Leeds Studies in English

New Series XLI

2010

Essays in Honour of Oliver Pickering

Edited by

Janet Burton, William Marx, and Veronica O'Mara

Reading for the Ear:
Lambeth Palace Library, MS 487, Item 10

Mary Swan

Introduction

This paper is concerned with reading, preaching, transmission, and reception, in terms of what they imply as practices, how they connect, and how — or rather whether — it might be possible to recover them from manuscript texts.[1] The texts to be discussed are ones which are particularly rich for these purposes because of their genre as preaching texts, and because of two aspects of their situation in relation to other texts: they are what are commonly called 'variant' copies, and they are post-Conquest re-writings of pre-Conquest Old English texts. Each of these categories of textual identity has very particular implications for the idea of reading, as will now be explored.

Preaching and Preaching Texts

A preaching text is a contradiction in terms. Preaching is a 'live', oral event, requiring a voice for its performance and ears for its reception. A written preaching text might be retrospective or proleptic.[2] It might contain the words of a preaching event which has already happened, and might thus act as a record of it, available to be repeated or adapted on a future occasion (and thereby potentially rewritten in advance of or after that occasion), or to be read and studied outside of a preaching event. It might, alternatively, be a script, to be followed exactly or adapted by a preacher in delivery, for a preaching event which is envisaged as happening in the future. Or it might be a fictive enactment of a preaching situation; always intended

---

[1]   Oliver Pickering's wisdom and collegiality have been fundamental to the development of the Institute for Medieval Studies. Teaching with him on medieval manuscripts has been very rewarding, so it gives me great pleasure to offer as my contribution to his festschrift a study of a manuscript included in his and Veronica O'Mara's *Index of Middle English Prose* (see note 9 for full reference) — even if I am re-appropriating it for Old English studies.

[2]   This paper has its origins in my contribution to the 2004 conference 'Recovering Reading: Reception Histories and Medieval Texts' at Queen's University Belfast, organized by Stephen Kelly and John Thompson. The other papers delivered on that occasion and the stimulating discussion during and after it contributed greatly to my thinking about the relationship between preaching and reading.

for contemplation or study or devotional use outside of the liturgy, and never intended to be preached in a liturgical setting. Whichever of these possibilities might pertain in any given case, a text can never be a preaching event.[3] There is, therefore, an inherent readerliness about a preaching text. Its rhetorical framing makes appeal to an imagined preaching event, but it is always a re-casting of such an event into another format: one which requires a reader. It is essential that this distance, and this separateness from a performance or delivery, are taken into account in attempts to conceptualize preaching texts as distinct from, but dependent on the idea of, preaching events. Preaching texts, then, require both reading with the eye, in order to process the words on the page, and reading for the ear, because their rhetorical construction always recalls a spoken and heard event.

Preaching texts, like the words spoken in a preaching event, exemplify some central characteristics of manuscript culture textuality, in that they only work if they make use of tradition and formula, and evoke and repeat the required elements of accepted, traditional doctrine and texts.[4] In the particular case of preaching, the work to be performed is ritual in nature, part of a religious service, an act of worship and an act of ideology-reinforcing and identity-building in line with a powerful tradition. Equally, to have meaning at any given reading or hearing, preaching texts and events have to work specifically; to respond to tradition and move it from the past to the present and from there to the future; to reiterate and re-present it. The resulting tension between tradition and innovation, continuity and change, past and future, is the dynamic which is created in a preaching text or event and is what gives it its cultural and ideological meaning.

The nature of the reading, in the sense of audience reception, of medieval preaching events is as unknowable to us as the precise nature of the events themselves. If we are to imagine the ways in which a preaching event might be received by a congregation, then these might include a response of approval and confirmation, recognition, collusion, boredom, resistance, counter-imagining, or — most interesting for the purposes of the present paper — a response which plans to re-use the preaching which is being heard to make a new homily, which is already imagining a moving forward of that preaching into the future. All of these possible responses are, of course, readings, in the sense of interpretations, of the preaching event, and all of them are possible readings of a preaching text too.

Variant Copies

The term generally used to refer to versions of a manuscript text which are judged to post-date its earliest form, and to make changes to it, is 'variant copies'. With its hint at deviancy,

---

[3] Beverly Kienzle provides a very useful overview of the question of genre in her 'Introduction' to *The Sermon*, ed. by Beverly Kienzle, Typologie des Sources du Moyen Âge Occidental, 81–83 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2000), pp. 143–74 (especially pp. 145–54 and 159–61). Many early medieval preaching texts combine general moral exhortation with biblical exegesis, and therefore the modern category distinctions of 'homily' and 'sermon' do not reflect their characteristics. For this reason, most early medievalists use the term 'homily' to refer to any preaching event or preaching text. In the current paper, 'homily' and 'preaching text' will be used to refer to all written versions of the genre, and 'homily' and 'preaching event' will be used for the live performance of preaching in the liturgy. For a discussion of the terminology, see Joyce Hill, 'Reform and Resistance', in *De l'Homélie au Sermon: Histoire de la Prédication Médiévale*, ed. by Jacqueline Hamesse and Xavier Hermand (Louvain-la-Neuve: Fédération Internationale des Instituts d'Études Médiévales, 1993), pp. 15–46 (p. 19), and Thomas N. Hall, 'The Early Medieval Sermon', in *The Sermon*, ed. by Kienzle, pp. 203–69 (pp. 203–12).

[4] For an interesting analysis of the role of tradition in Anglo-Saxon religious texts and practices, see Clare A. Lees, *Tradition and Belief*: *Religious Writing in Late Anglo-Saxon England* (Minneapolis and London: University of Minnesota Press, 1999). On the question of the function of preaching and how this might affect our analysis of

this term assumes a number of things: an identifiable, single 'original' form of the text which itself is not derivative, and which is the unadulterated product of the agency of an individual author; a contamination of this 'original' version by scribes who do not qualify to be classed as authors, and who corrupt what they copy; and the inherent superiority of an 'original' version, in terms of (almost always undefined) ascetic and moral quality, which have more to do with a modern scholarly desire for textual fixity and purity and supremacy of origin than with the realities of medieval textual cultures.[5] The present paper will refer instead to 'altered', rather than 'variant', copies of a manuscript text, in order to emphasize differences but not to imply a hierarchy of status or value. Altered copies of texts are made by readers who write. They are always the result of reading, and they constitute rereadings themselves; they are examples of reader-response — and sometimes, when their makers merge a main source with other texts from memory or from books or from their own voice, impressively dextrous and creative reader-response which creates a new textual voice.[6]

In studying multiple copies of a text, the questions of how to assess agency, and of whose agency we are reading on the manuscript page of an altered version of a text, are pressing and complex. In order to recover fully agency and its implications, it would be necessary, first, to compare an altered copy of a text with its source, but in fact the vagaries of manuscript survival, and the complexities of altered copies, mean that it is almost always impossible to identify with confidence the direct source, in manuscript form, for any given copy, and, furthermore, the nature of medieval textuality means that few versions of texts are simply derivations from a single written source. Secondly, it would be necessary to know the precise context and impulse for the production of the altered copy, in terms of who decided that the copy should be made; to know whether some or all of the alterations in it were the result of a conscious decision not to reproduce the source version exactly, and if so, why and by whom this was decided; to know whether the person who decided that the copy should be made and the person who made decisions about its form are the same person as the scribe who wrote it out; and to know the intended function of the copy.[7] Most of these elements of context are, of course, utterly unrecoverable, and we are therefore obliged to hypothesize a series of imaginable networks of points of agency, involving possible direct and indirect sources and influences, source-authors, scribes, commissioners of texts, and their intended users or receivers. This allows us to envisage agency in medieval textual culture as provisional and mobile and layered; responsive both to inherited norms and current agendas.

---

preaching texts, see Mary Swan, '*Men ða leofestan*: Genre, the Canon, and the Old English Homiletic Tradition', in *The Christian Tradition in Anglo-Saxon England: Approaches to Current Scholarship and Teaching*, ed. by Paul Cavill (Woodbridge: Boydell and Brewer, 2004), pp. 185–92.

5   Allen J. Frantzen's *Desire for Origins: New Language, Old English, and Teaching the Tradition* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1990) was a key impulse for a lively and continuing debate about these concepts in Anglo-Saxon studies, and for the development of a more nuanced approach to multiple copies of manuscript texts, as reflected in the ongoing analysis and discussion generated by the two international Anglo-Saxon source-study projects, *Fontes Anglo-Saxonici* (http://fontes.english.ox.ac.uk) and *Sources of Anglo-Saxon Literary Culture*, whose first volume has been published: *Sources of Anglo-Saxon Literary Culture*, Volune One: *Abbo of Fleury, Abbo of Saint-Germain-des-Prés, and Acta Sanctorum*, ed. by Frederick M. Biggs and others (Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute Publications, 2001).

6   Altered texts as reader-response are discussed by Mary Swan, 'Old English Made New: One *Catholic Homily* and its Reuses', *Leeds Studies in English*, n.s. 28 (1997), 1–18.

7   For a survey of some of these issues, see Mary Swan, 'Authorship and Anonymity', in *A Companion to Anglo-Saxon Literature*, ed. by Phillip Pulsiano and Elaine Treharne (Oxford: Blackwell, 2001), pp. 71–83.

Altered copies of preaching texts manifest the particular form of agency which is reader-response by writing out the original text in two ways: in the sense of copying it, and thus writing it out systematically and repetitively, and also of writing it out by obliterating parts or elements of it, by overlaying it with difference. Furthermore, to add to the layers of implications, altered copies of preaching texts also write out the previous version on which they rely by anticipating it, and indeed themselves, being superseded by a further response in the form of a future orally-delivered homily.

Post-Conquest Copies of Pre-Conquest Old English Preaching Texts

By defintion post-Conquest copies of pre-Conquest Old English preaching texts are always political readings, in that they result from a conscious choice to deploy English, rather than Latin or Anglo-Norman, and a version of English which is manifestly based on that of an earlier century. In the century and a half after the Conquest, making or reading a text in English was never a neutral or unconscious act, and scholarship on such texts is increasingly identifying them as deliberate acts of resistance, or articulations of a very particular identity.[8] They are also readings very far removed from their pre-Conquest sources, and can be seen as engaged in long-distance conversations at considerable chronological and cultural remove. Like all preaching texts, post-Conquest Old English homilies are predicated on an imagined preaching event, but in their case it is a very ideologically marked one: a preaching event in Old English. In the case of such very late Old English texts as those in London, Lambeth Palace Library, MS 487, the subject of the following case-study, it can be argued that what is underway is the enacting — or writing out or performance — of a desire to re-read and recover and re-configure a new, Old English, identity.

Lambeth Palace Library, MS 487, Item 10

In order to show how some of these readings might be recoverable, a preaching text in Lambeth 487 will now be examined. This manuscript is a very late twelfth- or very early thirteenth-century collection of devotional texts, all in English, which are drawn from both pre-Conquest Old English preaching texts and post-Conquest English religious works, and it was written out

---

[8]   For an overview of the current debates on Post-Conquest Old English textual production, a list of relevant manuscripts, and a catalogue of manuscripts, see *The Production and Use of English Manuscripts 1060 to 1220*, edited by Orietta Da Rold, Takako Kato, Mary Swan, and Elaine Traherne (Leicester, 2010), available at www.le.ac.uk/ee/ em1060to1220. *Rewriting Old English in the Twelfth Century*, ed. by Mary Swan and Elaine M. Treharne (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), brought together the first collection of new work on aspects of this material. Subsequent articles, including Treharne 'Producing a Library in Late Anglo-Saxon England: Exeter, 1050–1072', *Review of English Studies*, n.s. 54 (2003), 155–72; and 'Reading from the Margins: The Uses of Old English Homiletic Manuscripts in the Post-Conquest Period' (forthcoming) and Swan, 'Imagining a Readership for Post Conquest Old English Manuscripts', in *Imagining the Book*, ed. by Stephen Kelly and John J. Thompson (Turnhout: Brepols, 2005), pp. 145–57, and 'Mobile Libraries: Old English Manuscript Production in Worcester and the West Midlands, 1030–1215', in *Essays in Manuscript Geography: Vernacular Manuscripts of the West Midlands from the Conquest to the Sixteenth Century*, ed. by Wendy Scase (Turnhout: Brepols, 2007), pp. 29–42, further explore the political implications of post-Conquest Old English.

somewhere in the West Midlands.[9] Most of the items in Lambeth 487 are preaching texts in terms of their style and rhetoric, but we have no way of knowing if they were — or if they were intended to be — preached in a liturgical context. Lambeth 487 has no explicit signs of use during the Middle Ages, but this does not permit the deduction that it was not used. Many Old English manuscripts are similarly unmarked, and many of these contain pragmatic texts such as homilies; it is reasonable to assume that these would not have been written into codices unless there was a strong expectation that they would be used and, therefore, that some of them were used, whether for preaching or reading. I have argued elsewhere that it is possible that Lambeth 487 was intended for private devotional reading rather than for public preaching; ongoing work on this manuscript and others from the same period promises to provide further insight into its possible functions.[10]

The particular item which is the current case study, item 10, is one of the Lambeth 487 items with a surviving Old English source. Item 10, which has the manuscript rubric *De octo uiciis et de duodecim abusiuis huius seculi*, is an altered copy; a physical and intellectual manifestation of a response to reading. It is in fact an altered copy of a text which is already itself an altered copy. Its probable source is a version of a composite homily which also survives in two other manuscripts; Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 178 (hereafter CCCC 178) which was written at the beginning of the eleventh century and was in Worcester at some point in that century,[11] and Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Hatton 116, written in the first half of the twelfth century, and in Worcester by the early thirteenth century.[12] The component parts of this homily are excerpts from texts by the late-tenth to early eleventh-century English monastic author Ælfric of Eynsham.[13] Despite the distinctiveness of Ælfric's voice as a writer, many composite homilies re-use and re-configure parts of his works.[14] Numerous examples

---

[9]   The manuscript was edited by Richard Morris, *Old English Homilies and Homiletic Treatises of the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries*, EETS o.s. 29 and 34 (1868). The manuscript is discussed, and some of its contents edited, by Sarah M. O'Brien, 'An Edition of Seven Homilies from Lambeth Palace Library MS 487' (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Oxford, 1985). The prose items are described in O. S. Pickering and V. M. O'Mara, *The Index of Middle English Prose, Handlist XIII: Manuscripts in Lambeth Palace Library* (Cambridge: Brewer, 1999), pp. 40–43. The manuscript has been published in facsimile in *Wulfstan Texts and Other Homiletic Materials*, with an introduction by Jonathan Wilcox, Early English Manuscripts in Microfiche Facsimile, VIII (Tempe: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 2000). I discuss the manuscript in 'Preaching Past the Conquest: Lambeth Palace 487 and Cotton Vespasian A. XXII', in *The Old English Homily: Precedent, Practice, and Appropriation*, ed. by Aaron J Kleist (Turnhout: Brepols, 2007), pp. 403–23.

[10]   See Swan, 'Imagining a Readership', pp. 145–57, and 'Old English Textual Activity in the Reign of Henry II', in *Writers of the Reign of Henry II: Twelve Essays*, ed. by Ruth Kennedy and Simon Meecham-Jones (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006), pp. 151–68. Bella Millett studies the Middle English homilies in Lambeth 487 in the context of Latin preaching texts of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries in 'The Pastoral Context of the Trinity and Lambeth Homilies', in *Essays in Manuscript Geography,* ed. by Scase, pp. 43–64.

[11]   CCCC 178's place of production is not known. All manuscript details and dates are based on N. R. Ker, *A Catalogue of Manuscripts Containing Anglo-Saxon* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1957), except where otherwise noted, and except in the case of Lambeth 487 itself, which Ker does not include in his detailed catalogue entries because of its late date. Further details of CCCC 178 and Hatton 116 are given in the introductions to the editions of Ælfric's *Catholic Homilies*; see *Ælfric's Catholic Homilies, The First Series Text*, ed. by Peter Clemoes, EETS s.s. 17 (1997), and *Ælfric's Catholic Homilies, The Second Series Text*, ed. by Malcolm Godden, EETS s.s. 5 (1979).

[12]   Hatton 116's place of production is also unknown.

[13]   For current approaches to Ælfrician studies, see *A Companion to Ælfric*, ed. by Hugh Magennis and Mary Swan (Leiden: Brill, 2009).

[14]   I discuss Ælfric's preaching voice in 'Constructing Preacher and Audience in Old English Homilies', in *Constructing the Medieval Sermon*, ed. by Roger Andersson (Turnhout: Brepols, 2008), pp. 177–88, and his

from the late tenth to the twelfth century make use of one or two Ælfric excerpts, usually from his series of preaching texts known as the *Catholic Homilies*, in this way.[15]

What makes item 10 remarkable is that it is a composite made up of excerpts from a total of four Ælfrician texts, none of which is from his *Catholic Homilies*. Three are from pieces in Ælfric's collection of Saints' Lives,[16] and the fourth is his separate composition *De duodecim abusiuis*, which makes up two-thirds of item 10.[17] The first three Ælfric excerpts are joined together with some unsourced phrases which are presumed to be the work of the compiler of the composite piece. Scholars of Ælfric are of the opinion that Ælfric might not have been responsible for the welding together of these excerpts from his work, not least because the rhythm of some of them is lost in the compilation.[18] Whilst it does seem unlikely that Ælfric would transform the style and structure of his own work in this way, the idea of a compiler using such a range of pieces all by Ælfric, the first two of which are extremely short and unremarkable in their content and expression, is equally hard to imagine. Ælfric scholarship has long been alert to his tendency to re-write his own compositions, and recent and ongoing work is reshaping our understanding of his output,[19] so the question of the identity of the compiler of the composite homily which is the source of Lambeth 487 item 10 may yet be revisited.

The question of whether or not Ælfric made or authorized this composite from his work is not central to the current study; relevant for this discussion is the relationship which item 10 bears to the two other manuscript copies of the same text. It can be shown on a number of grounds that the Lambeth text is not a direct copy of the Corpus or the Hatton ones,[20] and

---

construction of a first-person position in other writings in 'Identity and Ideology in Ælfric's Prefaces', in *A Companion to Ælfric*, ed. by Magennis and Swan, pp. 246–69.

[15] See Mary Swan, 'Ælfric as Source: The Exploitation of Ælfric's *Catholic Homilies* from the Late Tenth to Twelfth Centuries' (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Leeds, 1993).

[16] The three pieces are *De natiuitate Christi*, *De oratione moysi*, and *Sermo de memoria sanctorum*, numbered as items I, XIII and XVI respectively in the edition of Ælfric's *Lives of Saints* from Julius E VII by Walter W. Skeat, *Ælfric's Lives of Saints*, 2 vols in 4 parts, EETS o.s. 76, 82, 94, 114 (1881–1900); reprinted as 2 vols (1966), pp. 10–24, 282–306, and 336–362. As noted by Donald Scragg, 'The Corpus of Anonymous Lives and Their Manuscript Context', in *Holy Men and Holy Women: Old English Prose Saints' Lives and Their Contexts*, ed. by Paul E. Szarmach (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1996), pp. 209–30 (p. 225), and Joyce Hill, 'The Dissemination of Ælfric's *Lives of Saints*', in *Holy Men and Holy Women*, pp. 235–59 (p. 248), hagiographic narrative in general is less re-deployable in contexts other than those associated with the saint in question, and this is one reason for the less frequent re-use and adapration of Ælfric's Saints' Lives than of his Catholic Homily texts. This notwithstanding, it is important to note that these three items are not strictly hagiographic, as Hill notes in 'The Dissemination of Ælfric's *Lives of Saints*', p. 237, and also that they are transmitted in manuscript collections which include non-hagiographic Ælfric homilies.

[17] *De duodecim abusiuis* is edited in *Early English Homilies from the Twelfth Century MS. Vespasian D. XIV*, ed. by Rubie D-N Warner, EETS o.s. 152 (1917), pp. 16–19. Aaron J Kleist discusses *De duodecim abusiuis* and CCCC 178 in 'Assembling Ælfric: Reconstructing the Rationale Behind Eleventh- and Twelfth-Century Compilations', in *A Companion to Ælfric*, ed. by Magennis and Swan, pp. 369–98.

[18] P. A. M. Clemoes, 'The Chronology of Ælfric's Works', in *The Anglo-Saxons: Studies in Some Aspects of Their History and Culture Presented to Bruce Dickins*, ed. by P. A. M. Clemoes (London: Bowes and Bowes, 1959), pp. 212–47 (p. 239, n. 3), expresses the possibility that the compilation was not made by Ælfric, and this view is reported and echoed by John C. Pope, *Homilies of Ælfric: A Supplementary Collection*, 2 vols, EETS o.s. 259 and 260 (London: Oxford University Press, 1967–68), I, 63–64.

[19] For example, Mary Clayton, 'An Edition of Ælfric's *Letter to Brother Edward*', in *Early Medieval English Texts and Interpretations: Studies Presented to Donald G. Scragg*, ed. by Elaine Treharne and Susan Rosser (Tempe, Arizona: Arizona Medieval and Renaissance Texts Series, 2003), pp. 263–82.

[20] O'Brien sets out a full case for the textual relationships in 'An Edition of Seven Homilies from Lambeth Palace Library MS 487', pp. 200–01.

thus the Lambeth scribe must have adapted *De octo uitis* from another pre-existing version of the composite text which does not survive. Since no surviving version can be identified as the direct predecessor in whatever chain of transmission leads to item 10, a direct source-product comparison cannot be made. This complicates further the pinpointing of agency and voice in item 10. In order to gauge what alterations the item 10 scribe might have made to a source text and to identify the preaching voice that has been created in item 10, comparison can only be made with the surviving versions of the source, and hypotheses drawn from these. The resulting hypotheses can be tested to some extent by virtue of the fact that other manuscript copies of the constituent parts of *De octo uitis* do survive. In particular, the three *Lives of Saints* excerpts used in *De octo uitis* are all present in manuscript London, British Library, Cotton MS Julius E VII, which is considered to be a good witness to the state of the individual Ælfrician Saints' Lives at the point of their issue by Ælfric. *De duodecim abusiuis* survives in three manuscripts, but not in Julius E. VII.[21] For the purposes of the current study, the published editions of the three *Lives of Saints* items by Skeat, and of *De octo uitis* by Warner, will be used as controls for the comparison of item 10 with the CCCC 178 *De octo uitis et de duodecim abusiuis*.[22]

In its general content, Lambeth item 10 tallies with the CCCC 178 version, and with the Skeat and Warner editions of other copies of its constituent parts, but at the level of vocabulary and detail of expression there are numerous differences between item 10 and the other versions, and it is striking that many of the ways in which the Lambeth version differs from the CCCC 178 one match the distinctive features of Lambeth 487's rewritings of other Ælfric texts in items 9 and 11. As explained above, it is impossible to tell how much of this distinctiveness was already in the immediate exemplar of Lambeth 487, and how much the Lambeth scribe may have introduced but, as will be argued below, those elements of the adaptation of Old English material in these items which are also characteristic of the manuscript as a whole might signal agency and readings on the part of the creator of Lambeth 487.

Almost all the differences between the CCCC 178 and Lambeth versions of item 10 take the form of expansions and alterations in the Lambeth version. Some of these alterations are clearly part of an attempt to update the language of the Ælfric texts for such a late audience by making substitutions of vocabulary, but many alterations go well beyond the necessity of updating.[23]

The first example is fairly unremarkable, and very typical:

1   Lambeth 487:

Þe þridde mihte is. *Largitas*. Þet is custinesse on englisc þet mon wisliche spene þa þing þe him god lene on þisse liue to brukene. and noht for world gelpe.

[The third virtue is *Largitas*, that is generosity in English, that a man should spend wisely the things which God gives him to use in this life, and not for worldly boasting.][24]

(Morris, p. 105, ll. 11–13)

---

[21] Although the scribal table of contents in Julius E VII does list it as the last item. See Joyce Hill, 'The Dissemination of Ælfric's *Lives of Saints*: A Preliminary Survey', in *Holy Men and Holy Women*, ed. by Szarmach, pp. 235–59 (pp. 237 and 241).

[22] Edited by Richard Morris as an appendix to his edition of Lambeth 487: *Old English Homilies*, ed. by Morris, pp. 296–304.

[23] In the comparative analyses which follow, differences between the text of CCCC 178 and the Skeat and Warner editions of the constituent parts of *De octo uitis et de duodecim abusiuis* are set out in footnotes.

[24] All translations are my own.

CCCC 178:

Seo þridda miht is largitas. Þ<æt> is cystignes on englisc. þ<æt> man wislice aspende. na for woruldgilpe þa þing þe him god lænde. on þisum life to brucenne;

[The third virtue is *Largitas*, that is generosity in English, that a man should spend wisely, not for worldly boasting, the things which God gives him to use in this life.] [25]

(Morris, p. 297, ll. 28–30)

In this example, the Lambeth version shifts a single clause — 'noht for world gelpe' — two clauses further along in the sentence. This has no effect on the detail of the definition of *Largitas*, but does destroy the alliterative pattern and rhythm of the Ælfric text as represented by the CCCC 178 version; 'wisliche' is longer in the same rhythmic line as 'woruld gelpe', and so the pairing is lost. Many of the additions and alterations in the Lambeth version have this effect, and the result is a homily which, although almost unchanged in basic message, sounds quite unlike Ælfric, and so is revoiced — in the sense of being re-read out loud, if we imagine it being preached or spoken in private reading — by the reader who made item 10.

The second example shows another stylistic transformation:

2   Lambeth 487:

On hwan mei þe mon modegian þeh he beo wel iþogen and iþungen. for he mei findan fele þe beoð bet iþogen and istogen þene he. Ne eft he ne mei on his welan. ne on his ehte modegian. forðon þet he nat þene dei ne þene time þe hit al forletan scal. Ne on nane þinge ne ah þe mon to modegian.

[What might the man be proud of even though he is wealthy and distinguished? For he might find many who are wealthier and of higher status than he. Nor yet may he be proud of his good fortune or of his wealth, because he does not know the day or the time at which it will all fall away. Nor ought a man be proud of anything.]

(Morris, p. 107, ll. 11–16)

CCCC 178:

On hwam mæg se mann modigian þeah ðe he wille. ne mæg he on geþingcðum. forþam þe fela synd geþungenran. Ne mæg he on his æhtum forþam þe he hys ende dæg nat. Ne on nanum þingum he ne mæg modigian.

[What might the man be proud of, even though he might wish to [be]? He cannot consider it, because there are many who are more distinguished. Nor yet can he be proud of his possessions, because he does not know when his end will come. Nor can he be proud of anything.][26]

(Morris, p. 298, ll. 26–30)

Here, the Lambeth version has 'beo wel iþongen and iþungen' for the Corpus 'wille'; and 'for he mei findan fele þe beoð bet iþogen and istogen þene he' for 'ne mæg he on geþingcðum.

---

[25] Julius E VII, as edited by Skeat, has some minor differences from CCCC 178 in one clause of this excerpt. Insertions above the line of text in Julius E VII (marked by underlining in the following quotation) give the reading 'þ<æt> is þæt man wislice his æhta aspende' for CCCC 178's 'þ<æt> man wislice aspende' (Skeat p. 358, l. 327). The layer of the Julius text which precedes these insertions therfore matches the CCCC 178 version exactly.

[26] The Julius version of this passage, as edited by Skeat, differs only in having 'þeah he wille' for the CCCC 178 'þeah ðe he wille' (Skeat, p. 62, l. 371). Both versions translate as 'even though he might wish to', and this phrase

forþam þe fela synd geþungenran'; and it adds 'welan' to the Corpus reference to possessions as something not to be proud of. In the final sentence, the Lambeth version refers to wealth and possessions passing away, whilst the Corpus reference is to the end day of the possessor. None of these alterations makes any great impact on the moral content of the Lambeth version but, as with the first example, the alterations in the Lambeth version obscure and dissolve the rhythm of the Ælfric text. Here, however, the additions build in new alliteration and rhyme with 'iþogen and iþungen' and 'iþogen and istogen'. Alterations to the Ælfric text in item 11 include the creation of a rhyming couplet which, like these couplets in item 10, does not alter the meaning of the text, but does transform its effect in oral delivery by slowing down the rate of information and creating moments of memorable sound patterning, in contrast to the even rhythm of Ælfric's text.[27] The many small additions and emphases inserted in the Lambeth version of Ælfrician texts in items 9, 10, and 11 have the general effect of rendering the style of these pieces more like colloquial speech and more like some non-Ælfrician styles of preaching rhetoric, and less like formal reading-book rhetoric.[28]

A further example includes an alteration in item 10 which might give insight into its intended audience:

3 **Lambeth 487:**
he scal beon swa iweorht þet him mon mote wið speken and his neode menan. and swa hwet swa þe lauerd speke to his men sterliche; do hit for rihtwisnesse and for godes ege and noht for wreððe.
[He [a secular lord] shall be of such conduct that a man can speak against him and remind him of his failings, and however the lord speaks harshly to his men, do it out of righteousness and out of respect of God and not out of anger.]
(Morris, p. 111, l. 34–p. 113, l. 1)

CCCC 178:
He sceal beon swa geworht. þ<æt> him man mote wið sprecan. 7 swa hwæt swa he wrece. wrece for rihtwisnysse. na for his agenum yrre. ac for godes ege;
[He [a secular lord] shall be of such conduct that a man can speak against him, and however he does it, do it out of righteousness, not on account of his own anger but out of respect for God.] [29]
(Morris, p. 301, ll. 16–18)

The CCCC 178 version in this example shows regularity and balance of syllable and clause patterning, if not consistent alliteration. The Lambeth version loses the syllable and clause balance with its insertion of 'þe lauerd speke [...]', and also adds an interesting note of concern for the functioning of social structure. The idea of a lord speaking to his men is not in the

is not in the item 10 version.

[27] See Swan, 'Old English Made New'. Rhyming couplets are a common feature of non-Ælfrician Old English homilies.

[28] For an analysis of item 9, see Swan, 'Ælfric's *Catholic Homilies* in the Twelfth Century', in *Rewriting Old English*, ed. by Swan and Treharne, pp. 62–82 (pp. 71–76).

[29] The Vespasian D XIV version of this text, as edited by Warner, has 'þ<æt> him wið mote specan' ('so that him [somebody] can speak against'); Warner p. 13, l. 20) for the CCCC 178 phrase 'þ<æt> him man mote wið

CCCC 178 version, and it is possible that in the Lambeth version its inclusion matches the earlier inserted reference to high status ('istogen' in example 2), and that it reflects concern on the part of the compiler or the audience for the relationship between leaders and the led. This is striking when compared with the rewriting of a homily by Wulfstan in Lambeth item 2, where the original references to the political situation of the years around the millennium are transformed in the Lambeth version into an account which matches the social problems in the reign of King Stephen as described in the 1137 annal in the *Peterborough Chronicle*.[30]

The fourth example shows another tendency common to almost all of the items in Lambeth 487: the use of short Latin quotations either to provide authoritative-sounding statements for translation into English, or as the subject for exegesis in English:

4   Lambeth 487:

Ðu gederast mare *and* mare. *and* man cwelað on hungre. *and* þine welan forrotiað biforan þine eh3an. Ne don we nauht þus. *ac* uten don al swa ure drihten cweð. he seide on his godspelle. *Date elemosinam; & omnia munda sun[t] uobis.* þet is. deleð elmesse *and* alle þing eou beoð clene.

[You gather more and more, and men die of hunger, and your wealth rots before your eyes. Let us not act in this way, but let us all do as our Lord said. He said in his gospel, *Date elemosinam; & omnia munda sunt uobis*. That is, give alms and all things will be clean for you.]

(Morris, p. 111, ll. 9–14)

CCCC178

Þu gaderast ma 7 ma. 7 menn cwelað hungre. 7 þine welan forrotiað ætforan þinum eagum; Doð swa swa drihten cwæd. dælað ælmyssan. 7 ealle þing eow beoð clæne. þis he cwæd on his godspelle;

[You gather more and more, and men die of hunger, and your wealth rots before your eyes. Do thus as the Lord said. Give alms and all things will be clean for you. This he said in his gospel.] [31]

(Morris, p. 300, ll. 26–29)

Latin snippets are also added to the Ælfric material used in items 9 and 11 to assert sources for some of the biblical quotations which Ælfric gives in English only. Throughout the Lambeth manuscript, Latin quotations are usually written in red by the main scribe. This is the highest level of visual marking the scribe engages in in the manuscript, and it highlights the assertion of Latin as an authority, underpinning the Old English which translates it.[32]

The fourth example shows the sort of source-providing described above. The Latin version of Ælfric's 'yrre hæfð wununge on þæs dysegan bosme' is added in red ink; possibly triggered

sprecan' ('so that him somebody can speak against'). This demonstrates that item 10 is almost certainly drawing on a source whose wording is closer to the CCCC 178 version than to the Vespasian D XIV one.

[30]   As shown by Jonathan Wilcox in 'Wulfstan and the Twelfth Century', in *Rewriting Old English*, ed. by Swan and Treharne, pp. 83–97 (pp. 87–95).

[31]   The Vespasian D XIV reading here (Warner, p. 12, ll. 34–37) matches exactly the CCCC 178 one.

[32]   For a fuller discussion of the Latin quotations and the use of red ink, see my 'Preaching Past the Conquest'. Titles of items and some subsections are also written in red, and although space is left for a two-line-deep opening initial to all items, this is not filled in, so the red text is the most striking feature of the script as it survives. From time to time, space has been left for a Latin quotation to be added, but this has not been done. These unfilled spaces

both by the compiler's recognition of the source of Ælfric's words, and by the 'cwæð' before them. This practice of providing a Latin source for English biblical passages, although common in Lambeth 487, as noted above, is very rare in other re-uses of Ælfric material in composite texts from the late tenth to twelfth centuries, and is more characteristic of Early Middle English homilies.[33] The assertion of authoritative text and source in item 10 functions as an exaggerated example of the general tendency to load the text with reference points to spell out its meaning and status.

Example 4 also shows typical minor shifts of word order and the insertion of some small, often monosyllabic, words, which do not at all alter the key sense, but do make the register a little more like speech: sometimes more relaxed, sometimes more heightened, in the manner of a particular style of pulpit rhetoric. The addition of a Latin authority/source for the Old English biblical text, which alters the status of the Old English by turning it into a translation (another kind of reading, of course), does something interesting, also, in its repositioning of the preacher and the intended audience, by making a much more explicit rhetorical framing of the preaching voice and of the implied congregation in 'Ne don we nauht þus. *ac* uten don al swa ure drihten cweð' as compared to 'Doð swa swa drihten cwæð'. Here, CCCC 178 positions the textual voice as giving instructions, and implies a clear stratification between the authority of that voice and the position of the implied 'you' it is instructing; item 10 positions a 'we': a group of people, including both preacher and congregation, who are all liable to sin, and who need exhorting together. Both of these styles of positioning the preaching voice and the implied congregation occur in other Old English homilies (and in homilies of all kinds). They each have a very distinct effect, and they construct their textual authority and their readers in a very different way, reminding us that different versions of the same preaching text can alter the work done by the text.

Conclusion

Some common elements in the re-use of Old English preaching texts in Lambeth 487, and indeed in other composite Old English homilies, include welding Old English source passages with compiler-written excerpts and altering the wording of the Old English texts not only to update vocabulary and grammar but also to transform their style into something with a higher degree of emphatic reiteration; more laboriously explanatory, longwinded, and colloquial. I have speculated elsewhere that the Ælfric material in these homilies is rewritten for an audience with less formal education in exegesis and with a preference for a more conversational sermon style.[34] Item 10 implies the same shift of audience, and a maker of Lambeth 487 who is re-reading source-texts in anticipation of a future reception — a future reading — of them, whether by real or rhetorically imagined ears. Item 10 is a good reminder of the provisionality of any one version of a text, and of any one reading. It is also a reminder that 'composition', or delivery, is not the start of the process — and, of course, that reading, in the form of reception, is not the end.

for Latin are not grouped together at the end of the manuscript or in clusters; they are interspersed with filled-in red Latin quotations, and they are particularly common in item 10.

[33] As I note in 'Preaching Past the Conquest', p. 408.

[34] See Swan, 'Old English Made New' and 'Ælfric's *Catholic Homilies* in the Twelfth Century'.