MORE LATIN SOURCES FOR THE OLD ENGLISH
“THREE UTTERANCES” HOMILIES

Charles D. Wright

To judge from the fifty surviving copies ranging in date from the eighth century through the fifteenth, the Latin sermon known as The Three Utterances of the Soul must have informed the ideas and the fears of many people during the Middle Ages about what would happen after death.1 According to this sermon,2 when the soul exits the body, two hosts come to meet it, one of demons and one of angels. The two hosts contend over the soul, which is taken by the host whose members are able to recognize it as a companion of theirs on account of its good or bad deeds. If the demons recognize it as their companion, they rejoice and the angels are saddened. The demons then order the soul to be extracted roughly from its body; after Michael takes it to the throne of God to be judged, the demons divide into two groups, one leading and one following, and conduct the soul to hell as they sing Psalm 51:3, “Why do you glory in malice, you that are mighty in iniquity?” If the angels recognize the soul as their companion, they rejoice and the demons are confounded. The angels command that the soul be extracted gently from its body; then they divide into two groups, one leading and one following, and conduct the soul to heaven as they sing Psalm 64:5, “Blessed is he whom you have chosen and taken to you: he shall dwell in your courts.” Along the way to its destination, the wicked or righteous soul makes a series of three utterances, exclaiming over what it perceives as it enters the next world. There are significant variations in the formulation and sequence of these utterances, but the most common series has the wicked soul exclaim first “How great the darkness!”; then “How harsh the road!”; and finally “How great the straits!”

1 I have inventoried the fifty copies known to me in “Manuscripts of The Three Utterances of the Soul,” the appendix to Charles D. Wright, “Latin Analogue for The Two Deaths: The Three Utterances of the Soul,” in The End and Beyond: Medieval Irish Eschatology, ed. John Carey, Emma Nic Cáithmhag, and Caithríona Ó Dócharthaigh (Aberystwyth, 2014), 113–37, at 128–37. The appendix is cited below as “Manuscripts.”

2 See nn. 3, 7–10, and 14 for editions of the Latin text. The following summary represents the common core content of the great majority of the manuscripts, ignoring features distinctive to each recension and the many minor variations within the manuscripts of each recension.
After each utterance the devils in concert respond “Greater darkness awaits you!”; “A harsher road awaits you!”; and “Greater straits await you!” The righteous soul, for its part, exclaims “How great the light!”; “How great the happiness!”; and “How pleasant the road!” The angels predictably reply that greater light, greater happiness, and a more pleasant road await the soul.

One of the two oldest copies of the Latin sermon was written on the continent, at Freising, by an Anglo-Saxon scribe named Peregrinus, but not one of the fifty was written or owned in Anglo-Saxon England. We know, however, that the sermon must have been very popular there before the Conquest, because three independent Old English versions survive, and there are also brief but unmistakable allusions in Vercelli Homily IV and Pseudo-Wulfstan Homily 46, and possible echoes in other homilies.


4 The earliest English manuscript is Oxford, Bodleian Library Hatton 26 (SC 4061), part B (s. xiii’), fol. 75ra–vb; see “Manuscripts,” no. 44. For paleographical and contextual evidence regarding the Insular role in the transmission of the Three Utterances, see Wright, “Latin Analogue,” 116–17 n.17.


6 Rudolph Willard, “The Address of the Soul to the Body,” PMLA 50 (1935): 957–83, at 980 n.77, points out that in Vercelli Homily IV (ed. D. G. Scragg, The Vercelli Homilies and Related Texts, EETS o.s. 300 [Oxford, 1993], 104.120–23) the angels bless the good soul after it is conducted before God’s throne with the same Psalm verses that the angels use to praise the good soul in the Three Utterances (Ps 64:5–6, “Beatus quem eligisti . . . ”). See also Charles D. Wright, The Irish Tradition in Old English Literature, Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England 6 (Cambridge, 1993), 264–65; and Scragg, Vercelli Homilies, 106. Willard (Two
The standard study of the Three Utterances was published in 1935 by Rudolph Willard, who was the first to edit the Old English versions, though he excerpted the Three Utterances material from longer homilies whose complete texts remained unpublished for many years thereafter. At that time Willard knew just one late manuscript of the Latin sermon, so his conclusions about how each Old English homilist had adapted his sources were necessarily very tentative. Within two years Willard had discovered and published one more Latin text, representing a distinct variant recension, enabling him to answer some of the questions that had been unresolved in his monograph, but leaving many others open. Two of the Old English homilies, Willard’s J and C (Oxford, Bodleian Library Junius 85/86, fols. 25r–40r [Fadda I] and the homily entitled Be heofonwarum ond be helwarum), diverge strikingly from both Latin recensions known to Willard, and while the third Old English homily, Willard’s H (Oxford, Bodleian Library Hatton 114, fols. 102v–105v [Bazire/Cross Homily 9]), is fairly close to the first Latin recension, it also shows some significant variation. The next major advance came in 1977 with the publication by R. E. McNally of another Latin text—a variant type of the first recension—from two early manuscripts. Unfortunately, McNally was un-
aware of Willard’s studies, but James J. O’Donnell, who prepared the edition for publication in *Traditio* after McNally’s death, was able to add selected variants from Willard’s texts to McNally’s apparatus. Bazire and Cross were able to show that McNally’s text accounted for a number of divergent readings in the Old English Rogationtide homily they edited in 1982.11

In the early 1980s, initially in collaboration with Mary F. Wack, I undertook a search for additional manuscripts of the sermon.12 Most of the additional copies have proved to be further witnesses to the versions already published by Willard and McNally, and so have not dramatically impacted source analysis of the distinctive features of the Old English versions. But one of them, Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek (BSB) Clm 28135, also from Freising, turned out to contain two versions of the Latin sermon,13 the first of which represents a distinctive abbreviated recension quite close to the source that must have been consulted by the author of Fadda I. The discovery, which Professor Wack and I published in 1991,14 answered many of the questions raised by Willard in a chapter he titled “The Problem of J.” In addition to resolving a number of specific textual problems, this new recension showed that the Old English homilist was not radically abridging or revising either of the two recensions known to Willard, but was following this distinctive abbreviated Latin recension.15 In the present article I will discuss two further,
previously unstudied manuscripts of the Three Utterances that affect source analysis not primarily in relation to the Three Utterances exemplum itself, but in relation to its immediate contexts in two of the Old English homilies, Fadda I and Bazire/ Cross Homily 9.

I

The Lenten homily in Oxford, Bodleian Library Junius 85/86, fols. 25r–40r (Fadda I) is a compilation from a variety of Latin sources, including a popular pseudo-Augustinian Doomsday sermon that often circulated with the Three Utterances and was often paired with it in early manuscripts.16 Were the diverse Latin sources translated in Fadda I already compiled in a single Latin homiliary or florilegium available to the homilist? And had they already been patched together in a composite Latin sermon he was translating? To what extent, in other words, was the author of Fadda I himself responsible for the resulting pastiche? In the vast majority of manuscripts containing the Three Utterances it occurs as a separate work, even when it immediately precedes or follows the Doomsday sermon.17 The Doomsday sermon in Clm 28135 does not belong to the same textual family as the one that the homilist of Fadda I used, and the abbreviated recension of the Three Utterances in Clm 28135 is not bundled with any other source used in Fadda I. That evidence would seem to support the conclusion that the homilist had encountered the abbreviated recension as a separate text and combined it with material from other Latin sources, or even with material of his own composition.

The evidence of a newly identified Latin Three Utterances manuscript suggests, to the contrary, that the homilist found the Three Utterances already bundled with some of the material that precedes and follows it. The manuscript is Engelberg, Stiftsbibliothek 44,18 dating from the first half of the thir-


17 For some manuscripts in which the Doomsday sermon immediately precedes or follows the Three Utterances, see Wright, “Apocryphal Lore,” 136; and Charles D. Wright and Roger Wright, “Additions to the Bobbio Missal: De dies malus and Joca monachorum (fols. 6r–8v),” in The Bobbio Missal: Liturgy and Religious Culture in Merovingian Gaul, ed. Yitzhak Hen and Rob Meens (Cambridge, 2004), 79–139, at 85 n. 11.

18 “Manuscripts,” no. 42; the incipit is “Isidorus. Initium sapientiae timor domini laudatio eius manet in seculum seculi [Ps 110:10]. Primum quidem docet nos audire iusticiam dei….”
teenth century. The Engelberg manuscript has received some attention as a copy of the Homiliary of Angers, the source of the Old English homilies in the Taunton fragment\(^\text{19}\) and also of one of the early Middle English Lambeth Homilies, as Stephen Pelle has recently shown.\(^\text{20}\) Winfried Rudolf added Engelberg 44 to the list of witnesses of the Homiliary of Angers,\(^\text{21}\) and Aidan Conti has supplied a description of the manuscript for the digital facsimile.\(^\text{22}\) In addition to the Homiliary of Angers, however, the manuscript includes other anonymous sermons, and among these, on folio 105v, is a version of the Three Utterances that has not hitherto been identified.\(^\text{23}\)

The Engelberg text is distinctive in two ways: first, it represents another copy of the abbreviated recension that was the source of Fadda I, but was previously known to exist only in Clm 28135; second, unlike the copy in Clm 28135, the Three Utterances text in Engelberg 44 does not stand alone but is embedded within a longer homily including material that accounts for some of the contents of Fadda I both preceding and following the Three Utterances. Although not the immediate source of Fadda I, the sermon in Engelberg 44 must be related to that lost source and brings us closer to it. The table below gives the relevant parts of Fadda I and the text of the Engelberg sermon in the first two columns.\(^\text{24}\)


\(^{22}\) Aidan Conti, “Standard description,” at e-codices, the website of manuscripts from Swiss libraries, <http://www.e-codices.unifr.ch/en/list/one/bke/0044>, uploaded in March 2014. The sermon is there flagged as “unidentified,” and indeed it seems to be unique except for the Three Utterances exemplum it incorporates.

\(^{23}\) In fact, the manuscript contains two distinctive variant recensions of the Three Utterances: the one edited here, and another on fol. 1rb, which was discovered by Stephen Pelle, who is preparing an edition.

\(^{24}\) The text of Fadda I is from Luiselli Fadda’s edition, but with the following corrections from the review by Malcolm Godden in *Modern Language Review* 76 (1981): 431–33, at 432: §25, forgifenes for forgifeness; §30, bilehwitnesse for liliehwitnese and geþylmodnesse for geþylmodnesse; §33, mycel for micel; §36, jaer (biþ wita) for ðær; §39, breohtnes for breohtenes. I have also modified the punctuation of the first two sentences of §33 in light of Godden’s comments. In the Latin texts I expand abbreviations silently and supply standard word-division
ances in Clm 28135 is included for comparison with that of the Engelberg homily. Some of the material that is not accounted for in the Engelberg homily can be accounted for in other Latin texts, included in the facing-page columns: two sermons in Cambridge, Pembroke College 25, a copy of the Homiliary of St. Père de Chartres known to have been used by several Old English homilists; Redaction I of the Visio Pauli; the Predicatio cotidiana and the so-called Dicta Sancti Effram II, both preserved in Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana (BAV) Pal. lat. 220; the bilingual Sermo ad reges in the Irish Leabhar Breac; the so-called Apocrypha Priscillianistica; and three homilies in BAV Pal. lat. 556, the first of which (Homily 4) includes material derived from the abbreviated recension of the Three Utterances. These are not direct sources but rather represent discrete “disseminations” (discussed below), which must have circulated more widely in many different contexts and therefore afford parallels only for brief passages. Bold font highlights material in Fadda I paralleled in the Engelberg homily; and underlining highlights material in Fadda I paralleled in the other Latin texts.

as well as punctuation. I do not correct grammatical errors, but emendations necessary to the sense are given in square brackets.


27 On these two texts, see O’Sullivan, “Predicaciones Palatinæ,” 289 (no. 6, Predicatio cotidiana, with extracts at 287–93 nn. 71, 75, 76, 82); 322–33 (no. 10, Dicta Sancti Effram II, ed. G. S. Assemani, S. p. n. Ephraem Syri opera omnia …, vol. 3 [Rome, 1746], 582–83).


(23) ... he is soþlice ðæt geþwære leohes bearn;
ond þa beoð wイトdice þeostra bearn þa ðe willað simle standan on ðam mæstum geflitum.
(24) Ac gehealden we us þæt we sien þæs leohistes leohes bearn, na læs þeostra bearn, 
forðan se man se ðe deð manige synna, se bið þeostra bearn ond deofla bearn geceged,
ond þa mæn þa doð god and beoð ælmesfulle, þa beoð Godes bearn geceged. Ond ða mæn þa ðe doð god ond Drihtnes willan, þanne wuniað þara saula in ecum wuldre.

(25) Ond bare saule mete biþ wutoúlice þæt se man healde Drihtnes bebodo þa hwile ðe he lifiende sie; ond ðæt bið ðære saule drinca, þæt man him geormlice to Gode gebiddhe on þæt man gelome fæste ond Godes naman geþence; ond seo ælmesse biþ hiera synna forgifenes, ond hiere organan beoð þa halgan Godes word be men singað.... (27) ... ond ure lichaman þe of eorðan gewordene waran, beoð ælce dagæ fedde fram þam heofonlican cyninge. (28) Þæs mannes saul bið liflic [read lyftlic = celestibus?] ond cymeð fram eorðan se lichama, forðan he sceal beon mid eorðan fed, ond Þæs mannes saul bið Godes orðes ond heo forðan sceal beon mid codecundum mægnum ond mid husle gefeded ond forðan us is to wittyne þæt God us gefyðe mid gðodfestsse. (29) Hwæt, þanne we beoð mid ðuras ond mid hungre gewyrde, ac we willað. Þanne sone drincan ond etan; forðan se lichama.
ne meag nane hwile lyfgean swa ðeah butan 
exte ond drincan, swa Þæs mannes saul ne 
meag nane hwile beon butan godcundum 
weorcum.

Ysidorus. Initium sapientie timor domini; intellectus bonus omnibus facientibus eum laudatio eius manet in seculum seculi [Ps 110:10]. Primum quidem docet nos audire iusticiam dei et intelligere et reddere fructus doctrine,

ne filii tenebrarum sumus.
Quia qui facit peccatum [dei et intelligere et reddere repeated from fol. 105va] filius tenebrarum appellatur [cf. 1 Thess 5:5].
Qui facit uoluntatem dei filius lucis est.

Non potest anima uiuere sine precepto dei, sicut non potest uiuere corpus sine cibo.
Reficiamus ergo primum
anima nostram quasi do-
minam divinis eloquis.
quia de caelestibus uenit,
et postea carnem quasi anci-
lam de fructibus terræ.
quia
de terra orta est, sicut enim
non potest caro uiuere sine
cibo. Ita non potest anima
uiuere sine preceptis dei.
et sancto sacrificio corporis
christi. Propret quod re-
fiucienda est, prius anima nos-
tra bonis operibus.

Ita non potest anima sine
precepta dei uiuere. Idcirco
alenda est nobis anima nos-
stra ut filius regis, quia do-
mus est regis de celo misa.
Colenda est anima ut sit
puræ, leta, et salua et munda
sine rugo sine querella
coram Domino rege
celestium et terrestrium et
infernorum.

Sancta [esca Salisbury 9]
autem anime precepta [+ dei
Salisbury 9], potus autem
eius oratio, baltheus eius
ieunium, organa eius lau-
datio domini in toto corde.

Anima ergo de celestibus
uenit, idque de celestibus
pascitur; sicut corpus qui de
terra exiuit, de terrenis fructi-
bus uescitur. Itaque uelud
coro [read caro] in fame et
sitii uel frigore aut lasitu-
dine, cibo, potuque, uestitu,
siue requ(e) desiderat, sin(e)
quibus uiuere non potest,
sicutque nobis iustitia et
opera bona quaerenda sunt.
Quia anima sine precepto
Dei et sacrificio uiuere ne-
quit.

Anima de celestibus uenit,
ideo de celestibus pascitur,
corpus de terra exiuit, ideo
de fructibus terre pascitur.
Ita desideranda est nobis
iustitia ut fame ac siti
desideratur cybus et potus.
... [Salisbury 9: Corpus non
(potest) uiuere sine cibo et
potu, ita et anima si non
uero dei pascitur.]
(30) Ac gegeawrian we ura Saula eanliness mid lufan ond mid eaðmodnesse ond mid arfæstnesse ond mid hallignesse ond mid geðungennesse ond mid blehemwitiesse ond mid rihtnesse ond mid godcundnesse ond geþyldmodnesse ond geswigunge, þonne us mon on ðweorh to sprece, ond mid wæccean ond mid mildheortnesse ond mid sigefæstnesse ond gemetfæstnesse ond mid ar(estimated)nesse godcundre beboda.

(31) Þis ðonne is swiðe gastlic weorc and swiðe halwendlic ond mid bylicum meægnunn bisp ðæs mannes Saul mid gereordum gefylled, ond þa mæn þe ðis eall beoþ donde, þanne beoð þara saula breohtran þanne sunne, ðanne heo breohtest scineð, swa he self wæs cwœôende: Tunc iusti fulgebunt sicut sol in regno patris eorum; qui habet aures audiendi audiat [Mt 13:43].

Anima hominis peccatoris cum exierat de corpore. Drihten he cwæð: “Soðfæste mæn…”

(32) Hit gelimpæð banne þæs synfullan mannes Saul geð of his lichaman, ðonne bii heo seofon siðum sweartre ðonne se hræfen. And hit is cweden on ðissum godspelle þæt deofla lædan þa saule ond þanne heo sprecæð wæpendre stæfne to ðam deoflum ond hyo cwæþ: “Micle siendon þa dyostre þe ge me tolaedæð.” Ond þanne andsweriað hire ða deoflo and hie cwœðað; “Maran þe siendan toweard in helle.”

Futurum est ut [read iter] facere de hoc mundo et mortem suscipere, ut propheta dicit: Quis est homo qui uiuet et non uidebit mortem? [Ps 88:49] Quemadmodum mors in Adam data est, ita dominabitur in omnibus filii eius [cf. 1 Cor 15:22].

Anima autem hominis peccat(estimated)oris cum exierit de corpore

sexcies nigror est coruuo, Êet demones qui ducunt eam et infersus in quo duciturÊ. Et dicit anima cum lacrimis et gemitu, “Magne sunt tenebra.”

Et dicit demones, “Maiores tibi future sunt.”

Et ueniunt duo hostes in obuiam ei, hostis niger (et) alius hostis in uestibus albis, et faciunt certamina erga hominem ut sciant cuius eorum socia sit.
Optima enim eius refectio est castitas, caritas, humilitas, pietas, largitas, sanctitas, sobrietas, simplicitas, aequitas, bonitas, longanimitas, taciturnitas, misericordia, iustitia, patientia, in deo oboedientia.

Hae sunt nostra alimenta spirituale ac salubria, quibus reficitur anima nostra.

Hec omnia cibaria sunt spirituale et salubria quibus reficitur anima et satiatur et faciunt eam splendorem [sic] sole, Domino dicente: Tunc iusti fulgebunt sicut sol in regno Patris eorum.

Anima hominis peccatoris cum exigerit de corpore

Septies nigror erit quam coruus.† Et demones qui ducent eam infernum qui dicitur.†

Et anima dicit cum lacrimis et gemitu, "Magne sunt tenebre."

Et respondent demones et dicunt, "Maiioresque erunt et tibi apud demones."

†Et demones qui ducent eam infernum qui dicitur.
Þanne cweð seo saul eft: “Micel is ðeos unrotnes þe ge me tolædað.” Ond þanne andsweriað hiere ba deofle ond hie cwæðað; “Maran gewin ond mare unblis þe is gegeawod on helle.”

Ond þanne æfter pysum wordum hie ledað þa saule on helle witu. (33) Ond þanne bið ðaes halgan mannes saul wutodlice, þanne heo of ðam lichaman gangeð, seofon síomum heo bið beorhtre þanne sunne, and þa halgan Godes ænglas hie ledað to Paradysum and þanne cwþþ ðæs saul hie ðæm ænglum þe hie ledað: “Eala, mycel is ðeos blis þe ic on gelædad eam.” Ond þanne andswergeað hiere þa ænglas and cweðað: “Mare blis þe is on heofonum gegeawad.” Ond þanne ðæs saul eft cwðþ: “Micel is þes þrym þe we on syndan.” Ond þanne andswergeað hie ða ænglas and, cwæðaþ: “ þu cymest ful ær to maran þrymme.” Ond þanne andswergeað hie ða ænglas and hie cwæðaþ: “þu gemetst mare leoh æfter ðinum huse.”

(34) Ond þanne synegað þa halgan ænglas swiðe gæstilinge sang ond berâð ða clænan sawle to Gode on heora fæðmum ond hie cwæðað to ðære sawle; “Beatus quem elegisti: replebimur” [Ps 64:5]. Hie cwæðaþ; “Eadig eart du sawl, du name Gode eardunge inords eam.” Ond we nu gefyllað mid Gode sawl, þa ðe æfre wære od æfre bist….”


Engelberg, Stiftsbibliothek 44, fol. 105vb

Dicit anima, “Asperum est iter.”

Demones dicunt, “Asperius tibi futurum. Deducemus te ad protoplastum nostrum Sathanam.”

Dicit tercio anima, “Magna angustia.”

Demones dicunt, “Maior est futura. Deducemus ad locum terribilem et tormenta impiorum et habitabis in eis.”

Hec sunt uerba demonum quando ducent hominem in infernum.

Anima autem hominis sancti cum exierit de corpore septies splendidior est sole. † Et sancti angelii qui ducent eam et paradisum in quo ducitur.†

Anima dicit, “Magna leticia.”

Et respondent angeli, “Maior est que tibi erit apud deum.”

Et iterum dicit, “Magna est maiestas in qua sumus.” Et respondent, “Maior tibi erit.”

Et dicit, “Maior est tibi futurum.”

Videbis claritatem dei et leticiam angelorum et tabernacula iustorum. Et suscitatur [read suscitate] de corpore suo leniter, et quod parauit sibi bonum uident.” Et diuident se angeli circa eam cantantes

et dicentes, “Beatus quem elegisti” et reliqua.
Et iterum dicit anima, “Magna est tristitia.”

Et respondent demones, “Maiorque erit tibi apud demones.”

Haec sunt trea uerba peccatorum quando ducuntur ad infernum. Anima autem hominis sequitur; cum exierit de corpore septiens splendor erit quam sol. Et sancti angeli qui ducunt eam ad paradysus quo dicitur; Et dicit anima, “Magna est laetitia.”

Et respondent angeli, “Maiorque erit tibi apud deum.”

Et iterum dicit anima, “Magna est magestas in qua sumus.” Et dicit angeli, “Maiorque erit tibi apud deum.”

Et tertia dicit anima, “Magna est lumen.” Et respondent angeli, “(...) apud deum.”

Et sancti angeli cantabunt canticum spiritalem, portantes eam in sinu suo et dicentes ad animam, “Beatus quem elegisti domine et adsumpsi; et inhabitat in tabernaculis tuis, Replebimur in bonis domus tuae; sanctum est templum tuum, mirabile in aequitate; et beatus es qui mandata seruasti dei tui et fecisti ea diligenter secundum voluntatem dei.”

Tres sunt in hoc mundo meliora omni bono: anima sancti in septimo sole speci(osi)or; et sancti angeli qui eam in sinu suo suspicunt; et paradysus cui dicitur et expectatio regni caelestis: his tribus non est melius in hoc mundo.

Et sancti angeli dilectantur animam spiritali cantico et dicunt; Beatus quem elegisti et adsumpsi, domine; et inhabitat in tabernaculis tuis, Replebimur in bonis domus tuae [Ps 64:5].
(36) And nu, mæn ða leofestan, ondraedan we us ðara awiergedra deofla sweartnesse ond helle brogan, ond hiora dracona fulnesse ond hiora wyrma grædignesse ond wildeora reðnesse and hiora susle michelnesse ond hiora ða ecean witu, þær biþ eagena wop ond toþa gristbitung and welera ðurst ond þær beoþ saula on miclum geflitum toslitene ond þær biþ heortan fyrhtu and þær biþ saula unrotehnesse ond þo swena drygnesse ond þær biþ singallic cyrm ond gelomlic geomrung and þær beoþ ða synfullan saula forgitene and heora eardungstow bið mid deoflum ond þær biþ wite butan ænde ond þær biþ mid deoðum ond þær biþ wite butan ænde ond þær biþ ece sar; ond orwene þæt him æfre ðæs sar linne ond him her næfre ne becampe nænig fræor ne nænig help a butan sarlic ænde; ond þæt beoð ða arleasan ðe simle hiera deades wysceða, ond him na geseadl ne bið na ðy hraðor.

(37) ... ond þær nænig god ætiewed biþ on ðam grunde ond þær biþ seo eorðe Gode ofergyten ond þær beoþ þæ earman tintrego ond hie ðær þa wumiaegða a worulda woruld. (38) Þis ðonne ðær ðonne beop on þisum witu ða forlegeran ond þa godwarcan ond þa ofer-welgan þe mid unrihtnesse him a begeatan, ond þa gitseras ond þa struderas ond þa ðeofas ond þa ðeodsceadan ond þa mansworan ond þa loge(þ)e)ras ond þa gramheortan ond þa lyblæccan ond þa ðe manige galdor cunnun ond þa ðe gelome galap ond þa unrihtfullan ond þa arleasan ond þa hethoðan ond þa æfeðgan ond þa yfelan ond þa ofermiodgan [read ofermodigan = superbi?] ond þa ðe eall yfel wrohtan ond þa ðe deofle wæron simle gongende on hiora eardungstowe, ðe hie noldan nænig hreowe don hyra synna ær hyra forðfore....

Non est acceptio personarum apud Deum [Rom 2:11], sed [read seu] diues an pauper sit, sed reddet Deus unicuiique secundum opera sua [Rom 2:6]. Propterea timeamus regionem demonum et horrorem infernorum et eternitatem penarum. Vbi fletus oculorum, ubi stridor dentium, 

ubi timor et cecitas et odibilitas et frequentia gentium [read gemitum = gelomlic geomrung], ubi sitis labiorum, ubi obliuio peccatorum, ubi cohabitatio demonum, ubi pene sine fine, tenebre sine luce, clamor sine auditu, eternitas in dolore; ubi desperatio sine consolatione, ubi nichil speratur magis quam plaga,

ubi mors optatur et non datur.

Ibi religio obliuta a deo, ubi non est fructuosa penitentia, ubi cruciamenta membrorum. Hec sunt habitacula in quibus erunt fornicares et scelerati et adulteri, cupidii [read cupidi], auari, rapaces, latrones, periurii, iracundi, inuidi,

superbi, blaspemhi, mali factores cum principe eorum diabolo ubi penitenciam egerint.
Ubi fletus oculorum et stridor dentium, ubi erit eterntitas poenarum; ubi erit fletus oculorum; eternitas penarum, ubi erit eternitas poenarum; ubi erit eternitas poenarum; ubi erit cohabitatio demonum; eternitas penarum, etc.

Ubi mors optatur et non datur ... Ubi nihil speratur nisi poena perpetua; eternitas penarum, ubi erit poena sine fine; ubi erunt tenebrae sine luce; ubi nulla consolatio est; eternitas penarum, ubi nihil speratur nisi poena perpetua; eternitas penarum, ubi erit cohabitatio demonum; ubi erit cohabitatio demonum.

ubi est sitis ardor et terrae oblivionis eternitas penarum, ubi erit eternitas poenarum; ubi erit eternitas poenarum; ubi erit eternitas poenarum; ubi erit eternitas poenarum; ubi erit eternitas poenarum.

ubi omne malum abundabit, et ubi omne bonum non apparebit.
It is immediately clear that Fadda I is closer to Clm 28135 than it is to Engelberg 44 for the portion of the homily containing the Three Utterances exemplum (from the middle of §31 to the beginning of §35). Engelberg 44, for example, includes several sentences that are not in Clm 28135 or Fadda I, such as the third utterance of the damned soul (“Magna angustia!”) and the response of the demons. Engelberg 44 also has the standard form of the second utterance (“Asperum est iter!”) instead of the unique “Magna est tristitia!” of Clm 28315. (Fadda I translates “tristitia” as “unrotnes” in the soul’s utterance, but with “gewin” and “unblis” in expanding the comparatives in the angels’ response.) Elsewhere the many passages in Fadda I that are underlined but not in bold indicate where it corresponds to Clm 28135 (sometimes also to
other Latin texts, or only to other Latin texts) rather than to Engelberg 44. There are just two minor readings that are in bold but not underlined, where Engelberg 44 preserves a reading closer to Fadda I: Engelberg 44 reads “sancti” instead of “sequitur,” paralleling “halgan” in the Old English at §33; and in the third utterance of the blessed soul, where Clm 28135 is defective, Engelberg 44 preserves the Latin translated by Fadda I at the end of §33. Yet even there, the remaining words in Clm 28135, “apud Deum,” which are not in Engelberg 44, are translated in Fadda I, “mid Gode.”

Were this all, Engelberg 44 would be of minimal significance for reconstructing the source of Fadda I. It is in the material preceding and following the Three Utterances section of Fadda I where Engelberg 44 becomes very
significant, for it provides close parallels for several paragraphs of Fadda I (§§23–24, 29–34 and 36–39) that are completely lacking in Clm 28135. The first Old English passage in bold (§§23–24) contrasts the sons of darkness and the sons of light in terms similar to the Latin of Engelberg 44. This is followed by an extended passage in Fadda I (§§25–31) about the food and drink of the body and of the soul and an extended list of virtues. Some of this material is paralleled in the so-called Apocrypha Priscillianistica, as Luiselli Fadda noted, but Engelberg 44 supplies some further parallels, and still more of the Old English can be paralleled in Pembroke 25 and the Dicta Sancti Effram II. Following the Three Utterances section, Fadda I continues (§§36–39) with extended descriptions of the pains of hell and a list of the sinners who will be punished there, and of the joys of heaven and a list of the virtuous who will be rewarded there. Once again, much of this material is paralleled in Engelberg 44, and once again some additional parallels for apparent additions in Fadda I can be found in other Latin texts. We are dealing here with what James E. Cross called “disseminations,” which he defined as “certain sequence[s] of words recorded in a number of Latin texts.” Such commonplace material might circulate in diverse contexts, often with minor variation in the wording, in some cases probably as a result of memorial transmission. Yet the parallels between Fadda I and Engelberg 44 can hardly be coincidental occurrences, first because they are so extensive and combine

---

31 The list of virtues seems to have been influenced by the Rule of the Master 3.3–8, ed. Adalbert de Vogüé, La Règle du Mâitre: Prologue–Ch. 10, Sources chrétiennes 105 (Paris, 1964): “humilitas, oboedientia, taciturnitas; prae omnibus castitas corporum; conscientia simplex; abstinencia, puritas, simplicitas; benignitas, bonitas [Gal 5:22, which adds longanimitas] misericordia; prae omnibus pietas; temperantia; uigilantia, sobrietas; iustitia, aequitas, ueritas....”

32 Luiselli Fadda, Nuove omelie, 2–3. On the Apocrypha Priscillianistica, which are probably an Irish compilation but in any case probably not Priscillianist, see my entry in Sources of Anglo-Saxon Literary Culture: The Apocrypha, ed. Frederick M. Biggs (Kalamazoo, 2007), 80–83.


multiple disseminations in the same order both preceding and following the Three Utterances, and second because the Three Utterances section in Fadda I translates a very distinctive and rare recension currently witnessed only by Engelberg 44 and Clm 28135. The thirteenth-century Engelberg text, then, must be a late variant copy of the source used by the author of Fadda I. The Engelberg text is probably more than one branch removed stemmatically from the text of the Latin sermon that was translated by the homilist, and in the process of transmission some material has been added or omitted. But the Engelberg sermon can be characterized as a congener of Fadda I’s lost source for this part of the homily. That lost source incorporated the abbreviated recension of the Three Utterances in a form closer to the one in Clm 28135 than to the one in Engelberg 44, but it also included extended framing material preserved partially in Engelberg 44 but not at all in Clm 28135.

As always, the discovery of Latin sources—even when the surviving text is at one or more removes from that of the manuscript actually consulted by the homilist—provides comparative evidence for assessing textual and lexicographical problems. In some cases a source may raise new textual and lexicographical problems. At the beginning of §28 occurs the apparently unproblematic phrase “Þæs mannes saul bið liflic,” which Luiselli Fadda translates as “L’anima dell’uomo è vitale.” The Latin parallel in the Apocrypha Priscillianistica, however, reads “Anima de celestibus uenit,” which is confirmed not only by the parallels in Pembroke 25 and Dicta Sancti Ephram II but also by the logic of the context, which contrast the soul’s celestial origin with the body’s earthly origin (“de terra exiuit”/“exiit”; cf. “de terra orta est” in Pembroke 25). The contrast is skewed in the Old English, where “liflic” (“vital”) is opposed to “fram eorðan” (“from the earth”). Yet the homilist seems to have understood that the soul is being defined in relation to the element of air, since he goes on to say that the soul is the “breath” of God (“Godes oroðes”). A paleographically close OE equivalent for the Latin that would restore the balanced contrast lies to hand: “lyftlic” (“aerial”), a term used also in the OE Seven Heavens homily, where “se lyftlica heofon” translates the name of the first heaven (Aer), and “se oferlyftlica heofon” translates the name of the second heaven (Aether or Aetherium [sc. Coelum]).

36 Luiselli Fadda cites the parallel with the Apocrypha Priscillianistica (Nuove omelie, 2), without considering the potential bearing of the Latin on the reading liflic.

the Seven Heavens and Three Utterances sermons seem to have emerged from a common milieu,\(^{38}\) and since “lyftlic” in the former designates an aerial heaven, the likelihood is strong that “liflic” in Fadda I is a scribal error for “lyftlic” = “de celestibus” (it is easy to see why a scribe might substitute “liflic,” for the soul was indeed the “vital” force).

Again, at the end of §37, the phrase “ond þær beoð þa earman tintrego” and Luiselli Fadda’s translation “e vi saranno tormenti miserabili” also seem entirely unproblematic until one compares the Engelberg text, where the phrase at the corresponding point is “ubi cruciamenta membrorum.” This raises the distinct possibility that “earman” (< *earm*, adj., “attended with misery, grievous”)\(^{39}\) is a scribal substitution for “earma” (< *earm*, n., “arm”): “and there will be torments of the arms.” If so, it would seem to be the only case in which *membrum* is translated synecdochically by *earm* rather than by *limu*; yet such a rendering is at least as likely as the possibility that the near identity of OE *earman* to *earma* precisely where the Latin source has “membrorum” is purely coincidental.

Finally, in the list of sinners in §38 occurs the hapax legomenon “ofernioðan” (not recorded in Bosworth-Toller or Clark-Hall, or their respective supplements by Campbell and Meritt), which Luiselli Fadda translates as “ultrainvidiosi.” The OE sequence here is “þa hatheortan ond þa æfestegan ond þa yfelan ond þa ofernioðan,” corresponding to the Latin sequence “ira-cundi, inuidi, superbi, blasphemii” in the Engelberg text. Since “æfestegan” clearly corresponds to “inuidi,” and since there is no OE equivalent for “superbi” (“yfelan” seems to render “blasphemii”), “ofernioðan” may well be a scribal corruption of “ofermodigan.” It is of course possible that the homilist employed a doublet for “inuidi,” and that his text of the Latin did not include the word “superbi”; but the very fact that the second of the pair is a hapax increases the likelihood that it is a scribal error for the homilist’s original equivalent for “superbi.”\(^{40}\)

---

\(^{38}\) See Willard, *Two Apocrypha*; and Wright, *Irish Tradition*, 221. One OE homily, HomS 5, “Be heofonwarum 7 be helwarum,” ed. Teresi, conflates the Three Utterances exemplum with the Seven Heavens apocryphon. Another OE homily, Vercelli IV, has echoes of both the Three Utterances and Seven Heavens; see Wright, *Irish Tradition*, 264–65, and DiSciucca, “Due note a tre omelie anglosassoni” (n. 6 above), 236–43. See also n. 42 below.


\(^{40}\) The value of comparing source and target texts for textual criticism can of course work in the opposite direction as well. In the Engelberg text the nonsensical Latin phrase “frequentia
In addition to providing us with a Latin source for more of the Old English homily, the Engelberg sermon also allows us to conclude that the author of Fadda I found the Three Utterances already bundled with other material that he translated along with it. What it does not clarify is the extent to which the Anglo-Saxon homilist was expanding on that source with material of his own composition. The sections preceding and following the Three Utterances in Fadda I are somewhat extended in relation to the corresponding passages in the Engelberg sermon. Either the Engelberg sermon represents a reduction of the homilist’s lost Latin source, or else the homilist was expanding modestly as he translated essentially what we have in Engelberg 44. The homilist, however, expands very little in translating the Three Utterances exemplum and also very little when translating the other Latin sources he is known to have used, such as the Doomsday sermon and a pseudo-Augustinian nativity homily.\footnote{On the homilist’s use of these sources, see Wright, “Doomsday Passage,” and “A New Latin Source for Two Old English Homilies (Fadda I and Blickling I): Pseudo-Augustine, Sermo App. 125, and the Ideology of Chastity in the Anglo-Saxon Benedictine Reform,” in Source of Wisdom: Old English and Early Medieval Latin Studies in Honour of Thomas D. Hill, ed. Charles D. Wright, Frederick M. Biggs, and Thomas N. Hall (Toronto, 2007), 239–65.} Most of these apparent additions, moreover, are paralleled in other Latin sources. In §31, for example, the theme of the good works that refresh the soul is followed by the image of the just shining like the sun, supported by quotation of Matthew 13:43, but precisely the same addition occurs in the Dicta Sancti Effram II. This suggests that most of the remaining unsourced material may also reflect a lost variant text of the sermon surviving in Engelberg 44.

The homilist probably did make some modest additions of his own.\footnote{The phrase “dracona fulnesse,” for example, is closely paralleled in the Old English Seven Heavens homily (HomU 12.2): “ðā fulnissa ðāra dracena” (ed. Willard, Two Apocrypha, 6).} Such additions can be comparatively trivial, though they are not without interest as evidence of what the homilist thought required clarification, thus affording insight about his intended audience. In §26, the homilist clarifies the opposition of “leohetes bearn” and “deofles bearn” by defining the conduct of the for-gentium” can be corrected to “frequentia gemitum” by comparison with the OE, which reads “gelomic geōnmung” (§36). Again, the phrase “caritas angelorum” makes a kind of sense, but the OE rendering “ængla breohenes” (§39) might lead an editor to suspect an error in the Latin for “claritas angelorum,” a superior reading that is supported by the parallel passage in Pembroke 25, Sermon 50 and the Sermo ad reges. The immediately following phrase, “ond haligra lufū,” suggests, at the same time, that the homilist’s source read “caritas sanctorum” where the Pembroke homily and Sermo ad reges read “claritas sanctorum.” Cf. Vercelli XXI, where “swete lufū” corresponds to “claritas sanctorum” in the same Pembroke Homily, and where Scragg suggest the homilist’s manuscript read “caritas” (Vercelli Homilies, 362).}
mer in this world ("þa mæn þa doð god and beoð ælmesfulle") and the fate of
the latter in the next ("þanne wuniað þara saula in ecum wuldræ").43 Here the
homilist amplifies the term "leohtes bearn" by singling out a virtue (alms-
giving) that is not in the source and that is appropriate specifically to a lay au-
dience. Similarly, the amplification of "geswigung" (= "taciturnitas") in §30
by "þonne us mon on ðweorh to sprecce" transforms the specifically monastic
virtue taciturnitas in a way that makes it applicable to a lay audience: silence
in the face of abuse by others is a very different kind of virtue than silence in
obedience to the Rule. It also echoes the homilist’s exhortation in §9 not to
repay evil words with other evil words "þeah man gehere oðerne him on
ðweorh sprecan."44 Finally, in the list of sinners, the homilist clarifies that the
"oferwelgan" (= "[cupidi]," "auari") are those "þe mid unrihtnesse him a
begeatan," so that the sin lies not in the mere possession of great wealth but in
having acquired it unjustly.45

Additions can be evidence of what the homilist thought important enough
to justify departing from his source. The single longest apparent addition in
this section of Fadda I is the trinitarian prayer in §35, “Eala, ðu halige
ðrynness....” Luiselli Fadda’s punctuation makes it a continuation of the an-
gels’ quotation of Psalm 64 (addressed to the blessed soul),46 but the prayer
seeks forgiveness for unrighteousness and admission to the community of
heaven with the “elect angels,” so it must be focalized through the homilist
(speaking for his audience) or through the blessed soul (speaking for all the
blessed), or both, and I would therefore punctuate it as a separate quotation.
The transition from the psalm verse to the prayer is abrupt (or rather there is
no transition), and the prayer is not paralleled in any of the Latin texts of the
Three Utterances that I have been able to consult, though it is of course
possible that a lost variant text of the Engelberg sermon included such a
prayer. I have found no close parallel for the prayer as a whole elsewhere,
though many of the phrases that make it up (such as the doctrinal language about the Trinity) can easily be paralleled. It may well be the homilist’s own addition to his source, which is not to say that it did not have its own separate source. Generically the prayer is a lorica, as it begins by invoking the Trinity and then seeks protection from spiritual danger (“ðæt us ne ðurfe sceamian ond ðæt us ure fynd ne gebismrian”), the very danger that is exemplified by the fate of the damned soul, which is recounted immediately after the prayer. The purpose of this addition (if such it is) is twofold: first, to envision the first half of the Three Utterances exemplum, dealing with the fate of the blessed soul, as a desirable and possible fate for the homilist and his congregation or readership (“ðæt we motan becuman to ðinum rice ...”), suggesting how that good fate can be realized not only through good deeds, as the exemplum stresses, but also through faith in the Trinity (“on ðe we gelefað”);

In §38, the addition to the list of sinners of three consecutive phrases referring to those who use magic or incantations (“ond þa lyblæce ond þa ðe manige galdor cunnon ond þa ðe gelome galaþ”) suggests that magic was a particular concern of the homilist that the source failed to include as a category of vice. (The last sentence of the same paragraph is likely to be the homilist’s own summation, as betrayed by the clause “on ðisum bocum sægeð.”) An addition to the list of virtues in §30 (“ond mid sigefæstnesse ond gemefæstnesse ond mid æðnesse godcundre beboda”) could also be the homilist’s own, especially since it comes at the end of the list, though the virtues in question are rather miscellaneous.

At the beginning of §36, the addition “ond hiora dracona fulnesse ond hiora wyrmra grædignesse ond wildeora reðnesse and hiora susl a micelnesse” (followed shortly by “saula unrotnesse ond protena drygnesse”) seems likely to be original—or if borrowed, then borrowed from a vernacular source—since the sequence of rhythmically and syntactically parallel phrases is similar to

48 Luiselli Fadda, ed., Nuove omelie, 23.
49 Ibid.
50 One would like to know what specific practices are covered by the homilist’s references to sorcerers and incantations. For an illuminating survey of the kinds of magic and superstitions that Ælfric might have been thinking of when he condemned “magic,” see Audrey Meaney, “Ælfric and Idolatry,” Journal of Religious History 13 (1984): 119–35.
that found in other OE anonymous homilies.\textsuperscript{51} The sequence makes the list of the pains of hell more vivid and concrete, and eschatological descriptions often inspired both homilists and poets to indulge in rhetorically heightened runs.

Three major Latin sources have now been identified for Fadda I, accounting for nearly all of the homily other than the introduction (§§1–11): the pseudo-Augustinian nativity homily (\textit{Sermo App.} 125), the source for §§12–21; an earlier variant version of the Engelberg sermon, incorporating the distinctive abbreviated version of the Three Utterances, and additional material that can partly be reconstructed from other Latin texts, the source for most of §§23–39 (aside from the trinitarian prayer in §35); and a variant redaction of the pseudo-Augustinian Doomsday sermon (\textit{Sermo App.} 251), the source for §§41–48. The homilist quotes a Latin passage from all three of these sources: in §13, he quotes a passage near the beginning of the nativity sermon; in §31 he conflates the Vulgate text of Matthew 13:43 with the incipit of the Three Utterances exemplum; and in §41 he quotes the incipit of the Doomsday sermon. Aside from the Latin quotation of the first few words of Psalm 64:5 in the address of the angels to the blessed soul in the Three Utterances exemplum (§34), his only other Latin quotation, Matthew 22:37–40 + Romans 13:8, comes in §21, immediately after the last material based on \textit{Sermo App.} 125 and just two paragraphs before the first material paralleled in Engelberg 44. Since the homilist’s method seems to be to quote a Latin tag when he turns to a new source, this may indicate that his version of the Engelberg 44 sermon began with this blended biblical quotation. The fact that the introduction, the only remaining unsourced block, does not include a Latin tag may therefore be an indication that in these paragraphs the homilist was not translating a single Latin source.

II

Oxford, Bodleian Library Hatton 114, fols. 102v–105v (Bazire/Cross Homily 9), one of the other Old English homilies incorporating the Three Utterances as an exemplum, affords a second case of bundling that was probably not original to the homilist. Here the Three Utterances is preceded by what

seems to have been another popular dissemination. This introduction compares the transitoriness and uncertain end of our life in this world to the condition of a person who lives in someone else’s house and does not know when he will be told to get out because the house does not belong to him. Cross found parallels for this introduction in a pseudo-Augustinian sermon and in an early medieval florilegium. Stephen Pelle has noted another in Einsiedeln, Stiftsbibliothek 27, and I have elsewhere cited an example from the twelfth-century English manuscript Hatton 26. This dissemination, however, also serves as an introduction to the Three Utterances in the twelfth-century Homiliary of Opatowitz in Prague, Národní knihovna České republiky III.F.6 (509) (s. XII), fol. 177r–179v, as the following table shows. The table includes on facing pages the closely similar text of the Three Utterances from Berlin, Staatsbibliothek Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Phillipps 1716, with selected variants from Vatican City, BAV Pal. lat. 220 (edited by McNally) as well as from Munich, BSB Clm. 14446b. For the opening paragraph the table gives parallels from other sources.


53 I am grateful to Stephen Pelle for drawing my attention to the example in Einsiedeln, Stiftsbibliothek 27 (s. VIII/IX, Northern Italy or Switzerland; CLA VII, no. 827), fol. 120r. For Hatton 26, see Charles D. Wright “Old English Homilies and Latin Sources,” in The Old English Homily: Precendent, Practice, and Appropriation, ed. Aaron J Kleist (Turnhout, 2007), 15–66, at 19 n.13. I take the opportunity to correct a wrong shelfmark in that footnote: in my reference to “Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Hatton 42, part II,” read “26, Part B.”


55 For the Berlin and Vatican manuscripts, see n. 10 above; for the Munich manuscript (s. IX°, Regensburg), see Wright, “Manuscripts,” no. 11.
Leofan men, uton nu geþencan, broðor mine, hwylc ure eard is in þissum middan-earde. Efne he is þon gelic þe hwylc man bing gestaólica in ðeres mannes huse, nat he na hwylce dæge oðde on hwylce tid him biþ to gegeðen, “Gang ut, forþam þis þis þin þus he þu on eardest. Næfst ðu her leng næ-nige wununge.” Ne we nytan þe georner on hwylce tid we ðís liene ðif aletaþ secelon. We mihtæ eað mid micclum egesan forhtian, forðam sceal anra manna gehwylces ende gewurðan; and him þonne biþ eft þær his sylfes dærum demed, swa god swa yfel swa he æþ lifræmede godes oðde yfel, ge seodfaestum mannum ge unseodfaestum, ge ricum ge hænum.

Him cumeð togeanes his sawle twegen englas: oðer bið Godes encgel, se bið swa hwit swa snaw; oðer bið deofles encgel, se bið swa sweart swa hræfen oððe Silharewa; and heora byð ægðer myccles geferscypes. Hi þonne habbað mycel geflit ymbe ða sawle on hwæðerere geferræddene heo beon scule. Gyf þonne þa deoflu þæt ongytað, þæt heo sceal beon on heora geferscype, þonne beoð hí ealle efenhleoþriende and swyðe bliðe, and þa englas heoð swyðe sarige and unrote gewordene. Donne cweþað þa deoflu þus, “Noster est ille homo.” Dæt is on ure geþeode þat hi cweþað, “Dis is ure mann, forðam þe heo larum geleðe....” Hi ðonne þa deoflu sceðað and reccað eall þa yfel þe he æþre gefremede, and hi hit call on heora bocum awritten habbað and þus cweþað, “Suscitate animam de corpore grauiiter.” Dæt is, “Aweccað nu grimlice þa sawle of þam lichoman, and syllæð lyre micce fyrtu and brogan ond ongirslan, and geleðað hi to þære egesfullan stowe þær heo gesyðð eall yfel and ealle tinctrega and helfebrogan.”

... Dispícete ergo fratres mei hunc mundum et temporalem uitam, et cogitate diligenter, quia habitatio nostra in mundo ita est, sicut aliquis fiat in domo alicuius, et nesciat qua hora dicitur ei, “Vade foras de domo mea”; sic incertum est unicusque homini quando a tabernaculo corporis sui exiturus est. Cum tamen pro certo scimus quod unusquisque hominem debet mortem accipere qui uitam accipit.

Et tunc ueniunt duo exercitus obuiam unicusque animæ, alius exercitus candidus fit ut nix, alter niger ut coruus, et faciunt certamina circa animam uniusquisque hominis. Si uero inuenient demons eorum sociam esse, cantant et gaudent, et angelii vehementer contrastantur. Tunc dicunt demons, “Noster est ille homo.”

Date illi tremores et timores, ut senciát qui eum duciunt.”
Einsiedeln, Stiftsbibliothek
27, fol. 120r

Ps.-Augustine, Sermo ad fratres in eremo 49
(PL 40:1332)

Sic est uita ista quasi se sit homo in domo aliena,
nescit qua die uel qua hora dicatur ei. “Veni foras,
qu(a) non est tua domus in qua es.”

Sic enim est vita nostra, quasi homo in domo aliena,
nesciens qua hora vel die patronus dicat: “Vade foras;
quia non est tua domus in qua es.”

Oxford, Bodleian Library
Hatton 26, fol. 74r

Frates karissimi istam
habitacionem quem tenet in hoc seculo ita tenet si esset in domo aliena, quia nescit qua die uel qua nocte
dicatur ei. “Vade foras, quia non est domus tua in qua es.”

Three Utterances sermon
(Berlin, Staatsbibliothek Phillipps 1716,
fol. 17r)

… futurum est duos hostes uenire in obuiam ei, hostis niger Ethiopum quasi corui uel carbones extincti, et aliu exercitus in uestimentis albis sicut nix.

Et faciunt certamina erga animam unius-cuisque hominis siue justi siue iniusti, ut ambo sciant cuius eorum est [sit socium Clm 14446b]. Si uero (in)ueniant demones eum eorum socium esse, chacin´nant omnes demones et angeli contristantur.

Demenes dicunt: “Noster (est) ille uir, qui inermis fuit in acie, non fortis, non custodii arma Pauli apostoli, scutum fidei et gladium Spiritus Sancti, quod est uerbum Dei, et lurica iustitiae et galeam salutis [Eph. 6:16] que ad bellum contra nos tenere oportebat.

Suscitate eam acerue de suo corpore, et date ei timores et horrores et deducite eam ad loca terribilia ubi uidebit temptamenta omnia” [ubi tormenta omnia Clm 14446b].

56 Vatican City, BAV Pal. lat. 212 and 220 both read “chacinnant”; McNally incorrectly reads “concinant,” and Bazire and Cross (117) report “concinant,” which corresponds to “efenhleopriende” but does not appear in any of the Three Utterances manuscripts I have seen.
Ne meæg seo sawul þonne nawiht gescean in þas worulc, ac heo on þeostrum and on gedwolan swyðe unliðe farð and þus cweð. “Magna est ista angustia.” Ðæt is heo cweð, “Eala, hwæt! Þis is mycel neareones!” Hire þonne sona andswariað þa deoflu and þus cweðað, “Mare, þe is toward þonne we de gebringað mid urum ealdre deofle, se is gebunden in þam nyðemestan hellegrunde mid þære menigo his gemæccan.”


Hire þonne andswariað þa deoflu and þus cweðað, “Maran þe syndon toweardes þonne we þe gelædað in þa neoðemestan þeostru þær bið eagna wop and toða gristbitung.” And heo þonne nyðelaw þa se wypal briddan siðe þus cweð, “Asperum est iter.” “Eala, hwæt! Þis is grimlic siðfæt þe we on syndon!”

Hyre þonne sona andswariað þa deoflu and þus cweðað, “De is mycel grimlicre toward þonne þu gesihst þa grimnesse þines siðfætes, and þu byst þaðra sooðfastra husa benumen and þu byst gelæded in þa witu hellecarcernes.” …

Gyf þonne þa englas geseoð þaet seo sawli bið heora geferscypes wyrdæ, hi þonne ongiðna seogan and radan swyðe freondlice eall þa god þe heo æfre fram frýmde hyre lifes oð hire daga ende gefremede; and heo hit eall on heora bocum awritten habbað. And Sanctus Michahel þonne þa sawle gelæded to þam heahsetle ures Drihtnes Hælendes Cristes, þær heo gesihð eall þa god þe heo æfre ær gefremede. Donne sona þa awyrgedan gastos swyðe unhyðige to helle in ece wite forð-gewitað.


Prague, Národní Knihovna České Republiky III.F.6 (509), fol. 178r

Tunc dicit anima inmundæ, “Heu me, magne sunt tenebre.”

Doemones respondent, “Maiores tibi futuri sunt, ibi erit fletus et stridor dencium et multitudo impiorum.” Tunc dicit iterum infelix anima, “Asper est iter.”

Dėmones dicunt, “Asperius est tibi futurum. Deducmus te ad locum teribilem, ubi uidebis simulque sencies tormenta impiorum.”

Quando uero angeli inueniunt animam iustam et eorum sociam esse, gaudent et dėmones contristantur.
Three Utterances sermon  
(Berlin, Staatsbibliothek Phillipps 1716,  
fol. 17r–v)

Tunc anima nihil uidens in presenti seculo  
dicit: “Magna angustia!”

Quasi ex more demones respondent:  
“Maior tibi est futura. Alligauimus te cum  
protuplausto Satanæ, qui alligatus est in puteo  
abyssi cum turba satellitum.”

Deinde dicit anima:  
“Magna sunt tenebre!”

Demoses respondent:  
“Maiores tibi future sunt.”

Tunc dicit tertio:  
“Asperum est iter!”

Demoses respondent:  
“Asperius tibi futurum est. Videbis  
asperitatem generis [itineris Clm 14446b] tuæ.  
carens tabernaculis iustorum.” Tunc dicent  
demoses: “Diuidite uos in [+ duos Pal. lat.  
220] hostes.…”

Michael tamen numquam dimittit.  
Si uero angeli inueniant (eum)  
eorum esse, gaudens  
omnes demoses uero constristentur.

Michael tamen numquam dimittit  
animam donec designet eam ante tribu-

nalis Trinitatis, ubi uidet omnia opera  
sua [+ quae fecit Pal. lat. 220] tenens  
librum in manibus suis metari (e)a siue  
bona siue mala.
Tunc dicunt angeli, “Noster est ille homo, fidelis est amans deum, ualde misericors et hospitalis, omnia sustinuit temptamenta propter deum omnipotentem.”

Tunc diuident se eos angeli in duos exercitus, alius preveniens, alius consequens
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Three Utterances sermon
(Berlin, Staatsbibliothek Phillipps 1716,
fols. 17v–18r)

Et dicunt angeli:
“Noster est ille vir, qui fuit fortis in bello et
stabilis in acie; et hospitalis erat et misericors
est. Omittatur, nihil mali commemorans,
onme bonum custodiens, non repellens arma
Pauli apostoli;...

Suscitate eam leniter de suo corpore ut nihil
timoris, nihil doloris, nihil dubitationis uidens
uel senciens.”

Tunc dicunt angeli: “Diuidite uos
in duos exercitus, alius preueniens
et alter subsequens. Et cantate illi
de canticis Daud ubi manifestat
beatitudinem animæ et [delete]
intrantis in domum Dei. Dicent:
‘Beatus quem elegisti et adsumpsisti’
[Ps 64:5] ….”

Tunc dicit anima: “Magnum
est lumen!”

Angeli respondent:
“ Maior tibi futurum est. Et uidebis
claritatem Dei sicut facie ad faciem,
non per speculum [1 Cor 13:12] neque per
uelum, quemadmodum uidebant filii Israel
faciem Moysi.” Dicit denuo anima:
“Magna let(it)iae [sic] est!” Angeli
respondent, “Maior tibi futura est.
Videbis let(it)iam angelorum uenientem
obuiam tibl cum concenctu diuino, ut
omnibus sanctis dicent: ‘Hii sunt qui
uenerunt ex magna tribulatione et lauerunt
stolas suas et candidas eas fecerunt in
sanguine agni’” [Apoc 7:14].

Et dicit tercio: “Suaue est iter!”

Et angeli respondent:
“Suauem tibi est futurum!”

Deducimus te ad tabernacula
sanctorum carens inustorum
habitationibus.”

Tunc dicunt angeli: “Diuidite uos …”
The bundling of this single “dissemination” with the Three Utterances could be coincidental, but while some of the wording in Bazire/Cross 9 is better paralleled in the Latin text of Hatton 26 and pseudo-Augustine, more of it corresponds with the Prague sermon. (Hatton 26 also transmits a copy of the Three Utterances just one folio after this dissemination, though they are separated by another sermon.) Bazire and Cross stated that “A collation of the variant texts of the Latin [Three Utterances] compared with our sermon indicates, probably, that the composer substituted a new introduction and, quite clearly, that he did not have before him an exact equivalent of any one of the published Latin texts.” While it is true that no surviving Latin text affords an “exact equivalent,” the parallel texts above show that Bazire/Cross 9 is quite close in most respects to the version published by McNally, albeit with some relatively minor variations. As Bazire and Cross state, “Some Latin quotations [in the Old English homily] … do not correspond with the words of any one of the Latin texts.”

The Prague sermon also corresponds closely to McNally’s text (edited from Pal. lat. 220, with variants from Pal. lat. 212), reedited in the table from Berlin, Phillipps 1716, but unfortunately it has been drastically abbreviated. Where they overlap, there are some readings in Berlin, Phillipps 1716 that are closer to Bazire/Cross 9, but there is also a unique variant that is paralleled only in the Prague sermon. Bazire and Cross drew attention to two specific

---

57 Prague, Národní knihovna České republiky III.F.6 (509), fols. 178r–179v continues with a version of Ps.-Augustine, Sermo App. 251. At the end of the homily (fol. 179v) is a brief passage based on Caesarius of Arles, Sermo 46 (CCL 103:205 and 206) that provides a parallel for a sentence in the introduction of Fadda I. Compare “Nullus alium in convivio suo cogat bibere amplius quam oportet, eo quod frequent de ebrietate ueniunt lites et pugnae et adulteria et nonnumquam homicidia perpetrantur” with Fadda I, ed. Luiselli Fadda, Nuove omelie, 9, §7: “Ne he selfa ne he oðerne ne bidde ðy læs hiera begra saul þurh þæt forloren weorþe, forþanþe se druncnesse manige synne wecéð on fulmum [sic, read fulum (so Godden)] fyrenlustum ond on unrihtum geflitum ond on gitsungum….”

58 Bazire and Cross, Eleven Old English Rogationtide Homilies, 116.

59 Ibid.
readings not paralleled in any of the versions known to them: First, when the
demons and angels claim the souls that belong to them, in Bazire/Cross 9 they
say “Noster est ille [or hic] homo” instead of “Noster est ille uir.” Again, in
Bazire/Cross 9 the third utterance of the blessed soul is “Dulce est iter”
instead of “Suaue est iter.” The Prague sermon does not preserve the iter
utterance, but when the demons and angels claim the souls they do say in each
case “Noster est ille homo.”60 In short, much like Engelberg sermon does for
Fadda I, the Prague sermon provides us with a late congener of the lost Latin
source translated by Bazire/Cross Homily 9, one that in this case has certainly
been abbreviated but one that also does preserve additional Latin material
translated by the homilist. The introduction, then, was probably not substi-
tuted by the homilist, as Bazire and Cross thought, but was already bundled
with the Three Utterances in his source.

III

We know that originality, in the sense of not deriving ideas or wording
from an existing text, was not greatly valued as a literary quality by Old Eng-
lish homilists.61 Nonetheless, we are often inclined to attribute unsourced pas-
sages to the homilists’ own composition, and we tend to assign to those

60 While homo for uir is a trivial substitution, of the forty-four manuscripts of the Three
Utterances I have been able to consult, only the Prague sermon makes that substitution.

61 On the relationship between Old English anonymous homilies and Latin sources, and on
the methodology of source studies, see Wright, “Old English Homilies and Latin Sources,” and
“Doomsday Passage.” The kind of originality I am immediately concerned with here is the
combination by an Old English homilist of material translated or adapted from diverse Latin
sources within a single homily. A related kind of originality in Old English homilies is when a
homilist departs from a Latin model and inserts “unoriginal” (but often adapted) material from
Old English sources, such as passages from other Old English homilies, or even from poetic
texts. A prominent example is Vercelli Homily XXI, which adapts passages from a preexisting
vernacular homily also used in Vercelli Homily II, from the surviving poem An Exhortation to
Christian Living, and from a lost poem about the fall of the rebel angels. See Wright, “More
Old English Poetry in Vercelli Homily XXI,” in Early Medieval Texts and Interpretations, ed.
Treharne and Rosser, 245–62; and Samantha Zacher, Preaching the Converted: The Style and
Rhetoric of the Vercelli Book Homilies (Toronto, 2009), 79–105. The notion of “originality”
can of course easily be troubled. Every translation, no matter how “slavish,” is original in that
the translator must choose words in the target language to represent (or misrepresent) those in
the source text. Compare Susan Bassnett’s comments on originality and translation: “there can
be no such thing as an “original” … translated text becomes an original by virtue of its
continued existence in that new context” (Comparative Literature: A Critical Introduction
passages greater interest and significance. Sometimes, of course, they may actually be original, but the continued discovery of new sources has continued to chip away at what relatively little there is left to regard as such, and this must give us pause when we assume that an unsourced passage does not have a source. When a new source is discovered, we may still be inclined to attribute any remaining divergences or unsourced phrases or sentences to the homilist’s revision. Here we are on somewhat safer ground, especially when the Latin source in question is preserved in many manuscripts and a thorough collation of the variants fails to account for the apparently original material. Yet sometimes a variant text of a Latin source subsequently comes to light that accounts for some of those apparent revisions. This was the case in Fadda I for the Doomsday passage, which J. E. Cross first sourced from a pseudo-Augustinian sermon in the Patrologia Latina. He cautiously suggested that material the Latin sermon did not account for might be the homilist’s contributions, but in a recent essay I have identified a variant form of the Doomsday sermon that accounts for many of those apparently original touches.

The same kind of uncertainty obtains when separate Latin sources have been bundled together in an Old English homily. We may be inclined to assume that the homilist made the selection himself and so was original at least in his choices and in his compilation of a new text from diverse sources. Source studies sometimes spoil that impression as well, for composite Latin homilies have been found to account even for the bundling of sources in a number of Old English homilies. The most well-known case is Vercelli Homily III, whose ultimate sources were pieced together by Joan Turville-Petre in a classic essay, “Translations of a Lost Penitential Homily.” Nineteen years later, Helen Spencer found and published that “lost” Latin sermon, and four years after that J. E. Cross demonstrated that the manuscript from which Spencer edited it was a copy of the Homiliary of St.-Père de Chartres, which Cross demonstrated had been used extensively by other Old English homi-

62 “Cross, “Doomsday Passage,” 107. In “Towards the Identification of Old English Literary Ideas,” 84, Cross referred to additional manuscripts of the sermon and added, “My suggestions [in the Anglia article] should be refined or even, possibly, confirmed by a collation of manuscripts.”

63 Wright, “Doomsday Passage.”


lists. In the case of the Three Utterances in Fadda I and Bazire/Cross 9, I have argued that the homilists were not themselves responsible for the bundling of the exemplum with other material immediately contiguous with it. I do not suggest that we should assume that unsourced passages must always have immediate sources, or that bundled sources in Old English homilies were always first bundled in Latin. I do suggest that originality, insofar as that is taken to mean non-dependence on Latin sources, should not be a privileged measure of value or interest in reading Old English homilies. And I would also suggest that what the discovery of Latin sources takes away with its left hand it gives back with its right. To the extent that we are able to establish with reasonable confidence the wording of a Latin source used by an Old English homilist, comparison can throw into relief the homilist’s ideological and rhetorical responses to it: how “original,” as it were, he was with his originals. That is considerable compensation for having to abandon the possibility that the homilist made up that part of his text from scratch.
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