synay’, ‘with heye wallis’, EETS o.s. 253, p. 39, ll. 20–21).

⁴⁴ *Festial*, I, 20–23, ll. 1–117, especially ll. 75–77, 97–111.

None of this material is in the Thomas legend in *LA*,⁴⁵ nor in *SEL*,⁴⁶ nor in *GL*.⁴⁷ The details of the hand's role in judgment (in bold above) are from *Mandeville's Travels*:

And the arm and the hond þat he putte in oure lordes syde whan he appered to him after his resurrexioun and seyde to him, **NOLI ESSE INCREDULUS, SED FIDELIS**, is 3it lyggyng in a vessell withouten the tombe. And be þat hond þei maken all here iuggementes in the contree, whoso hath right or wrong. For whan þer is ony dissencioun betwene .ij. partyes and euery of hem meynteneth his cause and saith þat his cause is rightfull, and þat oper seyth the contrarye, þanne bothe partyes writen here causes in .ij. billes and putten hem in the hond of Seynt Thomas. And anon he castethe away the bille of the wrong cause and holdeth stille the bille with the right cause. And þerfore men comen fro fer contrees to haue iuggement of doutable causes, and oper iuggement vse þei non pere.⁴⁸

Again, the *Festial* version appears to be memorial, rather than the result of direct use of this passage. Indeed, Mirk concentrates less on the role of the hand in settling disputes than on its role in providing grapes for the Eucharist wine and offering the Host to worthy communicants. This miracle has been traced to an anonymous twelfth-century tract, *De adventu patriarchae Indorum*, and is found in some manuscripts and printed editions of the Letter of Prester John, purportedly written to the Byzantine Emperor Manuel I Comnenus (1143–80) by Prester (Presbyter) John, descendant of one of the Three Magi and King of India.⁴⁹ As for the hand's role in disputes, this is not found in the Letter of Prester John but, as we have seen, in *Mandeville's Travels*. However, in a document associated with the Letter, it is said that once a year on St Thomas's feast-day, the patriarch of Hulna, where his shrine was, set the saint in the pontifical chair at the high altar and put the Host in his right hand, which then closed firmly against unworthy communicants.⁵⁰ The significance of the hand is implicit but is clearly derived from the fact that it entered Christ's side when Thomas doubted Christ's bodily resurrection (John 20. 24–29).

In all the passages discussed above, the *Legenda aurea* account of a saint's life has been augmented, either by Mirk himself (in the case of Thomas's hand) or by the redactor (for the wedding of the Virgin and the tomb of St Katherine). In each case, the details are circumstantial and not absolutely replicated in any known source. Such a source may well exist, but the freedom with which non-canonical, even non-apocryphal details attached themselves to the saints in the course of the Middle Ages is well exemplified in the *Festial* in examples such as the old ash rod in the temple (in the Nativity of the Virgin sermon), the burning bush at Mount Sinai (in the Katherine sermon), and St Thomas's role as winepress *cum* priest (in the Thomas sermon). The vitality and ingenuity of the medieval saints' legends is a source of wonderment to me, as I would suggest it has been to Oliver Pickering, over many years, and it is evidence of its vitality and ingenuity that the search for exact sources may so often prove unfruitful.

⁴⁵ *Legenda Aurea*, ed. by Graesse, pp. 32–39; *Legenda Aurea*, ed. by Maggioni, pp. 53–62.

⁴⁶ *South English Legendary*, ed. by D'Evelyn, II, 571–86, ll. 1–440.

⁴⁷ *Gilte Legende*, ed. by Hamer, I, 25–32, ll. 1–240.

⁴⁸ *Mandeville's Travels*, ed. by Hamelius, I, 114, ll. 28–115, l. 13, cf. *Bodley Version*, ed. by Seymour, p. 91, ll. 22–93, l. 9.

⁴⁹ Malcolm Letts, 'Prester John: A Fourteenth-Century Manuscript at Cambridge', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 4th series, 29 (1947), 19–26 (pp. 24–25).

⁵⁰ Malcolm Letts, *Sir John Mandeville and his Book* (London: Batchworth, 1949), especially p. 59 and (for a manuscript image of the hand sticking out of the tomb and grasping a bill) Plate VI (facing p. 33). Letts's statement (p. 139) that the story of the hand and the sacrament is based on chapter XXXII of Gregory of Tours's *Liber*

Appendix

In the transcriptions below, contractions are silently expanded and modern punctuation is observed. All variants are noted with the exception of those that are merely orthographic/dialectal. Lacunae and manifest errors in the base-text are emended, where possible from d, the manuscript closest to the base-text (c). The following abbreviations are used: *om.* (omitted), *add.* (added), *trs.* (transposed), *alt.* altered, *ab. l.* (above line). Sigla are as follows:

- a London, British Library, MS Harley 2371
- b London, British Library, MS Harley 2391
- c Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Rawlinson A.381 (the base-text)
- d Oxford, University College, MS D.102 (in the Bodleian Library)
- e Leeds, University Library, Brotherton Collection, MS 502
- f Durham, University Library, MS Cosin V.III.5
- g Dublin, Trinity College, MS 201
- h Hatfield House, Cecil Papers 280

(i) the addition to the sermon for the Nativity of the Virgin (witnesses: a fols 124v–125v, b fols 119r–120r, c fols 94va–95rb, d pp. 226–228, e fols 106r–107r (illegible readings are not noted in the apparatus), f fols 137r–138r, gh absent)

Aftur [þe] tyme that Ioachym and Anne had offred vp oure Lady into þe temple to þe bischop to kepe her in saf warde til þat sche were of xiiij zere of age and more, þan þe bischope must ordeine her a husbound and lete doun crye aboute in the cuntre þat kynges and oþer gentiles þat were without wifes schuld come þedur att a certayne dai for to witt who were best worþi
5 to wedde l [col. b] þat fayre maiden þat was floure of maydenes. For ri3t as a lyly is among the brerys white, so was that maiden among alle maydenes.

And whan þei come to Ierusalem for to see this mayden that was of the best blood of alle þe world, he ordeny[d] an olde staf of asche þat had ben in the temple many zeres and was alle worme-eten. And he þat handelid þat tree, and þe tre burionid and bare floures, he schuld
10 haue þe maide to his wif, and ellis nott. And alle þei wist of this ordenaunce and gedrid hem þerto.

And þan this bischop araide this maide and brou3t her into þe temple þat alle men mi3t se her, and sche was so faire and so bri3t þat þei mi3t not loke vpon here but as it had ben þe sonne. And þan þe bischop bad bring forþe þe staf and bad hem holde it vpon hye that
15 handelid it, and it schuld bere leues aftur hym þat schuld haue the maide. And kynges went to, but it would not be. And þan went oþer therto, but it would not be on day [ne] ij dayes.

Þan cam þe iij dai þat it most be made an end of. Þan cam þer an olde man into þe towne þat hi3t Ioseph and had not seen of this doying and would go þedur to se how he my3t spede, and stode in a corner of the temple in the l [fol. 95ra] chaunsell and lokid vpon this maiden.
20 And þan he said to hymself: ‘This maide is not for me.’ And þan þer cam a white dowue and satt vpon his hede, þat alle in the temple see it, and summe cau3t the dove by the leggis but þei mi3t not holde her.

Þan was the bischop war þerof and bad Ioseph come vp to hym. And Ioseph said: ‘Nay, for sche is not for me. Sche is too yong, for Y mi3t not gouerne her astate.’ And þan said the
25 bischop: ‘Handil þis staf!’ and toke him þe staf in his hande. And anon it beganne to burione

miraculorum is not correct (he references *Patrologia Latina* 0733A–0734A, but this handles different material).

and was grene and bare leues and blossomed to bere frute. And þan was þe bischop glad, and Ioseph was hevy and sory to haue her, for he was neuer in wille to haue had wif. And þan þe bischop weddid hem worschipfully, and bade hym take her home with hym, and so he did.

And þan, sone aftur, the Holi Gost li3t into her þrou3 þe gretyng of the aungel Gabriel, and sche bygan to wex gret and be with childe. And þan Iosep lokid vpon her and þou3t to goo priuely his wai frome her and [so to haue] laft her alone. And þan cam þer an aungel to hym and bad hym that he schuld not studye no more þervpon but that he schuld kepe her wel and þinke no more suche þou3tes, for þat was Goddis owne Child and | [col. b] God hymself would þat it schuld be so. And he left of alle þo þou3tes and kep her wel as a [man] schuld do his wif. And how the aungel grett her seke in þe Annunciacion.

1 Aftur] prec. by ffurthermore i saie þat f; þe] þat abe, *om. c*; vp] *om. abef*, after Lady d; into] vnto f; to] *om. abef*; 2 to kepe] tooke abef; in] a *add. ae*, into abf; til] to d, vnto þe tyme f; were] was f; of] *om. abf*; xij] xij abdef; of age] after more abef; of] *om. d*; more] and *add. f*; must] purposed to f 3 and] he *add. abe*; lete doun] þen made to d; doun] make a f; crye] all *add. f*; in] *om. f*; kynges] knightis f 4 þedur] *om. f*; certayne] *om. f*; dai] signed *add. f*; for to] to abef; best] more abe, *om. f*; worþi] worth f; 5 to] for to b; wedde] haue f; þat] this f; þat] whiche f; of] all *add. abef*; a] the abde 6 the] all ae, *om. f*; brerys] faire and *add. f*; so] right so abe; that] this abef; maiden] hauynge most of bewte and of all vertues *add. f*; among] about f 7 þei] these men f; for to] to af; that] whiche f; of] *om. f*; best] blessid a, roiallist f 8 ordenyd] ordeyned abdef, ordeny c; an olde] a f; of asche] *om. f*; of] a *add. bd*; þat] he *add. abde*, which f; ben] *om. abde*; 3eres] a 3ere f; and] insomoche that it f 9 alle] *om. f*; eten] fretyn abe; And] than the bisshop proclamid and saide *add. f*; handelid] hondeillith f; þat] this f; tree] rod abe, staffe f; þe ... bare] while it is in his hond bering f; þe] that ae; tre] rod abe, *om. d*; floures] in his hande *add. abe*; schuld] shal f 10 þe] that abe, this f; maide] maiden abdef; to] tyll e 10–11 And ... þerto] *om. f* 10 þei] that abe; and] *om. abe*; gedrid] grede d, arraied abe 12 this(1)] þe bdef; maide] maydyn d; alle] *om. f* 13–14 and(2) ... sonne] in euery mannys sight and in her biholding that thaie maruelid moche þerof f 13 vpon] on abde; ben] on *add. abe* 14 bad(2)] comaunded to f; hem] þat he that helde it sholde f; vpon] on abde, vp a f; hye] heght d 14–15 that handelid it] *om. f* 15 handelid] handyll d, schuld handyle b, (shulde *canc.*) handle e; and] yf *add. abef*; schuld bere] bare abef; þat] he *add. ae*, man *add. b*, he f; haue] here *add. d*; the maide] hir f; maide] maydyn bd; And(2)] þen d, thanne *add. abe* 15–16 kynges ... but] than þer went moche pepple (*alt. from plpple?*) and handillidd this staffe bothe kingis and many oþer grete estatis and f 16 be(2)] in no wise *add. f*; And] *om. abe*; þan ... dayes] *om. f*; therto] to abe, *om. d*; but] yitt *add. ab*; ne] *om. bcd* 17 Þan] thaie *add. f*; cam(1)] on *add. f*; þat it most] for it sholde f; most] nedes *add. abe*; an] *om. b*; of] and *add. f*; cam(2)] *om. f*; þer] was *add. f*; into] in f; towne] cite f 18 þat] whiche f; and] that a; of] all *add. f*; and would] he thought to f; se] wete f 19 and] so he *add.*; in the chaunsell] *om. abef*; vpon] on abde; maiden] maide f 20 And] *om. e*; þan ... to] whan he sawe hir he thought within f; This maide is] þat she was f; maide] madyn d; me] him f; þan] at þe last f; a] faire *add. f*; dowue] culuer f 21 satt] hir *add. b*; alight f; alle] they *add. abe*, men might *add. f*; in the temple] *om. abdef*; it] *om. abe*; cau3t ... leggis] made profir to cacche it f 22 þei ... her] it wolde not be and f 23 was] sayghe d, after bischop f; war] *om. df*; þerof] of this abe, of Ioseph f, *om. d*; Iosep] him þat he sholde f; Ioseph] answerid and *add. f* 24 for(1)] *om. aef*; me] for *add. f*; too] *om. f*; yong] and I am olde *add. f*; for(3)] perfore d, and abe, and also f; mi3t] may abdef 24–25 said ... him] the bisshop comaundid

The Nativity of the Virgin and St Katherine

him to take f 24 the] this d 25 toke ... hande] so he did abe; in his hande] *om. d; anon]*
as sone as it was in his hande f 26 blossomed to bere] redie to be f; blossomed] *blomyd d;*
was(2)] *after* bischop f; and] but f 27 was(1)] *om. b, both add. f; hevy and sory]* *trs. abe;*
to] for to d; for ... þan] vnto his wijf notwithstanding f; had] a *add. abe; þan]* *om. abe* 28
worschiphfully] in the most worschypful wise f; hym(1)] *om. abe, that he sholde add. f; and ...*
did] *om. f* 29 sone aftur] anone f; into] in af; þe] *om. b; Gabriel]* *om. abef;* 30 and(1)]
thanne *add. abe, than anone add. f; and be]* *om. abef; vpon]* on abdef; 31 goo] haue gon
bef, haue stolen a; priuely] *after* awaye f; his wai] awaye af; so to haue] f, he did and abeg,
om. cd; þan] þe angel *add. f; þer an aungel]* *om. f* 32 not] *om. abef þervpon]* þeron bd, such
thoughtes ae, whos the childe sholde be f; but] bad him *add. f* 32–3 kepe ... þou3tes] be hir
keper f 32 wel] wyll b 33 þat] it f; was] is ab; and] þat *add. f* 34 be so] *trs. aef; And]* so
add. abe, than add. f; of] *om. abef; þo]* such abef; þou3tes] fantasies f; wel] forth abe, in þe
best wise f 34–35 man ... wif] woman ought to be kept f 34 man] *om. c; schuld]* aught
to abe 35 And ... Annunciacion] seeke the remanent in thannunciacion (of oure ladie *add.*
f) how (þat *add. f*) thangell gret hir abef; And] *om. d; Annunciacion]* amen *add. d*

(ii) the addition to the sermon for the feast-day of St Katherine (witnesses: a fols 140v–141r,
b fol. 132r–v, c fol. 105ra–b, d p. 254, f fol. 153r–v, h fol. 67r, eg absent)

And att þe fote of þis monte þer is an abbey of monkes þat liven in gret abstinens, and this
abbey is strong and hye ywallyd and barrid with yrne for wilde bestes. And in þat abbey lyep
Seint Kateryne in a faire tombe of alabastre, for her bones were fet þedur for more reuerence
and worschip. And aboven in the chirch is a busch þat God stood in whan he spake to Moyses
5 and wrote þe Law in ij tables of stoun, and þat busch is as faire and as grene as it was þat
same dai.

And in þat abbey is a gret merveile, and þat is þis: every monke hath a lampe brynnynge
with oyle, and whan he schall dye [þei schall wete by his lamp, for,] as he drawiþ to his deþ-
ward, so quenchiþ his lamp of li3t, and whan he dyiþ, þan goiþ out þe lampe. And whan the
10 abbot dyiþ, þan his breþer schall sing a masse of the Holi Gost and bery hym symplye. And
whan the masse is donn, þei schall fynde vpon þe auter a letter writen who schall be her abbot,
and so l [col. b] makyn þei her abbot.

And also vpon Seint Kateryne ni3t alle the briddes in the cuntre come þedur and bring
ychon of hem a braunche of olive into þe place, and pilgrimes þat offre þat tyme sayne þat þei
15 make of þe braunches oyle to her lampes for alle the 3ere.

1 And] ffor f, *om. adh; þis]* þe abh; monte] mownte bdfh; an] *ab. l. f; þat ... abstinens]* *om.*
h þat] whiche f; in] ful *add. f; and(2)]* so *add. f* 2 is] ful *add. f; and(1) ... bestes]* *om. h;*
with yrne] *om. f; for]* bicause of f; þat] þis abf 3 faire] rial f; for(1) ... for(2)] bicause of
þe f 3–4 reuerence and worschip] *trs. f* 4–15 And ... 3ere] where as owur lord hath
schewyd to his peple þorow this blessyd mene of this holy maydyn and marter seynt kateryn
many grete myraclis and dayly doth h 4 aboven] also f; the] this f; chirch] abbey f; a] þe
abf; þat] whiche that f; God stood] oure lorde aperid f; whan] what tyme þat f 5 wrote ...
ij] what tyme þat he delyuered to him the f; in] þe *add. d; stoun]* and of the commaundmentis
f; busch] vnto this daie *add. f* 6 dai] tyme ab, tyme þat oure lorde aperid therinne f 7
And] also f; þat] same *add. f, the a; and þat]* whiche f; monke] in this abbey *add. f* 8 whan
he] what tyme ony of hem f; þei ... for] *om. c; þei]* he ab; wete] haue a knowelege f; for] euyng
add. f; his] þe abd, *om. f* 9 -ward] *om. abd; quenchiþ]* dyrkyns abd, wil derke more and
more (*after* lampe) f; his] the a; of ... lampe] *om. abf ; þe]* lyghte of þe *add. d* 10 dyiþ] is

ded bf; þan his breþer] thaie f; and] than *add. f*; symplye] sollemply abdf; 11 whan] by that tyme þat f; is] be f; vpon þe auter] on the aultere and *after* letter f; vpon] on abdf; her] *om. ab* 12–13 and ... And] *om. f* 12 makyn þei] *trs. ab*; þei] *ab. l. c* 13 And] *om. a*; also] anothir grete merueile þer is done there *add. f*; vpon] on abdf; niȝt] daie which is this that f; in] of abf; the] þat ab; cuntre] as that daie *add. f*; bring] brynges (*after* hem) df 14 ychon] eche f; þe] þat ab; place] abbey f; þat(1) ... tyme] *om. f*; þei] þe monkis f; 15 make] þam *add. abdf*; of þe braunches] *om. f*; þe] þes b, þoo d, thaire a; oyle] þerof *add. f*; to] serue *add. f*; her] þo b; for] *om. f*; ȝere] and so (so] som b) for to sell *add. ab*, and the remmaund they sille for her sustynauce *add. f*