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Chapter Four

St. Gregory the Great
Gregory was born in A.D. 540 of Christian Roman parents of considerable wealth. Bede records how Gregory wanted to leave the worldly life, ignoring pastoral duties which, he felt, interfered with his contemplations [1]. He reluctantly became Pope in 590, and was both influential and successful, acknowledging the authority of the Emperor in secular matters but ensuring that the Church had a prominent place in current affairs [2]. In 596 he sent missionaries to bring Christianity to the Anglo-Saxons, forming a bond between Gregory and insular monasticism that would remain strong. Gregory died in Rome in 604, greatly mourned [3].

His writings were widespread - it is possible that he sent some of his own works to Britain in 596 - and formed the basis of most monastic libraries [4]. Outside the cloister, Gregory's works were also used in secular teaching: both the Dialogi and Cura Pastoralis were translated into Anglo-Saxon by 894, and Alfred ensured the promulgation of the latter [5]. The influence of his work on other writers can be seen particularly in the work of AElfric, who read Gregory's works at Winchester [6].
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Notes to Chapter IV, 1:

Chapter IV, 2:

CURA PASTORALIS

(PLLXXVII) Bede refers to the Pastoral Care in his account of Gregory's life and works as egregium, excellent [1]. It was written before the Dialogi and the Registrum epistolarum, and the editor of the Maurist edition describes it as Gregory's best work, suitable for the instruction not only of bishops and priests, but also of fathers of families. He goes on to describe its effect at Councils and in missionary work, particularly Augustine's mission to England. Augustine is reported by King Alfred, an intelligent speculator, to have brought the Cura Pastoralis to England in 597, and "the circumstantial evidence of the characters, habits and relationships of Gregory I and his devoted disciple" [2] seems to bear this out. Its popularity at that time is borne witness to not only by the fact that we have ten extant MSS which are believed to have been in England before 1100, but we also have numerous MSS of this work translated into Anglo-Saxon by or at the command of King Alfred. The ten Latin MSS range from the eighth century to the late eleventh or early twelfth century, and are as follows:

C Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 361 s.xi
G Glasgow University Lib., Hunterian
  431 (v.5.l) s.x/xi
O British Lib., Cotton Otho A.i (f.) s.viii
C Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 361

s.xi, vellum, 250mm.x 155mm., ff.1 + 104, 28 lines to a page, "mostly in one large clear hand, rather sloping",
from Malmesbury. On i.a in faint ink:

Iste liber est de monasterio Malmesburye et in custodia ffratris Thome...

Contents:

Title in red capitals.

Incipiunt regule pastorales Gregorii pape urbis Rome.
scripte ad Iohannem ep. Rauenn. urbis.  f.1

Pastoralis cura me pondera fugere.

Ends 104a: tui meriti manus tenet. Expl. liber Pastoralis.

Deo gratias amen.

On 104b, in another large hand,

"The beginning of the Passion of St. Maurice:"

(Corpus Christi Catalogue)
Ker notes the Malmesbury ex libris [3], and says that the codex was noted by John Leland at the Dissolution of the monasteries. Gneuss does not mention provenances, but also gives the origin as Malmesbury [4]. The hand of this MS is untidy but clear enough, in thick, dark ink, the capitals filled in with colour. Words are generally separated correctly and letter forms are distinct, although the ct and st ligatures are frequently used. The supralinear contraction line is shaped thus: ~. Abbreviations used include, p, p for pro, per, g for ergo, c for -tur, q: or q; for -que, b; for -bus, e for ae, q for quod, y for -rum, n for non, e for est, supralinear 9 for -us, c for ter, tam for tamen, st for sunt, eee for esse, a for et, and the usual nomina sacra. The first omission of a line and a half in our passage (f.91r.) is signalled by the insular ō and striction in the text and in the margin (both symbols in both places) and then by the same two symbols at the foot of the page where the lines are inserted, in paler ink but in a similar and contemporary hand. In the second instance of this kind (f.91v.), the omission is not signalled on the margin but only by at in the text, followed only by ō at the foot of the page [5]. Several holes in the membrane evidently predate the writing. Punctuation uses the symbols ‐, ‐, ·, ;, and seems consistent. In about fifty percent of the places where a word breaks between two lines, a hyphen has been used. Syllabification is quite good. Accents are used occasionally but seem to appear in groups. Some drawings of hands appear
in the text, pointing and terminating in rudimentary cuffs, generally used to indicate a passage particularly worthy of note. One of these is in our passage, at Ammonendi itaque sunt ut si temptationum procellas cum difficultate...

Several other scribbles appear in the margins on each page, including the word loth, a symbol like a sprawling H, twice something that seems to read $pz/x/9$, and apha also appears four times. Other words are less legible, but all appear contemporary with each other, and rather later and finer than the hand of the text.

G Glasgow University, Hunterian 431 (v.5.1)

s.x-xi, vellum, 255 x 185mm., ff.158, "written in different hands, in single cols. of 14 lines (quires 1-13) and of 19 lines (quires 14-20), each 156 x 122mm.; margined and ruled with a bodkin; no signatures, catchwords or foliation; coloured initials; red and green rubric (1st. page); few marginalia; vellum unequal and defective; slightly worm-holed at beginning, otherwise well-preserved".

Contents:

S. Gregory the Great's Pastoral Rule:

Begins (I, 2r. 11.1-3):

\[
\text{INCIPIVNT REGVLe PaSToRaLeS GREGORII PAPe VRBIS / ROME.} \\
\text{ScRIPTaE ad IohaNNNeM epIScopVM RauENNE VRBIS. [rubric]}/ \\
\text{P[green initial]astoralis cure me pondera fugere}
\]
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Pre-Conquest Caroline Minuscule, Parchment, Worcester s.xi'-xii'. This text of the Pastoral Care is of particular interest in that the first 102 folios appear to have been "copied by 3 scribes in the early 11th. century from an exemplar in Welsh minuscule or less probably, Irish minuscule, which they could not read correctly" [6]. They extend certain abbreviations wrongly and preserve abbreviations which they did not understand. In the 12th. century the book was carefully corrected and 56 new leaves added. The book does not contain a Worcester ex libris, but it has marginalia in the "tremulous" Worcester hand - the hand of a late 12th. or early 13th. century monk whose glosses have enabled the Worcester provenance of many manuscripts to be established. The book seems to have been removed from Worcester between 1623 and 1697. (National Library of Scotland,
The codex is mentioned in Patrick Young's catalogue of 1622-1623. Ker dates the MS s.x-xi/xii in [3]. The script of this MS is an insular minuscule, and is slightly inconsistent in its letter forms, using both and d in similar contexts, which Ker sees as a sign of scribal inferiority [7]. The letters are neat and clear, but rather heavy and laboured. Line and word spacing are good. The written space is a somewhat small portion of the page, and the right hand margin is untidy. The wide margins have occasional scribbles, and there are several short glosses, almost illegible. The chapters are poorly indicated and do not correspond to modern printed editions. Chapter initials are fine and vary in style. There are some accents. Abbreviations are moderately frequent and consistent: q, q:, q, qd for qui, que, quo, quod, p, p, p, p for per, prae, pro, b; for bus, c for con, m for mihi, n for non, e or e for ae, e. for esse, e. for est, i for ius, g for ergo, g for igitur, t for tur, c for ter, c for tunc, ura for uestra, nob for nobis, nra for nostra, p for rum. The omission line is curled thus: ~.

(Initial A from cap.xxviii)
0 British Library, Cotton Otho A i

s.viii, vellum, 8 fragments, measuring from 66 x 44mm to 150 x 94mm, being the remains of a volume of 64 leaves which was burnt in the fire of 1731. Written in England, in round minuscules, with initials ornamented with red dots.

Contents:
2. Epistola Bonifacii, archiepiscopi Moguntinensis, ad Cuthbertum, archiepiscopum Cantuariae, de corrigendis uitiis Anglorum et adhibenda synodo: 2 fragments. f.5
4. Regulae pastoralis S.Gregorii pars secunda: a single fragment of ch.iv. f.8

(Thompson & Warner, Ancient MSS)

We are lucky also to have a catalogue entry for this MS dating from before the fire:

1. Synodalía gesta a Cuthberto...
2. Epistola Bonifacii...
3. Donatio siue concessio AEthelbaldi...
4. Pastoralis S.Gregorii pars secunda. Tantum debet actionem populi actio transcendere Praesulis, quantum a
Prologus partis tertiae. Quia igitur, qualis esse
debeat Pastor, ostendimus, nunc qualiter doceat,
demonstremus.

(Smith, Cotton Catalogue)

CLA II, 188:

...Script is a neat, roundish and regular majuscule: d
and n are uniformly minuscule, R majuscule, and s has
both forms...The Cotton catalogue in Harley 6018 shows
that it formerly belonged to Thomas Allen of Gloucester
Hall, Oxford.

Ker notes this as having been ascribed to Christ
Church, Canterbury [3]. He later rejects this ascription,
but must have based it on the other contents of the
manuscript, associated with Archbishop Cuthbert and King
AEthelbald. Ker does not give a date, although Gneuss [4]
and Lowe [8] say that the manuscript and its associated part
in the Bodleian (Arch.Selden B.26, f.34) are written in
s.viii2. Ker gives the provenance of the Bodleian fragment
as Salisbury. The script of the Cotton fragment bears a
striking resemblance to the hand in Kassel,
Landes.Theol.f.32 (see MS K below), which Lowe places
tentatively in the same scriptorium as the Corpus Glossary,
probably Canterbury.

All that remains of the text of Cura Pastoralis in
this MS is a scrap measuring approximately 63 x 44mm., baked
to a hard translucent brown, the edges of which are somewhat obscured on the verso by the paste used to mount it. The initial N which appears on the recto might be assumed to have been illuminated with a wash of colour, as it has burned shiny rather than matt black. Abbreviations used in the legible parts of the text are p for per and q, q. for quae and que, as well as dǐs for dominus and the omission line. The passages Smith cites agree almost entirely with the PL edition, except in one respect: his version of Ch.I of Part Two has the phrase quantum a grege distare solet, while Migne has quantum distare solet a grege. Although there is no difference in meaning here, Migne's version is better rhetorically. The fragment in the British Museum, though much shrunken and damaged, reads as follows (I cannot find the corresponding PL text for the recto, but have compared the verso with the printed edition):

//unitate .eter..u . /
..slatio.ne(m) .ile.iu. /
p.quit. uisibi eg..f /
dat Ne aut alta f /
lii firma ..p(er).... /
o u more longius .. /
lingui t(er).....q(uae)q(ue) /
........... b .....m. /
...........bi.....u /
pe.ereetu p(er) .ub.... h /
iuxta Ueritatis uocem, nequaquam iam gregis

custodiae Pastorum studio, sed mercenariorum

uice deseruiunt, quia ueniente lupo fugiunt,

dum se sub silentio abscondunt. Hinc namque

eos per prophetam Dominus increpat, dicens:

Canes muti non ualentes latrare. Hinc rursum

queritur, dicens: Non ascenditis ex aduerso,

nec opposuitis murum pro domo Israel,

The upper half of both sides is moderately legible, but the
lower half, as can be seen from the transcription above, is almost entirely destroyed.

Bodleian, Bodley 708 (2609)

s. xi in., parchment, 316 x 228mm., v + 114ff., "modified Carolingian minuscules", written in England, "with illuminated capitals (one on f.1 elaborate in black), &c.: discoloured by damp at each end, and with ff.iii, iv, 1 injured by it and repaired." Presented by Exeter Cathedral in 1602.

Contents:
List of 67 chapters.

Incipit Liber Pastoralis Curae editus a sancto Gregorio papa urbis Romae

At end Explicit Liber Pastoralis

"f.111 is bound after f.112. In the margin of f.110 are some contemporary English neums. The hand changes at the bottom of f.59r..."

f.113:

Hunc librum dat Leofricus episcopus ecclesie sancti petri apostoli in exonia ad sedem suam episcopalem pro remedio anime sue ad utilitatem successorum suorum. Siquid autem illum inde abstulerit. perpetue maledictioni subiaceat. Fiat.
with an Old English inscription to the same effect.

(Bodleian Catalogue)

Gneuss gives Christ Church, Canterbury, or Exeter as the origin [4]. Ker has no reference to Canterbury with regard to provenance, but follows the inscription cited above to conclude Exeter as the provenance [3]: he guesses that Leofric's bequests would be quickly deemed unfashionable after the Conquest [9]. The Dean and Chapter of Exeter Cathedral presented many volumes, including probably nine volumes of Leofric's library, to the Bodleian in 1602. This MS, which Ker dates as s.xi, and Gneuss dates as s.x ex., was probably new when Leofric donated it, and its history since then appears uneventfully to have followed that of many other Exeter books.

Maunde Thompson takes this codex as an example when describing the degree of amalgamation of insular and continental hands [10]. It is in a clear and even Caroline minuscule, well-spaced, written apparently between two lines. Capitals within the text are filled in with colour, and initial letters of chapters are tall and self-coloured, sometimes with plain flourishes at the ends of strokes. The first line of each chapter is in rustic capitals of the same colour as the ink of the text. Abbreviation and the following punctuation marks, ḷ, ⸞, ⸣ and ⸢, are clear and confident. The following abbreviations are used in our passage: q; q, qd for que, qui, quod, e for ae, ï for ius,
At for sunt, Ṣ for nt (several occurrences but only at line ends), ṗ, Ḗ, ḍ for prae, per, pro, ḳ for -rum, uṟa, nṝa, nṝorū for uęstra, nostra, nostrorum, scdm for secundum, ḳ for tībi, ḏ for -bus, ŵ for uero, ḳ for -tur. The ct and st ligatures appear, and & for et. Accents are used occasionally, and hyphens sometimes mark syllabification. The membrane is pale with only the occasional flaw, and the codex appears to be in a remarkable state of preservation.

H Bodleian, Bodley 783 (2610)

c.1100, parchment, 266 x 178mm., ii + 138ff., written in France (?), "with two miniatures, two illuminated and many coloured capitals: injured by damp, especially at beginning and end...This appears to be a MS presented by William Harwood or Hayward, prebend of Winchester, in 1611."

Contents:
List of chapters
Preface

Incipit liber primus pastoralis cure editus a beato Gregorio papa Romano ad Iohannem Rauennatem episcopum

The second book follows at f.44...At f.3 is a painting of Christ seated with a banner in his left hand, oval with a rectangular frame: at f.4v is St.Gregory writing his book. Ff.1-8, 124-136 are covered with a semi-transparent substance. On f.137v is a Latin form of supplication from
the Prior and convent of St. Nicholas of Exeter (?) to the Bishop John, that he should admit John Toyler, an acolyte, to the order of subdeacon (late 13th. cent?)

(Bodleian Catalogue)

Ker cites evidence from marginalia and script to give a provenance of Exeter, but does not mention how it arrived at Winchester [3]. Perhaps William Harwood or Hayward was originally a cleric connected with Exeter and brought the codex with him. Ker lists it with others which, written just after the Conquest in Norman script, are not clearly English or Norman [11]. Because it contains so little of the text of Cura Pastoralis, I have been unable to compare it with the other MSS.

J Oxford, St. John's College 28

s.x, large quarto, ff. 81, good Anglo-Saxon hand.

Contents:

a. Tabula titulorum. f. 5

b. Notitia de S. Gregorio, et occasione scribendi librum supradictum. f. 6b

... liber Pastoralis curae in partes quatuor distinctus, ad initium glossulis interlinearibus instructus.

Incip. Gregorius urbis Romae episcopus hunc librum
Pastoralis curae scripsit pro excusatione episcoporum.

Praemittitur, manu aliquantum recentiori, Martyrium SS. Petri et Pauli, auctore Lino, episcope Romano...

In f.2 est effigies B.Petri bene delineata.

In calce, manu altera,

Sed meritis Pauli capiamus dona salutis

Hec dampno verbum sed scriptum metrice versum.

In pag.i, "Johannes White de Suthwyke in com. Suth. armiger dedit hunc librum Thome White de London. militi ad usum collegii per ipsum de novo erecto in Oxon. anno 1553.

(Coxe, Part II)

The provenance of this MS is unknown, although it seems from this inscription to have been in private ownership in 1553, and was perhaps rescued as a treasure from the Dissolution. Ker agrees with Coxe's dating [12], but Gneuss is a little more specific, dating it as x². Gneuss also suggests that its origin is St. Augustine's Priory, Canterbury, but does not append evidence for this hypothesis. The script is remarkably neat and clear, as well as being quite close to the modern printed edition, and clearly copied by a first-class scribe [13]. Words are separated correctly and the very few words split between two lines are indicated with a hyphen. The et ligature appears
frequently. A few accents appear, and like both the punctuation and abbreviation signs they are drawn with fine lines that on a membrane any darker or less well prepared and preserved would have vanished completely. These lines are straight and made with rapid sharp movements of the edge of the pen. Abbreviations used, but not consistently, include æ for ae, ët for sunt, ñ for non, ø, p, ç, ç, for prae, per, pri, pro, pp for propter, tam for tamen, ëë for esse, ãd for quod, Ù for qui, ù for qua, Ù for ter, ç or ç for -tur, ù for uero, bÈ for -bunt once, ßdum for secundum once, ç for con, and the usual nomina sacra. Punctuation, using the symbols ‘, †, ‡, ‡, is neat and consistent. At one point the membrane is so fine that ink showing through from a line of capitals on the recto of a folio renders the writing on the verso almost entirely illegible. Capitals, even when large at the head of chapters, are very plain and do not appear even to have been filled in. At the end of cap.L, however, there is one small decoration in the form of a flourishing line to indicate that the word it surrounds belongs on the line above that on which it is written.

S Salisbury Cathedral 157
S.xi, vellum, 213 x 166mm., ff.174.

Contents:
1. Enchiridion S.Augustini f.1-4
Enchiridion S. Augustini f. 171-
2. Liber Pastoralis S. Gregorii f. 5
3. Service of S. Mary Magdalen with pneums f. 90
4. Liber S. Augustini ad Laurentium qui liber enchiridion nominatur de fide et spe et caritate.
   Table of chapters f. 92
5. S. Augustini dialogus questionum lxx f. 130
6. S. Augustinus ad probam, de orando Deo f. 143b
7. S. Gregorius de iura mentis episcoporum, f. 151b
8. Service for the consecration of a Church: with pneums, f. 152
9. S. Isidorus. Allegoria S. Scriptura, f. 154
10. Liber Isidori de ortu et obitu SS. Patrum, f. 164
   (Salisbury catalogue)

As a Salisbury MS, this is mentioned in Ker's papers [14]. Unusually for manuscripts which spent the Middle Ages and more recent years in Salisbury, 157 appears to have been written in Normandy in the early thirteenth century, although some of the hands are English and perhaps s. xi med., while others are of s. xi ex. Ker points out that in the earlier part there are many Insular abbreviations which might be Irish.

The script is mostly a clear Insular minuscule on good and apparently fine membrane, although it seems to deteriorate in places. Our passage is all in one hand, but others appear, more ponderous and heavy than this and having
a continental air. Abbreviations even in our passage are not at all consistent: both \( \textquoteright \) and \( \div \) are used for \textit{est}, and both \textit{enim} and \( \vdash \) are used for \textit{enim}. Other abbreviations include \( .\check{e} . \) for \textit{esse}, \( \check{p} , \check{p} , \check{p} , \check{p} \) for \textit{praee}, \textit{per}, \textit{pra}, \textit{pro}, \textit{post}, \( \check{q} , \check{q} ; , \check{q} , \check{q} , \check{q} \) for \textit{qui}, \textit{que}, \textit{quo}, \textit{qua}, \textit{quam}, \textit{quod}, \( \gamma \) once for \textit{quod}, \( \check{b} ; \) or \( \check{b} \check{y} \) for \textit{bus}, \textit{n} for \textit{non}, \( \check{u} \) for \textit{uero}, \( \check{c} \) for \textit{cum}, \( \check{g} \) for \textit{igitur}, \( \check{f} \) for \textit{ergo}, \( \check{d} \check{f} \) for \textit{dicitur}, \( \check{t} \) for \textit{ter}, \( \check{c} \) for \textit{tur}, \( \check{z} \) for \textit{rum}, \( \check{t} \check{c} \) for \textit{tunc}, \( \check{s} \check{t} \) for \textit{sunt}, \textit{nFa}, \textit{nray} for \textit{nostra}, \textit{nostrorum}, \textit{uob} for \textit{uobis}, \textit{scdm} for \textit{secundum}, \( \check{p} \) for \textit{ae} and the usual nomina sacra. \& is used. There are some accents.

W Worcester Cathedral, Add.3

Notes from Turner's Early Worcester Manuscripts:

"3 pairs of conjugate leaves, one leaf of each pair perfect and one of each damaged. A complete ternion or (more likely) the three inside leaves of a quaternion. Two leaves are particularly bad...Rather less than 4 columns of the Benedictine ed., II, 79B-83A. [Bk.iii of Cura Pastoralis, cap.27.] Semi-uncial, "insular", s always uncial (except to save space at the end of a line), n and r are sometimes uncial, sometimes minuscule. The script is in a single column always of 22 lines...It may well have been written at Worcester."

If we examine the plates in this book, we can judge the full leaves to measure c.235 x 180mm. If we take
this to be the fragment of a quaternion, f.1 is absent; f.2 has the outer half missing, but the script is fairly clear; f.3 has also the outer half missing, and the recto is very poor, although the verso is slightly clearer; f.4 is whole with a very little damage, possibly worm-eaten: both sides are clear, with the verso the darker but better of the two; f.5 is again missing its outer half, with more worm damage at the cut edge. The verso is paler, but both sides are quite clear. F.6 has a little damage and is rather faint on the recto: the verso is extremely poor and Turner fully admits that his transcription is almost entirely conjectural; f.7 is damaged but extremely clear on both sides; f.8 is absent.

Punctuation is rare: there are occasional points, occasional "capitals". Some accents used in the insular way on monosyllables. There are few abbreviations: nomina sacra, b:, q:, b:, q:. Final m is rare and at the end of a line only. per is always p; though p has been used as well but probably erased, apparently contemporarily. Turner suggests that this is the result of a continental exemplar or a scribe used to continental writing. p for pro only once, as n for non and h for autem, although this last might also have been in the lost part of f.1v. Insular dE for dicitur. The orthography is quite good, most commonly im- for in-, di- for de, and omission of i before another vowel. There is also some uncertainty about double consonants. Syllabification is very free. There are early corrections in
minuscule to both orthography and text, small blunders set right.

Turner goes on to collate six texts, including our J, with the fragment, and cites 5 examples of variations in the Worcester text. Of these, he decides that two are the right text, two probably or possibly right, and only one definitely wrong: in none of these cases does the text agree with the St. John's MS reading.

CLA II, 264:
Anglo-Saxon majuscule, s.viii.
...Insular spellings frequent: commisa, possitus.
Membrane well prepared, white, and rather fine. Script is a well-developed Anglo-Saxon majuscule, without strict alignment of letters...Corrections in Anglo-Saxon minuscule s.viii. Written in England. Comes from the binding of Worcester MS.F.163, a finely illuminated thirteenth-century Psalter.

This is apparently the oldest manuscript on our list. Gneuss agrees with Turner's guess that this manuscript might be a product of Worcester Cathedral scriptorium [4], but Ker has no reference to its whereabouts in the Middle Ages. Its present state and lack of shelfmark, were they the same in the 1600's, might well have led it to be overlooked by any inspector of libraries such as Patrick Young on his visit to Worcester. Sadly the contents of this fragment do not overlap at all with our other fragments.
Written between two lines, this MS is in Insular semiuncial of the typical large and quite clear type, with very few abbreviations and a few accents. The horizontal lines are extremely fine, and the serifs thick and heavy. The membrane is very badly damaged even in places where the whole page remains.

Kassell, Landesbibliothek, Theol. fol. 32

CLA VIII, 1138:

Fol. 72, 275 x 210 mm <220-230 x 165-170 mm> in 31-32 long lines. Punctuation: the medial point marks pauses; the group :... at ends of sections. Run-overs carried to the line above are set off by an oblique curve. Abbreviations include the Insular symbols ™, †, ‡ = autem, enim, and est; q:, q, tur; and the common forms b:, q: = bus, que; ª = esse, θ, φ = per, pro; q = qui; quô = quoniam; υ = tamen; † = uel. Spelling is Insular. Initials neatly and skilfully drawn, showing interlace patterns, beasts, and scrollwork in the finials, and recall the Corpus Glossary and the Book of Nunnaminster (CLA II, 122, 199); capitals at the beginning of sentences have a daub of red, some are surrounded by red dots. Chrismon or cross in upper left hand corner of ff. 2, 10 v, 11, etc. Vellum thick and dark; some leaves greasy, some imperfect. Ink black. Script a rather clumsy
Anglo-Saxon majuscule: uncial \( \mathcal{A} \) occurs with bow pointed and extending below the line; \( \text{d} \) is regularly minuscule, \( \text{n} \) mostly, \( \text{R} \) with shaft far beyond the line is regularly majuscule, \( \text{S} \) mostly; both branches of \( \text{y} \) curve to the right. Corrections in Anglo-Saxon minuscule s.viii-ix and in Caroline minuscule of the Fulda type s.ix. Some Old High German glosses scratched in with a stylus. Written apparently in a South England centre, perhaps in the same scriptorium as the Corpus Glossary. It was at Fulda by the ninth century. Came to Kassel in or after 1632.

Fulda was an Insular foundation on the Continent, but Bischoff reminds us that many manuscripts from various regions of England went to Fulda, so it is no evidence of origin [15].

This script is a small and untidy mixture of Anglo-Saxon majuscule and semiuncial, with most letters taking the majuscule form and \( \text{d} \) being semiuncial, with \( \text{e} \) almost minuscule [16]. The lines of writing are straight but the letters are of irregular size, the membrane rough and the ink blotchy, making the writing difficult to read. Sometimes whole words are surrounded by small dots in red ink. The \( \text{et} \) ligature is used frequently. Spelling is not always good, including \text{coniugi} consistently for \text{coniugii}, \text{deuiti} for \text{debiti}, and \text{aetiam}. Most of these have been corrected, apparently contemporarily but after the MS was
complete, as the corrector sometimes has trouble in fitting the extra letters into the tight spaces between the words.

\[ \text{P Paris, Bib.Nat.lat.9561} \]

\[ \text{CLA V, 590:} \]

Anglo-Saxon Uncial, s.viii.

Foll. 81; 285 x 220mm. <245 x ca.200mm.> in 29-39 long lines...Prickings on both margins guided the ruling—an Insular feature...chapter headings in red uncial; sentences begin with a larger letter, surrounded by red dots, and somewhat larger letters open sections. Punctuation: the medial point or comma marks final pauses; pairs of superimposed commas at the end of sections. Run-overs of one letter, marked by an oblique stroke, are frequent at line ends. Abbreviations include B; = bus; q; (or, erroneously, q;') = que; the Insular symbols h = autem; c = con; d, d = dicit, dixit; e = eiusmod; + (with cross-bar sometimes double or the whole symbol lying on its side) = enim; † = est; p = prae and occasionally per; q, q = quae, quia, quod; and the ordinary forms e = est; NR = noster, nostrae; NRT, NI, NW = nostre, -i, -ium; P, F, P, PP = per, prae, pro, profeta; q, q = quod, quoniam; ST = sunt; and normal forms of nomina sacra: ISRL = israel. Omitted M, even in mid-word, marked by a horizontal flourish over the right half of the vowel. Spelling
often faulty: fugerae for fugere, premiso. Initials, rather poorly executed, show typical Insular form; they are black, occasionally washed over with red or yellow ochre, and decorated with red dots. Vellum prepared in the Insular manner. Ink mostly black. Script is a not very expert and late type of uncial showing Continental and Anglo-Saxon influences... At the end of each treatise occurs a pious insertion by the scribe concerning his work and his hope of recompense in Heaven; two words of the note on f.14v are in Anglo-Saxon minuscule. Anglo-Saxon glosses s.x, written with a stylus interlinearly, are seen on ff.33v-42v; the interlinear transcription on the upper half of f.13v is by a twelfth century hand.

Written either in England or by an English scribe on the Continent, perhaps at St.Bertin, where the manuscript was found in the fourteenth century: the entry de libraria sancti Bertini s.xiv is found on the lower margin of f.1. First catalogued at the Bibliothèque Nationale as Suppl.Lat.254.2.

The script of this MS is a clear, neat, but slightly stilted Insular uncial. The downstrokes in n, g and x are extremely fine and occasionally end in a delicate fork. The supralinear contraction stroke is also fine and horizontal. A faint medial point is almost the only punctuation in this passage, except for at the end of the
chapter. At one line end the final t is balanced on the upright of the preceding n to save space. Some initials are surrounded by dots: these seem mainly to occur where the sentence they begin contains a Biblical quotation. Word division is occasionally faulty: at one point the scribe has possit iusum for possiti usum.

Comments:

Turner, in Early Worcester MSS, mentions a hypothetical English textual grouping (which he terms a "school"), a local corruption missing in f.5r of the Worcester fragment where it, along with Münich lat.18550 and Verona, Chapter Library XLII (40), has admissa, Milan Ambros.Cl38inf. has ammissa but the two Oxford MSS, St.John's 28 and Bodleian Laud misc. 263 have commissa. The Laud MS is s.ix from Würzburg, another Insular Continental foundation, and Turner suggests that it might, in fact, be English, too.

Of the contents of full texts which we have available, C, G, and B lack the explanatory preface to the work. H and J seem each to have a preface, but whether or not they are identical cannot yet be determined. Migne's edition begins with the letter to John of Ravenna as preface.

None of the ten manuscripts shares any text apart from that of the Cura Pastoralis, so that we cannot conclude
Migne cites the manuscripts he uses for his edition as follows:

1. Trecensis antiquissimus, uncialibus majusculisque litteris, non longe post sancti Gregorii obitum, ut conjicere licet, exaratus.
2. Codex Corbiensis
3. Carnotensis Ecclesiae, ejusdem fere antiquitatis.
4. Sancti Petri Carnotensis, uix inferioris aetatis.
5. Alter ejusdem monasterii D circiter annorum.
6. Sancti Petri Beluacensis...medio seculo X...
7. Ecclesiae Laudunensis.
8,9,10. Sancti Petri Gemeticensis quorum antiquior DCC annorum aetatem praefert.
11,12,13. Sancti Audoeni Rothomag. Primus a DC annorum antiquitate parum abest.
15. Monasterii Beatae Mariae de Lyra.
20. Uigesimo loco recensendi Anglicani octo, unus

21. ...duos Sangermanenses Codices...

It seems unlikely that anything was ever copied from G, to judge from Ker's opinion of it. However, it does more correctly render the last line as *meriti MANuS LEUET*, while C has *meriti manus tenet*, a not unlikely error if the exemplar from which the scribe was working was written in a Majuscule hand. The PL edition of the last line has *meriti manus me leuet*. The problems for the scribe of G with the unfamiliar Welsh or Irish abbreviations would have had a very harmful effect on the good transmission of the text, and the fact that they are easily noticed seems to indicate that the scribe was not particularly familiar with the text itself, otherwise he might have attempted to correct his errors himself. S might also have a connexion with Ireland or Irish scribes, and if so, G and S might be linked by a Celtic exemplar.

In the following pages, I have collated all the MSS from microfilm, with the exceptions of O, which I
transcribed in person, and of W, which I transcribed from the excellent plates in Turner's list of Worcester MSS.
munditia continentium. Uel certe quasi in monte
munditia continentium; uel certe quasi / in monte
munditia c(ont)inenti𝑢(m)· / Uel certe quasi in monte
munditia / continentium· uel certe quasi in monte
munditia continentium / tium uel certe quasi in monte
munditia continentium. uel ces'r'te quasi in / monte
munditia continentium uel certe qua / si in monte

sunt qui etiam carnali copulae inhaerent,
sunt qui etia(m) carn-[hole] ali copulae / inherent.
sunt Qui etia(m) carnali copulae in / herent
sunt- qui etia(m) carnali copulae inherent
sunt- qui etiam carnali copulae inherent*

sed tamen extra suscipientae proliis
sed tamen extra [hole] suscipientae / proliis
sed tamen extra suscipientae proliis
sed tamen extra suscipientae proliis

admitionem debitam, nulla carnis uluptate
ammixtione(m) debita(m) nulla carnis uluptate
ammixtione(m) debita(m) / nulla carnis uoluptate
ammixtione(m) / debita(m)· / nulla carnis uluptate
amxmixtion(m) / debita(m). nulla carnis uluptate
amxmixtion(m) / debita(m). nulla carnis uluptate

soluuntur. In monte quippe stare est,}
soluuntur; [di]
soluunt(ur). In monte quippe stare (est) /
soluuntur, In monte / quippe stare quid est,
soluuntur, In monte quippe stare quid est,
soluuntur. In monte quippe stare est /
soluuntur. In monte quippe stare quid (est)
Ch. XXVII: This passage instructs the clergyman how to go about advising married and unmarried people in ways appropriate to their state.

1 P tinentium: It seems that the scribe has failed to notice an omission mark in his exemplar. It cannot be that he has failed to recognize the unfamiliar insular ḏ, for he uses it himself several times earlier and later in the text.

2 K, P aetiam: Scribes of this period saw very little difference between the sounds e and ae, so that this is not strictly a spelling error. The scribe of P in particular seems to use the ae diphthong very frequently. K copule: See above. C, G, B, J, S, K, P inherent: See above. W inerent: The omission of an aspirate could signify one of two things: the first is that this was copied from a continental exemplar in which aspiration was confused, and the second is that it was copied from an Irish exemplar in which the aspiration sign ū was used, and the scribe of W failed to recognize or notice it. A later hand has added an h above the word.

3 P suscipiendi: Many insular scribes of this period had difficulty in distinguishing Latin vowel sounds. If P had copied this MS by dictation, this mistake would have occurred all the more easily. P
prolix: This makes no sense in the context and might have been an attempt to fill a space in the exemplar. The spelling of this scribe is not good on the whole, much worse than would seem to be reasonable if he were copying from any moderately accurate exemplar (although he may have been influenced by the spelling of ammixture in 1.4), but if he were writing the word prolis to dictation, he might well have written it this way.

C, G, B, J, S, W, K ammixture, P ammixtureaem: Ammixture is a viable alternative spelling for admixture. P's version is incorrect. W uoluptae: This slip has been corrected by a later hand. P uoluntate: This may have been an attempt to copy something illegible in the exemplar, but carnis uoluptas is a very common phrase in this period of Latin writing, and uoluntate makes little sense here.

B, J, S, K, P quid: This makes the clause into a question, to which the reply seems to be the following sentence, also beginning In monte stare (11.6-7). MS J in particular has the punctuation mark at the end of the next clause after quaerere (1.6), which is usually a form of question mark. See 1.17 for C's version.
PL nisi fructum propaginis in carne non quaerere. In

C fructum p(ro)paginis in carne non querere. In

G nisi fructu(m) propaginis / in carne non qu(a)erere; In

B nisi fructu(m) p(ro)paginis in carne non querere. In

J nisi fructum p(ro)paginis in carne / non qu(a)erere. In

S nisi fructum propaginis in carne non quaerere / re in

W nisi fructum propaginis in carne non quaerere. In

K nisi fructum propaginis in carne non quaerere. In

P nisi fructum propaginis in carne non quaerere. In

monte stare, est carnii carnaliter non

monte quippe stare est. / carnii carnalit(er) non

monte // stare est. / carnii carnaliter non

monte stare est. / carnii carnaliter non

monte stare est. / carnii carnalit(er) non

monte stare est. / carnii carnaliter / non

monte stare est carnii carnaliter / non

monte stare (est) / carnii carnaliter // non

mont(a)e stare e(st) / carnii car / naliter non

adhaerere. Sed quia multi sunt qui scelera

adherere; Sed quia / multi sunt qui scelera

adherere; Sed quia / multi sunt qui scelera

adherere; Sed quia / multi sunt qui scelera

adherere; Sed quia / multi sunt qui scelera

adherere; Sed quia / multi sunt qui scelera

adherere; Sed quia / multi sunt qui scelera

adherere; Sed quia / multi sunt qui scelera

adherere; Sed quia / multi sunt qui scelera

adherere; Sed quia / multi sunt qui scelera

adherere; Sed quia / multi sunt qui scelera

adherer(a)e. Sed quia multi sunt qui sc(a)elera

adherer(a)e. Sed quia multi sunt qui sc(a)elera

adherer(a)e. Sed quia multi sunt qui sc(a)elera

adherer(a)e. Sed quia multi sunt qui sc(a)elera

adherer(a)e. Sed quia multi sunt qui sc(a)elera

adherer(a)e. Sed quia multi sunt qui sc(a)elera

adherer(a)e. Sed quia multi sunt qui sc(a)elera

adherer(a)e. Sed quia multi sunt qui sc(a)elera

quidem carnis deserrunt, nec tamen in

quidem carnis deserunt, / nec tam(en) in

quidem carnis deserrunt, / nec tam(en) in

quidem carnis deserrunt, / nec tam(en) in

quidem carnis deserrunt, / nec tam(en) in

quidem carnis deserrunt, / nec tam(en) in

quidem carnis deserrunt, Nec / tamen in

quidem / carnis deserrunt nec tamen in

coniugio positi usus solummodo debiti iura

coniugio positi usus solummodo / debiti iura

coniugio positi usus solummodo / debiti iura /
C om. in Monte quippe stare est nisi fructum propaginis in carne non quaerere: see 1.17. G om. nisi: Small words are easily lost in transmission, and if this had been abbreviated to ħ it would have been particularly vulnerable. The scribe is unlikely to have missed it as the sentence is grammatically correct, but it now means the opposite of what it should: "Indeed to stand on the mountain is not to seek the fruits of propagation in the flesh.", although the scribe may have taken this to mean that the pleasures of the flesh must not be sought for any reason. W nisi: This word has been corrected later to non, which gives a meaning much like that in G above. W quaere: This example of haplography may be the result of the scribe omitting an abbreviation mark to represent the second re. The later correcting hand has added re above the word.

C carnali: This is an easy mistake to make as the scribe was probably influenced by the word carnaliter following.

G, W, K, P deserant (C deser'v'ant): This is the correct present subjunctive of this verb, and in the case of W, K and P it is correctly followed in 1.11 by the subjunctive conseruent. The corrector of C may have changed deseruant to fit with conseruant. Used here, the subjunctive would be
generic. W, P possiti: Insular scribes of the period in which this MS was produced sometimes had difficulty in distinguishing between the use of double and single consonants. The double consonant probably appeared in P's exemplar, as his word spacing seems to indicate that he thought the phrase read possit iusum, perhaps confusing it with the word iussum. P usum: This has to be genitive as there is no verb left of which it can be the object. K deuiti: b and u sounded very similar, particularly to the continental mediaeval scribe, and were frequently confused. K's reading makes no sense.
PL conserverunt, exiit quidem Loth Sodomam, sed
C conserverant; exiit quidem loth sodoma(m). sed
G c(on)servant; Exiit quidem(m) / loth sodoma(m). sed
B conserverant; exiit quidem loth sodoma(m). sed
J conserverant; exiit quidem loth sodoma(m). sed
S conserverant; exiit quidem loth sodoma(m). sed
W con / servent exiit quidem loth sodomam sed
K conserverunt. Exiit quide(m) / loth. sodoma(m) sed
P conserverent exiit quide(m) loth sodomam Sed

PL tamen mox ad montana non peruenit, quia iam
C tamen mox ad montana n(on) p(er)uenit- quia iam
G tam(en) mox ad montana non p(er)uenit- quia iam
B tam(en) / mox ad montana non p(er)uenit quia iam
J tam(en) mox ad montana- / n(on) p(er)uenit- quia iam
S tam( en) mox ad montana n(on) p( er)uenit- quia ia(m)
W mox / ad montana non p(er)uenit quia iam
K tamen mox ad montana non p(er)uenit. Q(uia) ia(m)
P tamen mox ad montana non p(er)uenit quia ia(m)

PL damnabilis uita relinquitur, sed adhuc
C damnabilis uita relinquitur. / sed adhuc
Gdamnabilis uita relinquitur(ur). Sed adhuc
B da(m)pna / bilis uita relinquitur. sed adhuc
J damnabilis uita relinquitur. sed adhuc /
S da(m)pna / bilis uita relinquitur(ur). sed adhuc
W damnabi / lis. uita relinquitur sed adhuc
K damnabilis uita relin / quitur sed adhuc
P damnabilis uita relinquitur sed adhuc

PL celsitudo coniugalis continentiae subtiliter
C celsitudo coniugalis continenti(a)e. / subtilit(er)
G celsitudo / c(on)iugalis c(on)tinentiae subtilit(er)
B celsitudo con / iugalis continentiae subtiliter
J celsitudo coniugalis continenti(a)e subtiliter
S celsitudo coniugalis / continenti(a)e subtilit(er)
W celsitudo coniugalis continenti(a)e subti / liter-
P cessitudo (con)iugalis (con)tintenti(a)e subtiliter

PL non tenetur. Est uero in medio Segor ciuitas,
C non tenetur; Est uero in medio segor / ciuitas
G non tenet(ur). Est uero in medio / segor ciuitas
B non tenet( ur). Est uero in medio / segor ciuitas
J non tenetur; Est uero in medium segor ciuitas
S n(on) tenet(ur); Est u(ero) in medium segor ciuitas
W non tene / tur êst uero in medium segor ciuitas
K non tenetur. Est uero in medio segor ciuitas
P n(on) / tinetur Segor uero ciuitas e(st) in mediu(m)
W, K, P consuerent: See 1.9 above. P exhit: It seems strange that a scribe looking at two i's could transcribe them as hi, even though mediaeval scribes often did have difficulty with aspiration. It is more likely that if the MS was being dictated, the scribe of P could mistake the sound of the double-i for an improperly pronounced aspirate.

W om. tamen: *

P cessitudo: A long s in the exemplar could easily be mistaken for an l by someone unfamiliar with the word.

P tinetur: Again the confusion of vowel sounds indicates either a poor exemplar or bad spelling on the part of P copying to dictation. See 1.3 above. P Segor uero ciuitas est in medium: This word order seems to be unique to this MS, and it changes the stress of the sentence, removing the emphasis from Segor and putting it on medium. B, J, S, W, P medium: This mistake could have arisen from the misinterpretation of o as û. It is interesting that it appears in both early and late MSS.
quae fugientem saluet infirmum, quia
quae fugiente(m) saluet infirmum. quia
quae fugiente(m) saluet / infirmum. quia
quae fugientem saluet infir / mum. q(ui)a
quae fugientem saluet imfirmum quia
qu(a)e fugiente(m) saluet / infirmum(m). Q(ui)a
quae fugientem saluet infirmum, quia

[non] In monte quippe stare quid e(st). nisi

p(ro)pa / ginis 'fructu(m)' in carne n(on). querere~//

uidelicet cum sibi per incontinentiam
uidelicet cum sibi p(er) incontinentia(m)
uidelicet cum sibi p(er) inc(on)tinentia(m)
uidelicet cu(m) sibi p(er) incontinentia(m) /
uidelicet cu(m) sibi p(er) incontinentia(m)
uidelicet cu(m) sibi p(er) incontinentia(m)
uidelicet cu(m) sibi p(er) incontinentia(m)
uidelicet cu(m) sibi p(er) incontinentia(m)
uidelicet cu(m) sibi per in(con)tinentiam

miscentur coniuges, et lapsus scelerum
miscentur con / iuges. & lapsus sceleru(m)
miscent(ur) c(on)iuges. & lapsus sceleru(m)
miscentur coniuges. et lapsus sceleru(m)
miscentur con / iuges. et lapsus scelerum
miscent(ur) coniuges. & laps(us) sceleru(m)
miscentur con / iuges et lapsus. scelerum
miscentur coniuges et lap / sus. sceleru(m)
miscentur / coniuges et lapsus sceleru(m)
Having omitted this sentence from its correct place at 11.5-6, the scribe of C inserts it at the bottom of the page, signalling its omission and insertion by the use of at its proper place and where it is actually written. The scribe has not been entirely accurate: the order of the words he has in fact left out is in monte quippe stare est nisi fructum propaginis in carne non quaerere; he has, instead, included the word in his original text, and has confused the two similar clauses, in monte quippe stare quid est and in monte stare est, so that. C quid: see 1.5 above. Clearly this scribe is following the same tradition.
PL fugiunt, et tamen uenia / saluantur. Quasi
C fugiunt· et tam(en) uenia / saluant(ur); quasi
G fugi / unt· & tam(en) uenia saluant(ur)· Quasi
B fugiunt· et / tamen uenia saluantur· quasi
J fugiunt· et tamen uenia saluant(ur); / quasi
S fu· giunt· et tam(en) uenia saluant(ur)· quasi
W fugiunt et tamen / uenia saluantur quasi
K fugiunt et tamen uenia saluantur· Quasi
P fugiunt et tamen uenia saluantur / quasi

PL paruam quippe ciuitatem inueniunt in qua
C parua(m) quippe ciuitate(m) inueni / unt· in qua
G parua(m) q(ui)ppe ciuitate(m) inue / niunt· in qua
B parua(m) q(ui)ppe ciuita / tem inueniunt· in qua
J paruam quippe ciuitatem inueniunt· in q(u)a
S parua(m) q(ui)ppe ciuitate(m) inueni / unt· in qua
W paruam / quippe ciuitate(m) inueniunt in qua
K paruam / quippe ciuitate(m) inueniunt in qua
P parua(m) quippe ciuitatem inueniunt in qua

PL ab ignibus defendantur, quia coniugalis
C ab ignib(us) defendant(ur); quia coniuga- / lis
G ab ignib(us) defendant(ur); quia coniugalis
B ab ignibus defendantur· / quia coniugalis
J ab ignibus / defendantur· q(ui)a coniugalis
S ab ignib(us) defendant(ur); quia con / iugalis
W ab ignibus def / fendantur quia coniugalis
K ab ignib(us) defendantur· Q(uia) coniugalis /
P ab ignib(us) defen / duntur· Quia (con)iugalis

PL haec uita non quidem in uirtutibus mira est,
C hec uita n(on) quide(m) in uirtutib(us) mira e(st):
G h(a)ec uita / n(on) quide(m) in uirtutib(us) mira (est)·
B h(a)ec uita non quide(m) in uirtutib(us) / mira est·
J haec uita n(on) quidem in uirtutib(us) / mira est·
S h(a)ec uita n(on) quide(m) in uirtutib(us) mira (est)
W haec uita non / quidem in uirtutib(us) mira est
K h(a)ec uita non quide(m) in uirtutib(us) mira (est)
P h(a)ec uita n(on) quide(m) in uirtutib(us) mira e(st)

PL sed tamen a suppliciis secura. Unde idem
C sed tam(en) / a suppliciis secura; Vnde isdem
G sed tam(en) a suppliciis secura· / Unde isde(m)
B sed tamen a suppliciis secura est; Vnde / isdem
J sed tamen a suppliciis secura est· Vnde isdem /
S sed tam(en) / a suppliciis secura est· Vnde isde(m)
W sed tamen a / suppliciis se cura unde isdem
K sed tamen a suplicis secura· / Unde isde(m)
P sed ta / men a supplicis s(a)ecura Unde isdem
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23 **W def/fendantur:** This example of dittography would be easily done and possibly even intentional, as when a word ran over the end of the line, scribes often repeated one or two of the last letters of the first half of the word at the beginning of the second half.

25 **K suplicis, P supplicis:** See 1.10 above. **B, J, S est:** This verb is unnecessary here, but it has possibly been introduced to balance **mira est** in 1.24 above. It seems likely that it is a later corruption, as it only appears in later MSS. **C, G, B, J, S, W, K, P isdem:** The scribes of our MSS presumably confused **idem,** nominative masculine singular of "the same", and **is,** nominative masculine singular demonstrative pronoun. **isdem** is not a recognized form of the nominative masculine plural, but of the dative and ablative plurals (**TLL** 181). It must have been an early error, as all our MSS have it.
Loth ad angelum dicit: Est ciuitas hic iuxta,

et ad quam possum fugere, parua; et saluabor in ea. Nunquid non modica est, et uuiuet anima mea? Iuxta ergo dicitur, et tamen ad salutem tuta perhibetur, quiaconiugalis salutem tuta perhibetur Quia (coniugalis)
C hec, G,B,J,S,W,K,P haec: The scribes or exemplars of all our MSS evidently decided that hic should be an indicative pronoun agreeing with ciuitas rather than a demonstrative adjective. The Vulgate (Genesis xix, 20) also has haec, which could well be the original reading. W's corrector has written an i above the word.

P fugirae: See 1.3 above. C,K et parua saluabor, G parua saluabor, J,S et parua et saluabor, W et saluabor: The version in PL, B and P here also appears in the Vulgate, and seems most likely to be correct, meaning "There is a small citadel hard by, to which I can flee; and I shall be saved in it." The version in C and K would mean "There is a citadel hard by, to which I can flee, and I shall be saved in it as it is small." J and S have connectives in both places and G has connectives in neither. Any of these could have been influenced by another version of the Bible, but on the other hand et is a small word which is easily misplaced in transmission. Ker [18] pointed out that G had been copied by three scribes from a Welsh or Irish exemplar, the abbreviations of which they could not understand. If that exemplar had used some unfamiliar sign for et such as 7, the scribes might have left it out rather than copy something they did not understand. In that...
case G's exemplar could have agreed with any of the other three groups above.

28 W numquit: The confusion of t and d appears quite regularly in mediaeval MSS. The later corrector has written d above the word. W,K,P uiuit: Confusion between i and e, especially in verb endings, was very common at this time.

28-29 C,G,B,J,S,W,K,P in ea anima mea: This change in word order is significant in that all our MSS share it. It is possible that an early scribe was confused by the profusion of minims, or that he thought that two sentences in a row should not end with in ea. In the Vulgate, the phrase in ea does not appear, which perhaps indicates that this phrase is a duplication of mea, particularly as in ea has already appeared above in 1.27-28.

29 C,G,B,J,W,K,P igitur: This probably arose from the misinterpretation of an abbreviation at some early point in this text's transmission in Britain. The fact that it does not appear in S could indicate a continental exemplar or another misinterpretation in which the scribe arrived by accident at the original reading. There is no significant difference in meaning, but as the variation is not mentioned in PL it seems to have been purely Insular and ergo is more likely to be the true reading.
uita nec a mundo longe diuisa est, nec tamen a
gaudio salutis aliena. Sed tunc in hac actione
uitam suam coniuges quasi in parua

custodiunt, quando pro se assiduis
deprecationibus intercedunt. Unde et recte
31 P non longe a mundo diuisa est: It would be easy to mistake nec for the more common word non. This version lays the stress more on mundo than on longe, and so is possibly the correct reading.

31-32 P nec a gaudio tamen: *

32 W in: The scribe may have thought he was balancing in aliena and in actione. He has no mark of punctuation between aliena and sed, so perhaps he takes 11.30-32 to mean "because the life of marriage is not far divided from the world, nor from the joy of salvation, married people, in far-off matters [aliena] and in action, guard this [hanc] life of theirs as in a little citadel." It has later been erased.

32-33 C,G,B,J,S,K actione hac: This word order is only significant in that these MSS all share it. W,P actione hanc: Both these MSS take the pronoun to go with uitam rather than with actione. Either is possible as hanc may be written hac, but hanc gives the wrong meaning.

34 W adsiduis: The later hand has corrected this to assiduis.
per angelum ad eundem Loth dicitur; Ecce

etiam in hoc suscepi preces tuas, ut non

uidelicet cum deprecatio funditur Deo

nequaquam talis coniugii uita damnatur.

J loquutus: The confusion of c and q as hard k sounds is not uncommon at this time. C,G,B,J, S,W,K,P quia: PL's version is a misprint at this point.

C,G,B,J,S,W,K cum deo deprecatio funditur: This change in word order is significant only in that all our MSS share it. It probably arose from the fact that deo and depraecatio start with the same two letters. P cum coram deo depraecatio funditur: This seems to be an example of dittography, where the scribe of P has rendered the same letters in his exemplar twice, once correctly as cum and once incorrectly as coram. It is not a corruption that has found its way into the other MSS.

C,G tali coniugio, B,J,S in tali coniugio, W,K,P talis coniugum: The version in C and G could be translated as "life is in no sense damned by such a marriage", which seems to make sense. Of the others, the version in B,J and S could mean "life in such a marriage is in no sense damned", which could be a reasonable reading but is more likely to be a corruption of the reading in C and G, which makes more sense in the context. The version in W,K and P, three out of our four oldest MSS, seems to mean "such a life of spouses is in no
sense damned", which makes little sense, and may be the result of corruption from the reading in PL, "the life of such a spouse is in no sense damned", a version which seems less fitting than the one in C and G. The double i at the end of coniugii, however, could have been misread as u, thus giving rise to the erroneous reading in W, K and P.
De qua deprecatione Paulus quoque admonet,
dicens: Nolite fraudare inuicem,
nisi forte ex consensu ad tempus, ut uacetis
orationi. At contra admonendi sunt qui ligati
coniugiis non sunt, ut praeceptis

PL
C
G
B
J
S
W
K
P

De qua deprecatione quoque Paulus am- monet
De qua depr(ae)catione quoq(ue) paulus ammone
De qua depr(ae)cati / one quoq(ue) paulus ammone
De qua deprecatione quoq(ue) paulus ammone
De qua depr(a)edication(a)e quo / q(ue) paulus ammone
De qua deprecatione Paulus quoque admonet,
dicens: Nolite fraudare inuice(m)
nisi forte ex consensu ad tempus ut uacetis
orationi; / At contra ammonendi sunt. qui ligati
coniugiis non sunt ut praecptis

C
G
B
J
S
W
K
P

Nolite fraudare inuicem
Nolite fraudare inuice(m).
Nolite fraudare inuice(m).
Nolite fraudare inuice(m).
Nolite fraudare inuice(m)
Nolite fraudare inuice(m)
Nolite fraudare inuice(m)
Nolite fraudare inuice(m)
Nolite fraudare inuice(m)
Nolite fraudare inuice(m)
Nolite fraudare inuice(m)

B
J
S
W
K
P

- fortexconsensusadtempus, ut uacetis
orati; / At contra ammonendi sunt qui ligati
coniugiis non sunt ut praecptis

G
B
J
S
W
K
P

ut uacetis
orati; / At contra ammonendi sunt qui ligati
coniugiis non sunt ut praecptis

"ut praeceptis

"ut praeceptis

"ut praeceptis

"ut praeceptis

"ut praeceptis

"ut praeceptis
Paulus: This change in word order is only
significant in that all our MSS have it.

42 P fraudari: See 1.3 above.

43 W temptus: This makes no sense here, and some
effort has been made to erase the second t.

45 P coniugis, K coniugi'i's: See 1.10 above. This
particular misspelling was common at this time.
coelestibus eo rectius seruiant, quo eos ad

PL coelestibus eo rectius seruiant, quo eos ad
C c(a)e1(a)e(stib(us) eo rectius - / seruiant- quo eos ad
G c(a)elestib(us) eo recti(us) / seruiant- q(uo) eos ad
B c(a)elesti / bus eo rectius seruiant- quo eos ad
J caelestibus eo rectius seruiant- quo eos ad
S c(a)elestib(us) eo / rectius seruiant- q(uo) eos ad
W caelestibus eo rectius seruiant quo eos / ad
K c(a)elestib(us) eo rectius seruiant quo eos ad
P c(a)elestib(us) eo rectius seruiant quo eos ad

PL curas mundi nequaquam iugum copulae carnalis
C curas mundi nequaqua(m) iugu(m) copul(a)e carnalis
G curas mundi nequaqua(m) iugu(m) copul(a)e carnalis
B curas mundi nequaqua(m) iugu(m) copul(a)e carnalis
J curas / mundi neq(ua)quam iugum copul(a)e carnalis
S curas mundi nequaq(uam) iugum / copul(a)e carnalis
W curas mundi nequaquam iugum copulae / carnalis
K curas mundi / nequaqua(m) lugu(m) copul(a)e carnalis
P curas mundi n(a)e / qua(m) iugum copul(a)e carnalis

PL inclinat; ut quos onus licitum coniugii non
C inclinat- ut quos honu(us) / lictu(m) coniugii n(on)
G inclinat- ut quos hon(us) lictu(m) coniugii n(on)
B inclinat. ut / quos onus lictu(m) coniugii non
J inclinat. ut quos / honus lictum coniugii n(on)
S inclinat. ut q(uo)s on(us) lictu(m) c(on)iugii non /
W inclinat ut quos onus lictum con / iugii non
K inclinat Ut quos honus lictu(m) con / iugii non
P inclinat Ut quos onus lictum con / iugi non

PL grauat, nequaquam pondus illicitum terrenae
C grauat- nequaqua(m) pondus / illicitu(m) terren(a)e
G grauat- nequaqua(m) pondus illicitu(m) terren(a)e
B grauat- nequaqua(m) / pondus illicitu(m) terren(a)e
J grauat- nequaquam pondus illicitu(m) / terren(a)e
S grauat- nequaq(uam) pondus illicitu(m) t(er)ren(a)e
W grauat nequaquam pondus // illicitum terrenae
K grauat. Nequaqua(m) pondus illicitu(m) terren(a)e
P grabat nequaquam pondus illicitu(m) t(a)erren(a)e

PL sollicitudinis premat; sed tanto eos
C sollicitudinis pr(a)emat. sed / tanto eos
G sollicitudinis pr(a)emat / Sed tanto eos
B sollicitudinis premat- / / sed tanto eos
J sollicitudinis pr(a)emat. sed tanto eos
S sollicitudin- / nis pr(a)emat. sed tanto eos
W sollic/ sed tanto eos
K sollicitudi / nis. premat. Sed tanto eos
P solli / citudin[[.]is pr(a)emat Sed tanto eos
47 P naequam: This is presumably an example of haplography, as the scribe should have written qua twice. K lugum: This is possibly the result of misreading an i-longa in the exemplar.

48 C,G,J,K honus: Confusion over aspiration was usually more common in continental MSS than in insular ones. Here it has affected both early and late MSS. P coniugi: See 1.45 above.

49 P grabat: See 1.10 above. K pundus: This was almost certainly an acceptable spelling variation at this time, when o and u were frequently interchanged.

50 W lacuna: Here the worst parts of W's damaged sections appear. The outside edge of this folio is missing altogether.
PL paratiores dies ultimus, quanto et expeditiores
C paratiores dies ultimus, quanto / expeditiores
G paratiores dies ultimus, quanto expeditiores /
B paratiores dies ultimus quanto ex- / peditiores
J paratiores / dies ultimus quanto expeditiores
S paratiores dies ultimus quanto / expeditiores
W p'a' r'a'..ti/
K paratiores dies ultimus quanto ex / peditiores
P parationes dies ultimus quan / to expeditiores

PL inueniat; ne quo meliora agere uacantes possunt,
C inueniat. Ne quo meliora agere / uacantes possunt-
G inueniat. ne quo meliora agere uacantes possunt
B inueniat. ne quo meliora agere uacantes possunt-
J inueniat. ne quuo meliora agere uacantes // possunt
S inueniat. Ne quo meliora agere uacantes possunt /
P inueniat ne quo meliora agere uacantes pos / sunt

PL sed tamen negligunt, eo supplicia deteriora
C sed tamen neglegunt. / eo supplicia deteriora
G sed / tam(en) neglegunt. eo supplicia deteriora
B sed tamen neglegunt. eo supplii // -cia deteriora
J sed tam(en) neglegunt. eo supplicia / det(e)riora
S sed tam(en) neglegunt. eo supplicia deteriora
W sed tamen n/ deteriora
K sed tamen neglegunt eo supplicia deteriora /
P sed tamen neglegunt eo supplici[.].]a deteriora

PL mereantur. Audiant quod Apostolus cum quosdam
C mereantur; Audi / ant quod paulus cu(m) quosda(m)
G mereantur. / Audiant quod paulus cu(m) quosda(m)
B mereantur; Audiant qu(uo)d paulus cu(m) / quosda(m)
J mereantur; Audiant qu(uo)d paulus cu(m) quosdam
S me / reant(ur); Audiant qu(uod) paulus cu(m) quosda(m)
W mereantur lus cum quosdam
K mereantur. Audi / ant. quod apostulus cu(m) quosda(m)
P merean / tur Audiant qu(uo)d paulus cum quosdam

PL ad caelatus gratiam instrueret, non
C ad c(a)e-libat(us) gr(atia)am / instruer(et) n(on)
G ad caelibat(us) gratia(m) instru / er& non
B ad c(a)elibatitatis gratia(m) instruer& non
J ad / caelibitatits gratiam instrueret. non
S ad c(a)elibitatit / gr(atia)am instruer& n(on)
W ad c/ strueret non
K ad celibatus gratia(m) instrueret / non
P ad c(a)elibatus gratiam / instrueret nec
P parationes: This probably arose from an attempt to transmit something illegible in the exemplar. It makes no sense. C, G, B, J, S, K, P om. et: This word would easily be lost before expeditiores. It is not strictly necessary in the sentence.

W om. some portion of these lines, but as we cannot tell accurately where the missing section begins and ends, it is difficult to assess the reason for omission. We only know that the portion of folio missing (the outer edge of the leaf is absent) is not large enough to accommodate the missing text.


C, G, B, J, S, P paulus: This is a strange variation and clearly quite an old one, as it appears in G and P. Since Apostolus in such a context usually refers to St. Paul, it seems unnecessary to make such a change, either from Paulus to Apostolus or vice versa. It may have been an interpolated gloss used eventually to replace the original reading.

B, J, S caelibitatis: This makes no sense, but is an interesting point of similarity between these three MSS.
coniugium spreuit, sed curas mundi nascentes

ex coniugio repulit, dicens: Hoc ad utilitatem

uestram dico, non ut laqueum uobis iniiciam;

sed ad id quod honestum est,

et quod facultatem praebat sine impedimento
57 C, G, B, J, S, P reppulit: See 1.10 above. B, J, S haec: This may have been influenced by the gender of utilitatem following. Again, it is interesting that these three MSS have this reading in common.

58 C, G, B, J, S, P iniciam: This is an accepted alternative spelling of this word. W, K? inieciam: The scribe may have been confusing this with the first person singular perfect, inieci. It seems that the e in K has been erased.

59 C, G, B, J, S, K prouoco: The version in PL and P, 11.57-59, means "I tell you this for your own use, not that I should throw you over, but for that which is honourable" with the clauses beginning ad utilitatem and ad id quod in parallel. The version in the MSS with prouoco means "I tell you this for your own good, not that I should ensnare you, but I challenge you to that which is honourable" This makes sense, but it is less likely than the version in PL and P, as the clause in 1.59, sed ad id..., seems to be designed to be in contrast to the clause non ut laqueum..., yet the latter is subjunctive and the former is indicative, so they cannot balance in this way. From the size of the letter-space missing in W, it seems unlikely that it had prouoco.
Domino obseruandi. Ex coniugiis quippe

PL

C d(omi)no obseruandi; Ex con / iugiis quippe
G d(omi)no obseruandi / Ex coniugiis q(u)ippe
B d(omi)no obsecrandi; Ex coniugiis / quippe
J d(omin)o obsecrandi; Ex coniugiis quippe /
S d(omi)no obsecrandi; Ex coniugiis q(u)ippe
W d(omi)no obseruande /
K d(omi)n(u)m obsecrandi; ex coniugi'is quippe //
P d(omi)no obseruandi Ex con[1.]iugiis / quipp(a)e

terrenae sollicitudines prodeunt; et idcirco

PL

C terren(a)e sollicitudines p(ro)deunt / & idcirco
G terren(a)e sollicitudines p(ro)deunt · & ic / circo
B terrenae sollicitudines prodeunt · & idcirco / co
J t(er)ren(a)e sollicitudines p(ro)deunt · & idcirco /
S t(er)ren(a)e / sollicitudines p(ro)deunt · & idcirco
W terrenae sollicitudines /
K terren(a)e sollicitudines p(ro)deunt · et idcirco
P terren(a)e sollicitudinis prodeunt et idcirco

magister gentium auditores suos ad meliora

PL

C magister gentiu(m) auditores suos / ad meliora
G magister gentiu(m) auditores suos ad meliora
B magister gentium auditores suos ad meliora /
J magister gentium / auditores suos ad meliora /
S magister gentiu(m) / auditores suos ad meliora
W magister gentium qudi/
K magister gentiu(m) auditores // suos ad meliora
P magister / gentium auditores suos ad meliora

persuasit, ne sollicitudine terrena ligarentur.

PL

C p(er)suasit · ne sollicitudine t(er)rena / ligarentur;
G per // suasit · ne sollicitudine terrena ligarent(ur);
B persuasit · ne sollicitudine terrena ligarentur ·
J p(er)suasit · né sollicitudine ter / rena ligarentur;
S p(er)suasit · ne sollicitudine / t(er)rena ligarent(ur);
W p(er)suasit Ne sollicitudin /
K p(er)suasit Ne sollicitudine terrena ligarentur.
P p(er)suasit ne sollicitudin(a)e / terrena ligarentur

Quem igitur caelibem curarum

PL

C Quem igit(ur) celibe(m) curaru(m)
G Quem igitur c(a)elibe(m) curaru(m)
B Quem igit(ur) c(a)elibe(m) curaru(m)
J Quem igitur c(a)elibe curarum
S Quem igitur c(a)elibe(m) curaru(m)
W quem igitur celibem cur/
K Quem / igitur celibe(m) curaru(m)
P quem igitur c(a)elibe curarum

- 60 -
61 K dominum: This is required by obsecrandi, but this is the only one of our MSS in which the accusative appears with it. C, G, P obseruandi: This is a corruption of the gerund of obseruio, into the gerund of obseruo. Clearly the former ("serving the Lord") is rather more likely than the latter ("watching the Lord") but the confusion could have arisen because although the verb seruio is quite common, its form obseruio is much less common than obseruo. Obseruandi requires the accusative case, which does not appear in C, G or P. B, J, S, K obsecrandi: A source common to these MSS must have replaced the incorrect obseruandi with this word which makes more sense in the context. W obseruande-: The end of this word is unclear, but there is perhaps an omission stroke over the e, which seems to be the end of the word. It seems unlikely to be right.

62 P sollicitudinis: See 1.10 above, although this may be seen as an acceptable spelling variation.
saecularium impedimentum praepedit,

et coniugio se nequaquam subdidit, et tamen

coniugii onera non euasit. Admonendi sunt

caelibes, ne sine damnationis iudicio misceri

se feminis uacantibus putent. Cum enim Paulus
The scribe originally wrote *nequaqua*, but the later correcting hand filled in an omission stroke over the *a*, and did not erase the *s*. *P subdit*: This is an example of haplography. The rest of the sentence is in the perfect tense, so this has also to be so.

*P coniugi*: See 1.45 above. *J,P honera*: See 1.48 above. *W,K euassit*: See 1.10 above. *P auasit*: This confusion over a vowel sound is the kind of spelling mistake which would most easily arise if the MS was being dictated to the copyist.

*P miscerae*: See 1.3 above.

*W uantibus*: *ca* has been inserted by the later corrector. The initial mistake is presumably just a slip of the pen.
71 fornicationis uitium tot criminibus
C fornicationis uitiu(m) tot criminib(us)
G fornicationis uitiu(m) tot / criminib(us)
B for / nicationis uitium tot criminibus
J fornicationis uitiu(m) tot criminib(us) //
S fornicationis uitiu(m) tot criminib(us)
W cationes uitum tot crıň/
K fornicationis uitiu(m) tot cri.minib(us) /
P fornicationis uitum tot criminib(us)
72 exsecrandis inseruit, cuius sit reatus indicauit,
C exsecran / dis inseruit. cui(us) sit reat(us) indicauit--
G ex's'ecrandis inseruit. cuieus sit reat(us) indicauit
B execrandis inseru- / it. cuieus sit reatus indicauit
J exsecrandis inseruit cuieus sit reatus indicauit
S. execran- / dis inseruit. cuius sit reatus indicauit
W imseruit cuieus siť rea/
K exsecrandis Insertit cuius sit reatus indicauit
P ex / (a)ecrandis inseruit cuieus sit reatus indicauit
73 dicens: Neque fornicatores, neque idolis
C dicens /
G diceNs. / Neq(ue) fornicatores. neg(ue) idolis
B dicens. Neq(ue) fornicato / res. neg(ue) seruientes
J dicens. Neq(ue) / fornicatores neque seruientes
S dicens. Neq(ue) fornicato / / catores. neg(ue) seruientes
W que idolis
K dicens. Neq(ue) forni / catores. neg(ue) seruientes
P dicens neq(ue) for / nicator(a)es neq(ue) idolis
74 seruientes, neq(ue) adulteri, neque molles,
C seruientes. / neq(ue) adulteri. neg(ue) molles.
G seruientes. neg(ue) adulteri. neg(ue) molles.
B idolis. neq(ue) adulteri. neg(ue) molles. /
J idolis. neque adulteri. negue / molles.
S idolis. neq(ue) adult(eri). neg(ue) molles. /
W seruentis / moles
K idolis Neq(ue) adulteri. Neq(ue) molles.
P seruientes neg(ue) adulteri neg(ue) molles /
75 neque masculorum concubitores, neque fures,
C neq(ue) masculor(um) / concubitores. neg(ue) fures
G neq(ue) masculor(um) concubitores. neg(ue) fures.
B neque masculorum(um) concubitores. neg(ue) fures.
J neq(ue) masculor(um) concubitores. neg(ue) fures
S neq(ue) masc(u)lor(um) c(on)cubitores. neg(ue) fures.
W neg(ue) / macuor(um) /
K Neque / masculorum(um) concubitores Neq(ue) fures.
P neq(ue) masculorum concubitores neg(ue) fures
71 W [fornicationes: See 1.62 above. W uitum: This presumably arose from confusing the number of minims in the word.

72 B, J, S execrandis, P exaecrandis (G ex's'eecrandis): The omission of s is this word is an acceptable spelling variation.

73-74 B, J, S, K seruientes idolis: This change in word order is only significant in that these MSS share it.

74 W seruientis: This was an acceptable spelling variation at the time. The later hand has corrected it to seruientes, not, as is usual in this MS, by writing an e above the word, but by adding a loop to the i. W moles: See 1.10 above.
neque auari, neque ebriosi, neque maledici,
neq(ue) auari· neq(ue) / ebriosi· neq(ue) maledici·
neq(ue) auari· / neq(ue) ebriosi· neq(ue) maledici·
neq(ue) auari / neq(ue) ebriosi· neq(ue) maledici·
neq(ue) auari· neq(ue) / ebriosi· neq(ue) maledici·
neq(ue) auari neq(ue) /
Neq(ue) auari. Neq(ue) ebriosi. Neq(ue) / maledici·
neq(ue) auari neq(ue) / (a)ebriosi neq(ue) maledici
neque rapaces regnum Dei possidebunt. Et
neq(ue) rapaces· regnu(m) / d(e)i possidebunt; Et
neq(ue) rapaces· regnu(m) d(e)i possideb(un)t; / Et
neq(ue) rapaces· regnu(m) / d(e)i possidebunt; Et
neq(ue) rapaces regnu(m) d(e)i possideb(un)t; / Et
neq(ue) rapaces· regnu(m) d(e)i possideb(un)t; / Et
neque rapaces regnu(m) /
Neq(ue) rapace's regnu(m) d(e)i possidebunt. Et
neq(ue) rapaces regnum d(e)i non possidebunt / Et
rursum: Fornicatores autem et adulteros iudicabit
rursum· Fornicatores / aute(m) & adulteros iudicabit
rursum; Fornicatores aute(m) & adulteros· iudicabit
rursum· Fornicatores aute(m) et / adulteros iudicabit
rursum· fornicatores autem et adulteros iudicabit
rursu(m); Fornicatores aute(m) & adult(er)os iudicabit
rursum fornicatores /
bit
rursu(m) fornicatores / (autem) et adulteros iudicabit
rursum fornicatores (autem) et adulteros iudicauit
Deus. Admonendi itaque sunt, ut si
d(eu)s; Ammo / nendi itaq(ue) sunt· ut si
d(eu)s; / Ammonendi itaq(ue) sunt· ut si
d(eu)s; Ammonendi itaq(ue) sunt· / ut si
d(eu)s; / Ammonendi itaque s(un)t ut si
d(eu)s; / Ammonendi itaq(ue) s(un)t ut si
d(eu)s; Ammonendi /
d(eu)s Ammonendi sunt itaq(ue) ut si
d(eu)s Ammo / nendi sunt itaq(ue) ut si
tentationum procellas cum difficultate
temptationu(m) p(ro)cellas / cu(m) difficultate
temptationu(m) p(ro)cellas cu(m) diffi / cultate
temptationu(m) p(ro)cellas cu(m) difficultate
temptationu(m) p(ro)cellas cu(m) diffi- / cultate
temptationum procellas /
temptatio / nu(m). p(ro)cellas cu(m) difficultate
temptationum procellas cum difficulta / te
77 P non: The scribe of P seems to have felt that the build-up of *neque...neque...neque*... was not sufficient and that another negative was required to reinforce the meaning.

78 W furnicatores: See 1.49. P iudicauit: The common confusion of b and u has resulted in a loss of sense here, where we are to look not into the past but ahead to the Day of Judgement.

79 K, P sunt itaque: The phrase *Ammonendi sunt* has already appeared several times in this text and it is possible that the scribe of some exemplar common to these two MSS did not realize until he had copied it that this instance included the word *itaque*.

80 C, G, B, J, S, [W], K, P temptationum: This is an acceptable spelling variation.
salutis tolerant,coniugii portum petant.
salutis tolerant: coniugii / portu(m) p(a)etant;
salutis tolerant: c(on)iugii portu(m) petant;
salutis tolerat: coniugii portum petant;
salutis tolerant: c(on)iugii portu(m) petant;
us tolerat coniugii /
salutis to:lerant coniugii' portu(m) petant /
salutis tollerat (con)iugii portu(m) petant

Scriptum namque est: Melius est nubere, quam
scriptu(m) quippe est. Melius / est nubere qua(m)
Scriptu(m) quippe (est) / Melius (est) nubere quam
Scriptu(m) quippe est. // Melius est nubere qua(m)
Scip / tum quippe est / melius e(st) nubere quam
Scriptu(m) / quippe (est) Meli(us) (est) nubere quam
riptum quippe est /
Scriptu(m) quippe (est) melius (est) nubere qua(m)

uri. Sine culpa scilicet ad
uri. Sine culpa scilicet ad /
uri. Sine culpa scilicet ad
uri. Sine culpa scilicet ad /
uri. Sine culpa scilicet ad /
uri. Sine culpa scilicet / ad
uri sine culpa /
K uri. Sine culpa scilicet ad
uri sine culpa scilicet ad

coniugium ueniunt, si tamen necdum meliora
coniugiu(m) ueniunt. si tam(en) necdum meliora /
coniugium / ueniunt. si tam(en) necdum meliora
coniugium ueniunt. sf tamen necdum meliora
coniugium ueniunt: "si tam(en) necdum meliora
coniugium ueniunt. si tam(en) necdu(m) meliora

uouerunt. Nam quisquis bonum maius subire
deuouerunt; Nam quisquis bonu(m) maius sub / ire
deouuer(un)t. Na(m) quisquis / bonu(m) mai(us) subire
deouuerunt; Nam quisquis bonu(m) maius subire
deouuerunt; / Nam q(ui)squis bonu(m) maius subire
deouuer(un)t; Nam / q(ui)sq(ui)s bonu(m) mai(us) subire

couerunt nam quis /

deouerunt Nam quis / quis bonu(m) maius subire
81 P tollerant (K to. lerant): See 1.10 above. It is interesting to see that someone has corrected K's "mistake". P coniugi: See 1.45 above.

82 P scriibtum: The confusion of p and b was not uncommon at this time, but it appears rarely in this MS. C,G,B,J,S,W,K,P quippe: The fact that all our MSS, late and early, have this reading, casts some doubt on the authenticity of the reading in PL. Either reading makes sense in the context. P nuberi: See 1.3 above.

85 C,G,B,J,S,[W],K,P deuouerunt: uoueo means to promise to a god, to pray or to long for, while deuoueo means to vow as an offering or sacrifice, to devote one's life to (OLD). As such, it seems the more appropriate word here. The de at the beginning would be more easily lost than gained in transmission. However, it requires a subjunctive verb to follow it, which does not appear here.
proposuit, bonum minus quod licuit,
C p(ro)posuit bonu(m) minus q(uo)d licuit
G p(ro)posuit bonu(m) min(us) q(uo)d licuit
B pro / posuit- bonu(m) minus q(uo)d licuit
J p(ro)posuit bonu(m) minus q(uo)d licuit
S p(ro)posuit bonu(m) min(us) q(uo)d licuit.
W prop(ossuit bonu(m) /
K p(ro)posuit bonu(m) minus quod licuit (autem).
P potest bonu(m) minus q(uo)d licuit

illicitum fecit. Scriptum quippe est: Nemo
C illicitu(m) / fecit. Scriptu(m) quippe e(st) Nemo
G inlicitu(m) fec(it). / Scriptu(m) q(ui)ppe (est) Nemo
B inlicitu(m) fecit; Scrip / tum quippe est.~Nemo
J inlicitum fecit. Scriptum quippe est-~nemo
S in / licitu(m) fec(it); Scriptu(m) q(ui)ppe (est).~Nemo
W inlicitum fecit scrip /
K lic / tum fecit. Scriptu(m) quippe (est) nemo
P inlicitum / fecit Scriptum quippe e(st) nemo

mittens manum suam ad aratrum, et
C mittens ma / nu(m) sua(m) sup(er) aratru(m). &
G mittens manu(m) sua(m) sup(er) aratru(m) &
B mittens manu(m) sua(m) super / aratrum. &
J mittens / manum suam sup(er) aratrum. et
S mittens manu(m) suam / sup(er) aratru(m). &
W mittens manum su et
K mittens manu(m) suam / sup(er) aratru(m) / et
P mittens manum suam sup(er) ara / trum et

respiciens retro, aptus est regno
C respiciens retro. apt(us) / est regno.
G respi / ciens retro. apt(us) (est) regno
B respiciens retro. apt(us) est regno
J respiciens retro. aptus est / regno
S respiciens retro. apt(us) (est) regno
W respiciens retro ap /
K respiciens retro aptus (est) regno
P respiciens retro aptus est regno

coelorum. Qui igitur fortiori studio
C celor(um). Qui igit(ur) fortiori stu / dio
G c(a)elor(um). Q(ui) (igitur) fortiori studio
B cae- / lorum4 Qui igitur fortiori studio
J c(a)elorum4 Qui igit(ur) fortiori studio
S c(a)elor(um); Qui / (igitur) fortiori studio
W um qui igitur fortiori /
K c(a)eloru(m). Qui igitur fortiori stu / dio.
P c(a)elorum Qui igi / tur fortioris studio
86 W propossuit: See 1.10 above. P potest: This makes grammatical sense and is possibly the result of an effort to transcribe something illegible in the exemplar. K autem: No trace of this appears in the other MSS. Perhaps it arose from the misinterpretation of a mark in the exemplar, or more particularly the in of the next word inlicitum, as Hr. On the whole the style is improved by the separating of licuit and inlicitum.

87 K licitum: See 1.86 above. If the scribe had already transcribed in, he was unlikely to read it again as part of inlicitum, although the result makes little sense.

88 C, G, B, J, S, K, P super: The version in the Vulgate is ad aratum, but it is possible that the reading in these MSS was influenced by a reading in another text of the Bible, or that the edition in PL was changed to the Vulgate reading, although this does not seem to be a strict policy of the PL editions (see Ch.IV,3, 1.138 of the passages).

90 P fortioris: This is an example of dittography, where the scribe has attached the first letter of the next word to the end of fortiori and also repeated it in its proper place.
intenderat, retro conuincitur respicere, si
intenderat; retro conspicere conuinci / tur. si
intenderat / retro c(on)spicere conuincitur. si
intenderat / retro conspicere conuincitur. si
intenderat. retro / (con)spicere (con)uincit(ur). si
intend(er)at. retro c(on)spicere c(on)uincitur. si /
intenderat retro conspicere conuincitur si
intenderat retro respicere (con)uincitur / si
relictis amplioribus bonis ad minima retorquetur.
derelictis bonis ampliorib(us) ad minima retorquetur; /
derelictis bonis amplioribus ad / minima retorquetur; /
relictis bonis / amplioribus ad minima retorquetur;
relictis bonis ampliorib(us) ad minima retorquetur.
bonis ampliorib(us) ad / ret.rq(ue)tur /
derelictis bonis / ampliorib(us) ad minima retorquetur:
relictis bonis ampliorib(us) ad minima retorq(ue)tur; /
C, G, B, J, S, [W], K conspicere conuincitur: The change in word order, common to all these MSS, probably influenced the change of prefix in respicere. This may have been unclear in an early exemplar. P respicere conuincitur: Here the change in word order has taken place, but not the change of prefix, placing this MS at an earlier stage of transmission, perhaps, than the others. However, it is possible that the word has been contaminated by the word retro in the previous line.

C, G, K derelictis: The difference in meaning here is merely that of intensity, with derelictis the stronger word. As in 1.85 above, it seems more likely that the de should have been lost than gained in transmission. C, G, B, J, S, W, K, P bonis amplioribus: This change of word order is only significant in that all our MSS share it.
Overview of the quality of transmission in the above MSS:

C There are very few mistakes in this MS, the most notable being the omission of a line through haplography, but its omission and later inclusion at the bottom of the page are carefully marked (1.6). There is one small error (1.7), and the scribe follows others in unnecessarily doubling consonants (e.g.1.57 reppulit) and confusing i and e (e.g.1.53 neglegunt).

G Again, this is quite an accurate MS, although, typical of its date, it contains examples of confusion over ae and e, over e and i, and over aspiration, although not many of any of these.

B This MS contains no completely independent readings, although confusion between ae and e, and between e and i, arises.

J This MS's one independent reading in our passage is a matter of orthography, 1.38, loqutus.

S There are very few variations in this MS, and most of those in reading are shared with other MSS.

W This MS contains one or two omissions (e.g.1.12 om.tamen), a number of orthographical variations, consistent with the date of its production (e.g.1.28 numquit), and omissions of one or two letters, most of which have been corrected by a later hand (e.g.1.6 quaere).
There is a variation in reading in this MS at 1.61 which appears in part in MSS BJS, but is only finished correctly in K. There are also orthographical variations (e.g. 1.49 pundus).

The spelling in this MS is very bad (e.g. 1.49 grabat), and several slips lead to the sense being obscured (e.g. 1.39 coram). Other mistakes, including grammatical ones (e.g. 1.42 fraudari), are frequent, but almost all, particularly some of the wilder spelling errors, could be accounted for by the theory that an inexperienced scribe had this text dictated to him.

To begin with, all our MSS (with the possible exception of O) derive from the same root: 1.41 quoque Paulus, 1.85 deuoverunt, 1.91 con (or re)spicere convincitur.

By a simple examination of independent readings we can see that none of our MSS is copied from W (e.g. 1.4 voluptae, 1.12 om. tamen), or from K (e.g. 1.9 deuiti, 1.47 lugum), or from P (e.g. 1.1 tinentium, 1.91 respicere). By elimination in the following evidence we can also deduce that none of our MSS is copied from any other.

CG share the significant reading, 1.40 tali
coniugio.

CS'K share the significant reading, 1.27 et parua saluabor.

JS² share the significant reading, 1.27 et parua et saluabor.

WP share the significant reading, 11.32-3 actione hanc (word order same as CGBJSK).

KP share the significant reading, 1.79 sunt itaque (lacuna in W).

CGK share the significant reading, 1.92 derelictis.

CGP share the significant reading, 1.61 obseruandi.

BJS share the following significant readings: 1.25 est, 1.40 in tali coniugio, 1.55 caelibitatis, 1.57 haec.

WKP share the significant reading, 1.40 talis coniuqum.

BJSK share the significant reading 1.61
obsecrandi, 1.73-4 seruentes idolis. I have been unable as yet to collate O with these MSS.

GBJSP share the significant reading, 1.72 execrandis (P exaec-, G ex's'-)

BJSWP share the significant reading, 1.5 quid.

BJSKP share the significant reading, 1.15 medium.

CGBJSK share the following significant readings: 1.32-3 actione hac, 1.59 prouoco (no space for it in W).

CGBJSP share the significant reading, 1.54 paulus.

CGBJSWK share the significant reading, 1.39 cum deo deprecatio funditur.

CGBJSKP share the significant reading, 1.88 super (lacuna in W).

CGBJWKP share the significant reading, 1.29 igitur.

The archetype [ω] of these MSS was in England very early, perhaps in the first half of the eighth century. There [α] was copied from it, from which in turn P was
copied (see P's clearly earlier reading in 1.91). Later [β] was copied from the archetype, and W, K and possibly O (apparently in the same hand as K) were copied from it. By the tenth century [γ] had derived from the archetype and from its B, J and S were copied. Later in the century [δ] derived from the archetype and first G and then C derived from it.

The explicit of C is badly copied, reading tenet for leuet. If the explicit of the exemplar were in majuscule, as would not be unusual in a minuscule MS, the scribe of C could have mistaken the Irish majuscule L, Κ, for τ and the ᾱ for Ν. The fact that eleventh-century scribes had to wrestle with unfamiliar eighth or ninth-century Irish minuscule exemplars is evidence of the break in transmission in the tenth century that was the result of Viking raids. Whether this is also the case with B, J and S cannot now be discerned.

The common readings of BJSK listed above are evidence of some contamination in this tradition.
Notes to Ch. IV, 2:

2. The Medieval Library, p.108.
3. MLGB.
5. "This pair of signs occurs in two mid-11th.-century English MSS, London B.L. Royal 5.F.xiii, f.46, and Harley 3080, f.30 (our Augustine, Confessiones MS H). There and in Salisbury 106, 179, they are a hangover from Anglo-Saxon usage." Ker, B,C & L, p.167, n.2.
8. CLA II, 188, 229.
13. See Persius, MS C, above.
15. Bischoff, Palaeography, p.93.
16. See MS O above.
17. Presumably this is Thomas James, the first librarian and cataloguer of the Bodleian Library. I cannot trace the work.
Chapter IV, 3:  

**MORALIA**

(PLXXVI) The Maurists say that this was Gregory's first work, although it was only published in the 590's, and in his letter to John, subdeacon of Ravenna, he explains how he reluctantly came to write it, thinking it inappropriate for ordinary people. Bede records this reluctance, but describes the resulting work as *miranda ratione*, "with marvellous reasoning" [1].

The early English manuscripts are well spread geographically and chronologically, and there is reason to believe that besides the six extant MSS listed below there are two other whole MSS and were, at least, several abbreviated copies. The five extant manuscripts and one fragment from this date listed in Gneuss are as follows:

- C Cambridge, Trinity College B.4.9 (123) s.xi ex.
- D Durham Cathedral B.III.10 s.xi ex.
- B Bodleian, Bodley 310 (2121) s.ix²
- O Oxford, Trinity College 39 s.xi/xii
- S Salisbury Cathedral 33 s.xi ex.
- Y Yale, Beinecke Library 516 (f.) s.viii in.

**C Cambridge, Trinity College B.4.9 (123)**

s.xii, vellum, 359 x 231mm., ff.178, double cols. of 43 lines, in the Canterbury hand, finely written. On f.1,
74 and 172 is Secunda pars Moralium de Claustro ecclesie Christi Cantuarie.

Contents:

Moralia b. Gregorii pape per contemplationem sumpta libri .vi. pars quarta inc. f.1

Quotiens in sancti uiri hystoria
(This in red and purple capitals). Ends 176b.

Moralia b. Greg. pape urbis rome in lib. Iob per contemplationem sumpta expliciunt.

(Trinity Catalogue)

Ker confirms the Christ Church, Canterbury ex libris and the appearance in Ingram's catalogue as No.131, as well as pointing out that the same MS is listed as 332 in Henry of Eastry's catalogue [2].

The script, with its split minims and developed hair lines, seems to me not of the first flush of Canterbury writing. [3]

The text of this MS is late minuscule in two columns, written in very dark ink which remains clear although the membrane has suffered much minor damage. The initial to Part Four, with which the codex starts, is very good, incorporating the body of a dragon. Large initials also begin the libri within the Part, but seem less accomplished and heavier. About nine folios are missing between f.8 and f.9, so we lack the initial for Lib.18. The text is much
abbreviated, with consistent use of a few set abbreviations: q, q̀ for que, quod, p, p, p for per, pro, pri, c̀ for ter, n̄ for non, à for vero, e for ae, b for bis, ō for rum, ã for ergo. ct and st ligatures are both common, and the ampersand is regularly use for et. The most common punctuation mark is the medial point, but â and ò are also used frequently. Syllabification is common and mostly good.

D _Durham Cathedral B.III.10_

s.xi ex., vellum, 338 x 225mm., 238ff., 39 lines to a page, prov. Durham. First volume only, bks.I-XVI.

Bishop William's library had a copy in two parts, and one is recorded in the mid-twelfth century catalogue, but vol.ii was apparently lost before 1395 (when there was also a catalogue)...A handsome hand with headings in coloured capitals. Smaller initials with a filling of much conventionalized vine-tendrils, in red, green and blue with a wash of yellow (purple appears, but very rarely); ff.1 and 3 have large initials on coloured grounds, the latter perhaps with some use of silver. There is a normal s.xv Durham inscription on f.1.

(Durham Catalogue)

Ker comments that this is a small book [4], which probably means it was designed for personal reading, and he
further notes that the codex was

Written before 1096...The script is like that of Durham Cathedral B.III.1 (also a gift from Bishop William of St.Carilef) and Bodleian Bodley 301 (2739). [5]

The hand is complex with sharp diagonal downstrokes in the letters and also rudimentary dots for the i's. The initial R on f.1 [6] extends for 22 out of the 33 lines and involves a figure, a bird and a beast as well as several animal heads. The colours are blue, red, green and yellow, and the same colours are used in the title letters. Book X is written in very dark ink, with dark smudging, but each chapter clearly indicated. The writing is crammed close, although expertly written, on closely ruled lines, and the membrane is fine enough for the writing to show through the page, which does not aid legibility. c and t are very similar and in several places indistinguishable. Abbreviations are few, but include ã, ã, ³, ³ for qui, qua, quo, que, ø, ², ² for pro, per, prae, ë for ae, ³ for ergo, b; for bus, ² for tus, ² for ter, ² for tur, æ for tunc, and the usual nomina sacra.

B Bodleian, Bodley 310 (2121)

s.x, parchment, i + 301ff. Bound also with a MS of s.xiv.

Contents:

I In nomine Dei summi Incipit in libro béati Iob
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Moralia Gregorii. per contemplationem sumpta. Liber vi 
[uerius xi] Pars tertia. 

This third part contains books xi-xvi commenting on Job xii-xxiii. The lemmata are in rustic capitals, usually introduced by *sequitur*, and are sometimes in red: the books divide at foll. 24v, 47v, 64v, 92v, and 119v.

(Bodleian Catalogue)

Ker gives an ex libris from New College, Oxford, but this is only for the second part of this MS [2].

...in a continental hand, s.x, may be an early import: nothing is known of its history before s.xvii in. [7].

It does not match the third part with which it is now kept. Our MS is written in clear, confident Carolingian minuscule with lower case a's somewhat sharper at the beginning of a word than within it. Upper case N is occasionally used. Line rulings are guided by dots in the outer margins. Punctuation is common and varied, including *, ;, ;, ;, ;, f, c and .

The ampersand and st ligature are common. Abbreviations are not much used, but where they appear they are consistent, and include *p, p* for *per*, *pro*, *q* for *que*, *q* for *quod*, *e* for *ae*, *n* for *non*, *t*, *e* for *ter*, *tur* and *e* for *etur*, and the usual nomina sacra.

---

Oxford, Trinity College 39
s.xi in., folio, ff.149.
Contents:

*S. Gregorii papae I. cognomento Magni, Moralium super Job libri decem priores.*

a. *Capitula tocius libri.* f. 1b
b. *De inuentione librorum moralium.* f. 2
   *In calce, Explicit uisio Taionis, Cesaraugustensis episcopi, quam uidit in ecclesia beati Petri apostoli.*
c. *Praefatio ad Leandrum coepiscopum.* f. 3

D. Incipit moralium beati Gregorii pape in librum Job pars prima.

(Oxford Catalogue)

C. 1130, Lanthony. 305 x 180mm. Good initials, marginal drawings by the scribe, later marginal sketch, f. 18.

Provenance: note of contents written by Morgan of Carmarthen, canon of Lanthony, s. xv., f. ii.

(Illuminated MSS)

Small, for personal use...was found to be unsatisfactory in the twelfth century when a new copy, now Lambeth Palace 56, was made [8].

Trinity College 40 contains what would be the second volume of this text, books xi-xxii, dating from the twelfth century, but it might not be connected with this MS.
Our part is in a fine, clear minuscule, quite small and very neat with letter forms mostly consistent. Towards the end of the volume some of the ligatures become almost cursive. Fine initials start each book, and the chapters thereafter are occasionally noted in the margins. Marginal notes are frequent if not verbose: the sign $\nabla$ appears often, and possibly indicates passages worth noting. Inked dots down the outer edge of most pages seem to indicate line rulings. Accents are occasionally used, and the syllabification hyphen appears at line ends. The text, though good, is much abbreviated, inconsistently, with several unconventional uses of the supralinear contraction line appearing only once each in our passages. The following abbreviations are used: $\overline{p}$, $\overline{l}$, $\overline{p}$, $\overline{p}$, for pri, prae, pro, per, $\hat{q}$, $\check{q}$, $\check{q}$, $\check{q}$, $\check{q}$, $\check{q}$, $\check{q}$, $\check{q}$ for quae, que, qui, quo, quam, qua, quia, quod, b, for bus, $\delta$ for bis, $\varepsilon$ for con, $\varepsilon$ or $\varepsilon$ for ter, $\varepsilon$ for tur, $\varepsilon$ for tra, $\varepsilon$ for tunc, $\varepsilon$ for ius, $\epsilon$ for ae, $\epsilon$ for esse, $\epsilon$, $\epsilon$ or $\epsilon$ for est, $\epsilon$ for sed, $\gamma$ for rum, $\hat{n}$ for non, $\check{n}$ for nunc, $\hat{u}$ for uer, $\hat{u}$ for vero, $\gamma$ or a much flattened ampersand for et, and ct and st ligatures. The early abbreviation spc also appears for spiritus.

[Initial Q from Lib.X]

- 87 -
S Salisbury Cathedral 33
s.xii, vellum, 319 x 250, ff.497.

Contents:

Moralia

(Salisbury catalogue)

Notes from Ker's Salisbury papers:

1089-1125, 497ff., Salisbury.

Relatively rare amongst Salisbury MSS, this is a two-column book.

"...the first quires of MS.33 were renewed in the twelfth century..."

Salisbury 33 contains the work of Scribe A, whose writing appears in fourteen Salisbury books and Exon Domesday. In this MS, his work is as follows:

"fols. 274-380ra/17 (except 313va/4-41, 377ra/37-377va/12, 378va/6-378vb/41, 379va/22-379vb/41) and fols. 453-97, in all about a third of a massive copy of Gregory's Moralia on 497 leaves.

This copy of Moralia is divisible into two after Book 18 and may once have been in two volumes: if so, Scribe A's work was entirely in volume 2, fols.258-497. His part makes a fine book on good parchment. Fols.1-66, books 1-4 and part of book 5, were supplied on 8 quires in s.xii."

This MS also contains the writing of Scribe B3, one of the
scribes initially differentiated by Ker. His work appears in fols. 67-196. (p.162)

Patrick Young's catalogue, no. 98: Gregorius in Jobum libris 35. (p.193)

The script of the parts of this MS studied here, identified by Ker as the work of Scribe B\textsuperscript{3} (except for the last passage which is the work of Scribe A), could be described as a flowing form of minuscule. Some initials are sketched in, while others are missing. A few drawings of hands appear in the margin, for instance on f. 9v., but are rather faint. The membrane is fine and patched in places. The scribe does not use the omission line as frequently as he might, and in general is not over-liberal in abbreviation, but the following abbreviations are used: p, p for per, pro, q; or q (and once q\textsubscript{3}), q\textsubscript{4}, q\textsubscript{d} for que, quis, quod, \'e for est, \e for ae, \e\e for esse, \textasciitilde for bis, \ for ius, q for igitur, n for non, c for tra, \ for tur, t for ter, \ for rum, the ampersand and the ct and st ligatures.

[Initial from Lib. X: dark red ink]
This MS page, reconstructed to its original size, would have had around 11 to 12 lines to a page and a length of around 300mm.

Notes from "A Manuscript Fragment from Bede's Monastery" [9]:

...upper half of the original folio leaf of heavy vellum. Its size now, after having been trimmed on three sides, is 172 x 235mm. The rather large letters are written in a single column. The script is a graceful, firm, precise English uncial hand very similar to, if not identical with, that of the Codex Amiatinus. The ink is dark and clear; there are no erasures or corrections, but in 3 instances a second hand has supplied several letters missing at the end of a line...

The portion of the text of the Moralía that is preserved in the MS is from the eighteenth book, chapters 41 and 42, where St. Gregory is expounding the text of the Book of Job at the beginning of Ch.28 (PLLXXVI.59)...

The Latin text, too, is of interest because it represents a very early recension. Although there are many MSS that preserve the text of Gregory's Moralía, not one is older than our fragment. In only 3 instances a word of the text in the fragment differs slightly in
spelling from the modern edition of Gregory. It is also
worthy of note that in 2 cases where the same quotation
from Paul's Letter to the Corinthians is given, the
text has a word that occurs in the old Itala version of
the Bible rather than that of Jerome's Vulgate edition,
normally used in Gregory's time. (The Itala version
reads habeam, while the Vulgate has habuero.)

Among the books that Benedict Biscop...brought
back from his 6 journeys to Italy between 653 and 683
were the Moralia and other works of St. Gregory.

This fragment is an example of insular semiuncial
of the highest class, undoubtedly of the same standard as
that of the Codex Amiatinus and almost certainly from the
same scriptorium. It is not impossible that it should be the
work of one of the same scribes. The membrane is fine and
pale, translucent to judge from the photograph, although
there is a hole at one point which predates the writing. The
script is remarkably fine and clear, with care taken in a
most professional manner over both the serifs and the
horizontal line ends of letters, which tend to be slightly
forked. The downstroke of the g is fine and curled, and the
loop of the a, extending only to the line of the script, is
so extremely fine as to look like one line rather than a
loop. Diagonal downstrokes are controlled rather than bold,
as are larger curves in such letters as o, c, and u. A very
faint medial comma is the only form of punctuation, although
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again double commas appear in the margin. Abbreviations used in this fragment are as follows: ā for -am (only twice at line ends), dē for deo, ṛ for -nto at a line end, sanctae. On what would have been the inner margin of the verso of our fragment is written, in perhaps slightly later writing, + liber iste. fr(atr)is redneri de capella orate p(ro) eo.

Comments:

Most of the manuscripts are grouped around the late eleventh and early twelfth centuries, with the exception of B, which Ker took as being the earliest extant MS in England (although it is probably a continental import), and the fragment Y, with which he was apparently not familiar when he wrote his paper "The English Manuscripts of Gregory's Moralía". However, he does mention the existence of early abbreviated versions dating from the eighth to the tenth centuries:

That the Moralía was copied in England in the seventh and eighth centuries is more than likely, but no certainly English copy survives. (see CLA 1664...and CLA 1427) That it was copied in the hundred years between the revival of English monasticism and the Norman Conquest is less sure: imports and abbreviations of the full text may have sufficed for the needs of the time. (...)Abbreviations of the Moralía in English hands
of this date are in Pembroke College, Cambridge, MS.88, and in Trinity College, Cambridge, MS.141, ff.64-148).

Neither CLA 1664 nor 1427 is mentioned in Gneuss' List. Ker evidently admits the possibility that they are English and Lowe, although he sees one as being from an Anglo-Saxon centre on the continent, readily states that the other, 1664, is English.

CLA, 1664:
New York, Pierpont Morgan Library, Wm.S.Glazier Coll.G.30 Uncial s.vii ex.

Moralia in Job (xxi. 12, 16-17).

Fragments of two folios survive, now measuring 162 x 148 and 162 x 105 mm., <estimated width 190mm.> in long lines of which parts of eighteen survive...Punctuation: an occasional medial point for the main pause; words mostly well separated. Citations from Job indicated by a comma in the margin to the left; other citations by pairs of s-like flourishes, perhaps by an early corrector. Abbreviations seen are confined to SÇS and SÔM for sanctus and spiritum. Spelling good. The single initial P is in bold black outline with a white inside and with delicate hair-line finials at both ends of the stem, the whole reminiscent of Anglo-Saxon practice. Membrane vellum. Ink brown. Script is a regular uncial of a type recalling the Northumbrian school...A
somewhat similar type of uncial is seen in the Wroclaw Gregory.

Written in England, presumably in Northumbria, to judge by the general aspect of the script, the form of the initial, and the use of vellum. Formerly belonged to Max Kammerer. The fragments were purchased by William S. Glazier of New York in 1954...

This is in a insular semiuncial which is certainly competent but not of the first class. The text is good, but the membrane is dark and damaged in many places: almost certainly the fragment was used in binding another volume. One large initial is used, but is very plain and only about four times the height of the letters of the text.

CLA 1427:
Würzburg, Univ.-Bibl. M.P.Th.f.149a.
Anglo-Saxon Minuscule s.viii².
Moralia in Job (Libb.XXXII-XXXV)
Foll.54; 295 x 225mm. <245 x 165-170mm.> in 40 long lines...Incipits and Explicit in red, in capitals or in Insular majuscule; some Incipits preceded by a cross; opening lines in angular capitals, filled with red and yellow. Punctuation: the medial comma marks the main pause; other points added later. Job lemmata are in compressed Anglo-Saxon majuscule or in uncial (foll.45v., 46) and are marked by K and the citation
mark ., in the left margin, other citations are marked with by an s-shaped flourish to the left of each line. Omissions indicated by signes de renvoi. Accents over some monosyllables. Abbreviations include the ancient and Insular symbols \textit{\textit{\textit{h, H, ã, 7 = autem, enim, est, et; p = per; q, q̣i, q, q̣ = quam, quasi, qui, quia; o, ọr, = tamen, tur; and the common forms b, q, = bus, que; d̄r, d̄xp = dicitur, dixit; eee = esse; n̄m = nostrum; n, n̄ = non, nunc; p, p̣ = prae, pro; q, qndn, q̄d, q̄m, q̄q = quae, quando, quod, quoniam, quoque; f̄ = rum; f̄r = sunt; f̄c = tunc; f̄ = uel. Simple initials of Insular type, surrounded by red dots, some using the rope and spiral motifs. Vellum of the Insular type with some parchment leaves interspersed; many imperfect sheets used. Script is a pointed Anglo-Saxon minuscule...The uncial used in the lemmata on foll.45v and 46 recalls somewhat the type seen in the capitula in Northumbrian manuscripts. The fence-shaped Insular \textit{M} is seen in the opening line on fol.32v. The Greek letter \textit{Ψ} is used here and there in \textit{psalmista} and similar words. Some corrections in ninth-century Caroline minuscule.

Written in an Anglo-Saxon centre on the Continent, to judge by the use of parchment, and probably by a scribe trained in the Northumbrian tradition; textually there is some affinity with the oldest Freising copies of the \textit{Moralia} in CLM 6382 and 6297. Belonged to the Würzburg Cathedral Library: the entry \textit{Liber sui}
Kyliani, s.xii-xiii, is seen on fol. lv. It bore the number 'XII', later '78'.

The Maurist edition of *Moralia* is made up of six parts, containing respectively five, five, six, six, three and eight books, a total of thirty-five books. Migne comments that in this he follows Gregory's own remarks in his letter to Leander:

*Opus hoc per triginta et quinque uolumina extensum in sex Codicibus expleui.*

The contents of our MSS are as follows:

C has only "Part Two",

D has Books I-XVI, apparently the first of two volumes.

B has "Part Three", here Books XI-XVI.

O has Books I-X, apparently the first of two volumes, the second of which contains "Books XI-XXII".

S is apparently whole, but Patrick Young refers to its probable original division into two volumes after "Book XVIII", containing respectively 257 and 240 leaves. This seems an illogical break, but S is not unique in this: the Maurist editor points out that Book IV non ab octauo decimo, ut mendose habetur in Editione Paris 1518 inchoatur.
Y is a fragment.

CLA 1664 contains only XXI.12, 16-17.

CLA 1427 contains Books XXXII-XXXV.

In the following pages, I have collated C, D, B
and O from microfilm, Y and P from photographs, and S from
the actual MS.
Lib. X, 14:

1 CCL Excelsior caelo est, et quid facies? Profundior
D EXCELSIOR c(a)elo est & q(u)i)d facies-' P(ro)fundior /
O Excelsior c(a)elo est. & / q(u)i)d facies-' P(ro)fundior
S Excelsior c(a)elo (est) & quid facies' pro- / fundior

2 CCL inferno, et unde cognoscies? Longior terrae mensura
D inferno. & unde cognoscies-' Longior t(era)ra mensura
O inferno. & unde cognoscies- Longior t(era)ra mensura
S inferno. & unde cognoscis- ' longior terra mensura

3 CCL eius, et latior mari. Quod Deus caelo
D ei(us). & latior mari. Q(uo)d d(eu)s / c(a)elo
O ei(us). & / latior mari. Q(uo)d d(eu)s c(a)elo
S eius & latior / mari. Q(uo)d d(eu)s c(a)elo

4 CCL excelsior, inferno profundior, terrae longior
D excelsior. inferno p(ro)fundior. terra longior.
O excelsior- inferno p(ro)fundior- t(era)ra longior-
S excelsior- inferno / p(ro)fundior- Terra longior-

5 CCL marique latior esse describitur, tanto
D marig(ue) latior e(ss)e describitur- / tanto
O marig(ue) latior / (esse) descript(ur) tanto
S mari latior. / e(ss)e. discribitur.Tanto

6 CCL spiritualiter debet intellegi, quanto de eo
D sp(irit)ualit(er) debet intelligi- quanto de eo
O sp(irit)ualit(er) debet intelligi. q(u)a nto de eo
S spiritualiter de- / bet intelligi- quanto d(e) o

7 CCL quicquam nefas est iuxta corporea lineamenta
D q(u)i)cqua(m) nefas est iuxta corporea / liniamenta
O q(u)i)cqua(m) nefas (est) iuxta / corporea liniam(en)ta
S quicquam ne- / fas (est) iuxta corporea lanimenta

8 CCL sentire. Sed caelo est excelsior quia
D sentiri. Sed c(a)elo excelsior est-' q(u)i)a
O sentiri. S(ed) c(a)elo excelsior (est) 'q(u)i)a
S sen / tire; sed c(a)elo (est) excelsior quia

9 CCL incircumscriptione sui spiritus cuncta
D incircu(m)scriptione sui sp(iritu)s cuncta /
O incircumscriptione sui sp(iritu)s / cuncta
S incircu(m) / scriptione sp(iritu)s cuncta

10 CCL transcendit; inferno profundior quia
D transcendit. Inferno p(ro)fundior- ' q(u)i)a
O t(ra)nsceedit. Infe'r'no p(ro)fundior. q(u)i a
S transcendit- / Inferno p(ro)fundior. Quia
Lib. X, ch. 14: This passage forms a description and explanation of the boundless nature of God, as mentioned in Job 11, vv. 8-9.

1 S Exscelsior: *

2 S cognoscis: -es and -is were almost entirely interchangeable at this time. D, O, S terra: Two of CCL's main MSS, K (s.viii ex./ix in., from Germany, containing libb. VI-XVI, XXIII-XXIX) and M (A.D. 914, written in Cardena in Spain, containing libb. V-XXXIV), three minor ones and one MS of Lathcen's Egloga de Moralibus Iob have terrae, while terra appears in the majority of Lathcen MSS and in the Maurists' edition. It is also in the Vulgate version of this passage. The difference in meaning seems to be slight: "His measure is longer than the earth / than the measure (understood from before) of the earth". For variations in Biblical quotations in Moralia, see the section at the end of this chapter.

4 D, O, S terra: One of CCL's main MSS (K) and three minor ones (the same three as in 1.2 above) have terrae, while the Maurists and main MS M have terra. In this case the use of terra may have been influenced by confusion over which case to use with comparative adjectives, but it seems likely that Gregory himself would have used the same case as he had used in 1.2 in the quotation, as he is
commenting on the quotation and referring back to it.

S om. -que: This reading also appears in MS K in CCL. The sense is almost the same in either reading: the scribe of S may have preferred the extra asyndyton, or he may not have noticed an obscured q:. S disceribitur: The vowels i and e were much confused at this time.

D, O spiritualiter: OLD does not give this as an accepted spelling variation, but it is the normal mediaeval spelling. D, O, S intelligi: This is the usual insular spelling of this word. S deo: This would be an easy haplographical mistake to make, a simple contraction of de eo.

D, O liniamenta, S lanimenta: Liniamenta is an equally correct spelling of this word. Lanimenta does not seem to exist, but would have something to do with either wool (lana), butchers (lanius) or savage wounds (lanio), none of which seems to fit here.

D, O sentiri: It is not clear how a scribe of this period would have differentiated the meaning of the active and passive infinitives in this case, but the common confusion of e and i might have been sufficient to produce this reading. D, O excelsior est: This inversion of word order would be simple enough, and is remarkable here only in
that these two MSS share it.

\textit{om.sui}: Given that the following word also begins with s, it would be easy for the scribe to omit this small word accidentally. The inclusion of the word is not absolutely essential here, although it clarifies the case of \textit{spiritus}. 0 spc for \textit{spiritus}: This is interesting in that it is a contraction based on the Greek influence on Irish scribal practice. It seems to have influenced Anglo-Saxon texts in Carolingian times [11].
transcendendo subuehit; terrae longior quia
creaturae modum perennitate suae
aeternitatis excedit; mari latior quia
rerum temporalium fluctus sic regens
possidet, ut hos sub omnimoda potentiae suae
praesentia coangustando circumdet. Quamuis
possint et caeli appellatione angeli, et inferni
uocabulo daemonia designari; per terram uero
iusti homines, per mare autem peccatores
intellegi. Excelsior itaque caelo est quia
D, O, S terra: See 1.2 above. Here K, M and the same three minor MSS have terrae, while Lathcen and the Maurists have terra.

D est: The scribe of D or of his exemplar may have felt that it was necessary to include a verb in this phrase, rather than understanding it from 1.8. If this is so, it is strange that he did not then think it necessary to include one in 11.10 and 11. Another possibility is that the scribe found a mark in his exemplar which he interpreted as an abbreviation for est. The abbreviation in D is indistinct, and the scribe may have felt uncertain about it.

D, O possint: It is unclear to what extent scribes of this period would have differentiated between the forms of the indicative and subjunctive, although it seems likely the scribe would have used the subjunctive after quamuis. There may have been some confusion over minims at this point, but here either mood seems fitting.

O signari: Both words can mean to indicate, denote or designate by words or a sign, but signari is generally used in this sense by poets, so is slightly less likely here. Perhaps the scribe omitted de thinking that it was a repetition influenced by demonia before it.

D, O, S intelligi: see 1.6 above.
ipsi quoque electi spiritus uisionem tantae
celsitudinis perfecte non penetrant.
Profundior inferno est quia malignorum
spirituum astutias longe subtilius quam ipsi
putauerant iudicans damnat. Terrae longior quia
longanimitatem nostram patientia diuinae
longanimitatis exsuperat, quae nos et
peccantes tolerat, et conuersos ad praemia
remunerationis exspectat. Mari latior quia
ubique facta peccantium retributionis suae
21 D spiriti: This is presumably a mistake caused by
the fact that the scribe thought spiriti, which is
not a correct form of this word in any case, had
to agree with ipsi...electi.

24 S ... ras.: Nothing is missing from this MS that
appears in any of the others, so the scribe
perhaps made a mistake that was later erased after
the MS had been completed.

25 D, O, S terra: Main CCL MSS K and M and three minor
MSS have terrae, while the Maurists have terra
(see 1.2 above).
praesentia occupat, ut et cum non praesens per
p(rae)sentia occupat* ut & cum 'non' pr(ae)sens p(er)
p(rae)sentia occupat* ut & cu(m) n(on) p(rae)sens p(er)
presentia occu- / pat*. Ut cum non praesens p(er)

speciem cernitur, praesens per iudicium
specie(m) cernit(ur) pr(a)e / sens p(er) iudiciu(m)
sp(ecie)m cernit(ur)--p(rae)sens p(er) iudiciu(m)
specie(m) / cernitur. praesens per iudicium /

CCL
sentiat(ur).

CCL
Lib. XV, 57:

Deus seruabit filiis illius dolorem patris: et
d(eu)s / seruabit filiis illius dolorem(m) patris. &
D Deus / seruabit filiis illius / dolorem patris. &
B Deus / seruabit filiis illi(us) dolorem(m) patris &
S Deus / seruabit filiis illius dolorem patris:

CCL
cum reddiderit, tunc sciet. Scriptum nouimus:
cum reddid(er)it* t(un)c sciet*. Scriptu(m) // nouim(us).
cu(m) reddiderit tunc sci&t*. Scriptu(m) nouim(us). /
S cu(m) redid(er)it / tunc sciet. Scriptu(m) nouim(us)

Qui reddis peccata patrum in filiis ac nepotibus,
Qui reddis peccata patrum in filiis ac nepotibus-
qui reddis peccata / patru(m) in filiis ac nepotib(us)

in tertiam et quartam progeniem. Et
in t(er)ti(a)m & quarta(m) p(ro)genie(m). / Et
S in tertia(m) & quarta(m) / p(ro)genie(m). -

rursum scriptum est: Quid est quod inter
rursu(m) scriptu(m) (est) Quid est q(uo)d int(er)
brursu(m) scriptu(m) est; Quid est q(uo)d inter
S rursu(m) scriptu(m) (est) Quid (est) q(uo)d int(er)

uos parabolam uertitis in prouerbium istud in
uos parabola(m) uertitis in p(ro)uerbiu(m) istud in
uos parabola(m). / uertitis in p(ro)uerbiu(m) istud in
S uos / parabola(m) uertitis in p(ro)uerbiu(m) istud in

terra Israel dicentes: Patres comederunt
t(etr) / ra isr(ae)l dicentes: patres comed(er)unt
B t(etr)ra isr(ae)l dicentes: patres com(m)ederunt. /
S t(etr)ra isr(ae)l / dicentes ~ Patres comeder(unt)

- 106 -
S om.et: This short word would be easily omitted after another short word like ut.

Lib.XV, ch.57: This passage constitutes an explanation of the Biblical quotation that the sins of the fathers are visited upon the sons, which is used to expound the passage in Job 21, v.19.

S rediderit: Insular scribes frequently confused double and single consonants.

CCL, D, B, S Qui reddis...filiis: The Vulgate version of this line reads: Qui reddis iniquitatem patrum filiis (see 1.2 above). D pec..ta, B pecca: As these two MSS seem to be connected, if distantly, these variations are presumably caused by something obscure in a common exemplar.

B generationem: Possibly the scribe failed to notice an obscured abbreviation for pro, and expanded geniem into generationem. The Maurists have generationem, as does the Vulgate (see 1.2), so it seems more likely that the scribe was familiar with the Vulgate passage and copied it here. The version in the other MSS is quite possibly a reading in the Itala Bible. For variations in Biblical readings in Moralia, see the section at the end of this chapter.

B commederunt: *
CCL uuam acerbam et dentes filiorum
D uua(m) acerba(m) & dentes filior(um)
B uua(m) acerum & dentes filioru(m)
S uua(m) acerua(m) & dentes filior(um)

CCL obstupuerunt? Viuo ego, dicit Dominus Deus,
D obstupe... Viuo ego dicit d(omi)n(u)s.
B obstupescunt uivo ego dicit d(omi)n(u)s.
S obstipuer(unt) Viuo ego dic(it) d(omi)n(u)s d(eu)s.

CCL si erit uobis ultra parabola haec in
D si erit ultra uobis parabola h(a)ec i.
B si erit ultra uobis parabola h(a)ec in
S Si / erit uob(is) ult(ra) parabola h(a)ec in

CCL proverbia in Israel. Ecce omnes animae,
D proverbiu(m) in isr(ae)l Ecce om(n)es / anim(a)e
B proverbiu(m) in isr(ae)l Ecce om(ne)s anim(a)e
S proverbiu(m) in isr(ae)l Ecce om(n)es anim(a)e

CCL meae sunt; ut anima patris, ita et anima filii,
D me(a)e sunt Ut anima patris / ita & anima filii
B me(a)e sunt Ut anima patris / ita & anima filii
S me(a)e sunt ut anima patris ita & anima filii

CCL mea est. Anima quae peccauerit, ipsa punietur.
D mea est Anima qu(a)e pecca / uerit ipsa mori(ut).
B mea est Anima qu(a)e / peccauerit ipsa mori&(ur).
S mea (est) anima que peccauerit ipsa / mori(ut).

50

CCL ut discretionis uiam subtiliter requirat
D ut discretionis uia(m) subtilit(er) req(uir)at
B ob discretionis uia(m) subtilit(er) requirat
S ut discretionis // uia(m) subtilit(er) requirat

CCL instruitur. Peccatum quippe originale a
D instruit(ur): Peccatu(m) q(ui)ppe / originale a
B instruit(ur): Peccatu(m) quippe originale a
S instruit(ur). Peccatu(m) q(ui)ppe / originale a
B, S aceruam: The confusion of b and u in MSS of this date is more usually a Continental error than an Insular one, which might tell us something about the origin of the tradition of these two MSS.

42 D obstupe..., B obstupescunt, S obstipuerunt: Each of our three versions could be correct, as -i- and -u- are equally correct spellings, and it is only a matter of deciding which tense is more appropriate. The present tense would emphasise the contrast between past sins and present punishments. Clearly something was obscure in an exemplar common to these MSS. CCL's MS M and two other continental sources (one Norman) have obstupescunt, as does the Vulgate version of this passage (see 1.2 above). D, B om. deus: the small nomen sacrum dēs would easily be omitted between dēs and si, particularly in the case of B, where it would occur at a line end. Possibly it was, in fact, left out of a common exemplar.

43 D, B ultra uobis: These two words would be easily inverted: the fact that these two MSS have this word order in common shows another connexion between them. This word order also appears in the Vulgate (see 1.2 above).

46 D, B, S morietur: MSS K and M in CCL have punietur as do two codices of Bessarion, but the Vulgate
and the Maurists have morietur (see 1.2 above). In 1.75 below, all versions have morietur.

48 B Si auditoris: This seems to make no sense and I see no clear reason why si should have been included.

49 B ob: This can mean "by reason of", and here would apply to discretionis uiam, but that it is the object of the verb requirat. It does not therefore make sense here. Small words are easily confused, particularly in untidy exemplars.
parentibus trahimus; et nisi per gratiam

parentibus trahimus & n(isi) p(er) gr(ati)am

parentibus trahimus & nisi / per gratia(m)

parentibus trahimus & n(isi) p(er) gr(ati)am

baptismatis soluamur etiam parentum peccata

baptismatis soluat(ur)-etia(m) parentu(m) / peccatu(m)

baptismatis soluamur &ia(m) parentu(m) peccata

bap / tismatis soluam(ur). &ia(m) peccata parentu(m)

portamus, quia unum adhuc uidelicet cum

portam(us)- quia unu(m) adhuc unu(m) uidelicet cu(m)

portamus & quia unu(m) adhuc uidelic& cum

portam(us)- quia unu(m) adhuc uidelic& cu(m)

illis sumus. Reddit ergo peccata patrum in

illis sum(us). Reddit (ergo) peccata pa / trum in

illis sumus; Reddit ergo peccata / patru(m) in

illis sum(us). Red / dit ergo peccata patru(m) in

filiis, dum pro culpa parentis, ex originali peccato

filiis dum p(ro) culpa parentis ex originali peccato

filiis dum p(ro) culpa parentis ex originali peccato

filiis. dum p(ro) culpa / parentis ex originali peccato

anima polluitur prolis. Et rursum non reddit

anima pollut(ur) p(ro)lis / Et rursu(m) n(on) reddit

anima pol / luitur p(ro)lis; & rursu(m) n(on) reddit

anima pollutur / p(ro)lis. Et rursu(m) non reddit

parentum peccata in filiis, quia cum ab originali

parentu(m) peccata in filiis quia cu(m) ab originali

parentu(m) peccata in filiis quia cu(m) ab originali

parentu(m) peccata in / filiis. quia cum ab originali

culpa per baptismum liberamur, non iam

culpa p(er) bapt- / tismu(m) lib(er)amur. n(on) ia(m)

culpa p(er) baptismu(m) liberamur. non iam

culpa p(er) baptismum / liberam(ur). non ia(m)

parentum culpas sed quas ipsi committimus,

parentu(m) culpas. s(ed) quas ipsi co(m)mittim(us)

parentu(m) / culpas sed quas ipsi co(m)mittimus

parentu(m) culpas sed quas ipsi co(m)- / mittim(us)

habemus. Quod tamen intellegi etiam aliter

habem(us). Q(uo)d tam(en) / intelligi etiam alit(er)

habemus; Quod tamen intellegi / &iam & aliter

habem(us). Q(uo)d tam(en) intelligi &iam aliter /
D soluatur: This version is grammatically correct, and to a certain extent is more likely than soluamur...peccata, as that gives us a subjunctive (soluamur) followed by an indicative (portamus) in a conditional clause. The version in D gives us a passive followed by an active verb, which is unusual but more correct than the other reading. The sentence would then read "...unless by the grace of baptism it were washed away, we still bear the sin of the parents..." This requires the reading, later in the same line, of peccatum, which D has, rather than peccata, which appears in all our other MSS but might have been influenced by the Biblical quotation at the beginning of the chapter, from Exodus, ch.34, 7. Soluatur appears in CCL's MS M, corrected to soluamur, and in one Tours codex and the Norman codices, but only the Norman codices also have peccatum. The version in CCL's M and the Tours codex may well have influenced D before M was changed. In this case the rule of difficilior lectio potior seems to apply, and D has the original reading. D peccatum: see above. S peccata parentum: The alliteration of these two words makes the confusion of their order a simple matter. This version appears supralinearly in MS M of CCL.
53  D adhuc unum: *

60  D, S intelligi: see 1.6 above. It is unusual that the spelling in B agrees with the printed edition, but then it is continental in origin, so perhaps it is more unusual that B's scribe spells the word intelligi at three other points in these passages. The two spellings seem to have been interchangeable at this period.
CCL potest, quia quisquis praui parentis
D potest: Q(u)ia q(ui)sq(u)is p(ra)ui parentis
B potest: quia quisquis praui parentis
S potest quia q(ui)sq(u)is praui parentis

CCL iniquitatem imitatur, etiam ex eius delicto
D iniqui(t)ate(m) imitat(ur): etia(m) ex ei(us) / delicto
B iniquitate(m) / imitat(ur): &ia(m) ex eius delicto
S iniqui(t)ate(m) imitat(ur) / &ia(m) ex ei(us) delicto

CCL constringitur. Quisquis autem parentis
D c(on)stringit(ur): Quisq(ui)s aute(m) parentis
B constringitur: Quisq(ui)s aute(m) paren / tum
S constringit(ur): Quisq(ui)s aut(em) paren- / tis

CCL iniquitatem non imitatur, nequaquam delicto
D iniqui(t)ate(m) n(on) imitat(ur): nequaq(uam) delicto /
B iniquitate(m) n(on) imitat(ur): Nequaq(uam) delicto
S iniqui(t)ate(m) non imitat(ur): Nequaq(uam) delicto

CCL illius grauat(ur). Vnde fit ut iniquus filius
D illius grauat(ur): Unde fit ut iniquu(us) fili(us):
B illius grauat(ur): Unde fit ut iniquus filius
S illi(us) / grauat(ur): Unde fit ut iniquus fili(us)

CCL iniqui patris non solum sua quae
D iniqui patris imitator n(on) solu(m) sua / qu(a)e
B iniqui patris imitator n(on) solu(m) sua qu(a)e /
S iniqui patris / non solu(m) sua qu(a)e

CCL addidit, sed etiam patris peccata persoluat;
D addidit: s(ed) etia(m) patris peccata p(era)soluat:~
B addidit: sed &ia(m) patris peccata p(era)soluat:~
S addidit: sed &ia(m) patris peccata / p(era)soluat:~

CCL cum uii patris quibus iratum Dominum non
D cu(m) uii patris quib(us) iratu(m) d(omi)n(u)m / n(on)
B cu(m) uii patris quibus / iratu(m) d(omi)n(u)m n(on)
S cu(m) uii patris quib(us) iratu(m) d(omi)n(u)m non /

CCL ignorat, etiam suam adhuc malitiam adiungere
D ignorat: etiam sua(m) adhuc malicia(m) adiungere.
B ignorat: &ia(m) sua(m) adhuc malitia(m) adiungere
S ignorat: &ia(m) sua(m) adhuc malitia(m) adiungere /

CCL non formidat. Et iustum est ut qui sub
D n(on) formidat: Et iustu(m) (est) ut / q(ui) sub
B non for / midat: Et iustu(m) est ut qui sub
S non formidat: Et iustu(m) (est) ut qui sub
B parentum: It is possible that the scribe mistook is (with a long s) for u, particularly with the minims of iniquitatem to follow. This version is also grammatically correct, changing merely from the singular to the plural, but the singular is more likely to be correct here, as quisquis refers to one son of the one father.

D, B imitator: This is probably an interpolated gloss, but it changes the meaning of the sentence slightly, from "the sinful son of the sinful father" to "the sinful son, imitator of the sinful father". This version appears in the Norman MSS of CCL.

D maliciam: This confusion of c and t is a common one at this time, and many examples of it occur in this MS.
CCL districto iudice uias parentis iniqui non timet
D districto iudice uias parentis iniqu(i) non timet
B districto iudice uias parentis ini/qui non timet
S districto iudice uias parentis iniqu(i) non timet

CCL imitari, cogatur in uita praesenti etiam
D imitari, cogat(ur) in uita pr(a)e/entia(m)
B imitari, cogatur in uita presenti &ia(m)
S imitari, cogatur in uita prae/entia(m)

CCL culpas parentis iniqui persoluere. Vnde et illic
D culpas parentis iniqu(i) persoluere. Unde & illic
B culpas / parentis iniqui persoluere. Unde & illic
S culpas parentis iniqu(i) / persoluere. Vnde & illic

CCL dictum est: Anima patris mea est, et anima filii mea
D dictum (est) Anima patris mea est, anima filii mea
B dictum est, anima / patris mea est, anima filii mea
S dictum (est) An.ima filii / mea est anima patris mea

CCL in carne nonnumquam filii etiam ex patris
D in carne n(on)nunqua(m) filii etiam ex patris
B in carne n(on)nunqua(m) filii &ia(m) ex patris
S in carne n(on)nunqua(m) / filii &ia(m) ex patris

CCL plerumque a daemonibus arripiuntur, nisi quod
D plerunq(ue) demonibus arripiunt(ur) n(isi) q(uo)d
B pleru(m) que de / monibus arripiuntur. Nisi q(uo)d
S pleru(m) q(u)e demonib(us) arripiunt(ur). n(isi) q(uo)d
S Anima filii...anima patris: *

S peccati erit: This mistake would require the obscurity of only one letter, u, which the scribe here has replaced with ti. It is possible that the scribe interpreted this as meaning "the soul which is of sin", not a very likely variation.

D nequicia: see 1.69 above.

D est enim: This version is not notable except in that D has it in common with CCL's MS M. B fii: This would be an easy mistake to make, particularly after paruuli, as the scribe would then have written all the letters of filii but not in the right order.

D,B,S om.a: Small words are easily lost, and the scribes of this tradition may have felt this one to be unnecessary. It is also omitted by CCL's MS K, while two of the Norman MSS replace it with de.
CCL caro filii ex patris poena multatur? In
D caro filii ex patris poena multat(ur).
B caro filii ex patris p(a)ena multat(ur).
S caro / filii ex patris p(a)ena multat(ur).

CCL semetipso enim percutitur pater iniquus et
D semetipso eni(m) p(er)cutit(ur) pat(er) iniquu(us) &
B semetipso eni(m) p(er)cutit(ur) pat(er) iniquus &
S semetipso / eni(m) p(er)cutit(ur) pat(er) iniquus &

CCL percussionis uim sentire contemnit.
D per(cussionis uim sentire con)te(m)nit.
B per(cussionis uim sentire / contempnit.
S per(cussionis uim sen- / tire contempnt.

CCL Plerumque percutitur in filiis ut acrius
D Plerunq(ue) / p(er)cutit(ur) in filíis ut graui(us)
B Pleru(m)q(ue) p(er)cutit(ur) in filiis ut acrius
S Pleru(m)q(ue) p(er)cutit(ur) in filiis ut / acri(us)

CCL uratur; et dolor patris carni filiorum redditur,
D urat(ur). & dolor patris carni filior(um) reddit(ur).
B urat(ur) & dolor pa / tris.
S urat(ur) & dolor patris carni filior(um) reddit(ur).

CCL quatenus per filiorum poenas mens patris
D quatin(us) / p(er) filior(um) poenas. mens patris
B
S quaten(us) p(er) filior(um) paenas mens patris

CCL iniqua puniatur. Cum uero non paruuli, sed
D iniq ua puniat(ur). Cu(m) u(ero) n(on) paruuli. s(ed)
B iniqua puniat(ur); Cu(m) uero non paruuli sed
S iniqua puni / atur Cum uero non paruuli sed

CCL iam proiectiores filii ex parentum culpa
D iam p(ro)uectiores / filíi ex parentu(m) culpa
B iam proiectiores / filii ex parentum culpa
S iam p(ro)ectiores / filii ex parentu(m) culpa

CCL feriuntur, quid aliud aperte datur intellegi,
D feriunt(ur). quid aliud ap(er)te dat(ur) intelligi.
B feriunt(ur)- quid aliud ap(er)te dat(ur) intelligi /
S feriunt(ur). quid aliud ap(er)te / dat(ur) intelligi.

CCL nisi quod illorum etiam poenas luunt,
D nisi q(uo)d illo- / ru(m) etia(m) poenas luunt.
B nisi quod illor(u)m &ia(m) p(a)enas lu.unt
S n(isi) q(uo)d illor(um) &ia(m) poenas luunt. /
84  **D grauius:** This could be a fair attempt to transcribe something illegible in the exemplar, or it could be the swapping of a word for its gloss.

85-86  **B om. carni...patris:** This is an example of a line lost through parablepsy.

88  **S profectiores:** This is a spelling variation possibly arising from pronunciation, which this MS has in common with CCL's MS M. However, here it has the effect of changing the meaning from "sons more advanced in age" to "sons who are more successful", which seems unlikely.

89  **D,B,S intelligi:** see 1.6 above.
quorum facta secuti sunt? Vnde et recte dicitur:
De quor(um) facta secuti sunt unde & recte dicitur:
S quor(um) facta secuti sunt unde & recte dicitur:

Vsque ad tertiam et quartam progeniem.
D usq(ue) ad t(er)cia(m) & quarta(m) p(ro)genie(m).
B usq(ue) ad tertia(m) & quarta(m) p(ro)geniem;
S usq(ue) ad tertia(m) & quarta(m) p(ro)genie(m)

Quia enim usque ad tertiam et quartam
D Quia enim usq(ue) ad t(er)cia(m) & q(ua)rta(m)
B Quia enim usq(ue) ad t(er)cia(m) & quarta(m)
S Quia enim usq(ue) ad tertia(m) & quarta(m)

progeniem, eam quam imitantur filii
D p(ro)genie(m), ea(m) q(uam) imitent(ur) filii
B progeneriem eam qua(m) imitantur / filii
S p(ro)geniem ea(m) qua(m) imitantur / filii

parentum uita possunt uidere, usque ad eos
D pa / rentu(m) uita(m) possunt uid(er)e usq(ue) ad eos
B parentu(m) uita(m) possunt uid(er)e usq(ue) ad eos
S parentu(m) uita(m) possunt uid(er)e usq(ue) ad eos

ulti extenditur qui uiderrunt quod male
D ulti extendit(ur) q(u)a(e) mala
B ulti extendit(ur) / qui uiderrunt quod male
S ulti extendit(ur) qui uiderrunt q(u)a(e) mala

seque / rent(ur)
D seque / rent(ur)
B seque / rent(ur)
S seque / rent(ur)

Lib. XVIII, 41-42:

omni uirtute sit uacuus: Frustra conflauit
S Om(n)i uirtute / sit uacuus frustra conflauit
Y omni uirtute sit uacuus, frustra conflauit

conflator, malitiae enim eorum non sunt
S conflator / maliti(a)e eni(m) eor(um). n(on) sunt
Y conflator malitiae enim eorum non sunt

consumptae. Ecce ignis exterius conflans et
S consu(m)pt(a)e. Ecce ignis / exterius conflansi &
Y consumptaee ecce ignis exterius conflans / et

durae passionis admonet poenam, et tamen erroris
S dur(a)e passionis admonet / poena(m) & tam(en) erroris
Y durae passionis admonet poenam et ta / men erroris
D terciam: see 1.69 above.

D terciam: see 1.69 above.

D imitentur: *

D quae mala: This changes the meaning of the end of this sentence from "...who saw what they had wickedly followed" to "...who saw what evils would follow". The variation would occur easily, but it seems that the version in B and S fits the context better. It seems that CCL's MS K also has quae here.

Lib. XVIII, ch. 41-2: This passage talks of the necessity for Christian charity rather than just good works for membership of the Christian Church. It expounds the beginning of Job 28, and covers the text of the fragment Beinecke 516 (our Y).

Y uacus: This is a rare spelling variation: the OLD cites only one example, in MSS of Celsus, but accepts it as viable.

S conflansi: *
non excoquit culpam, et tormenta

CCL
S non ex quo quid culpa(m) / & ta tormenta
ta

Y non ex coquet culpam et tormenta

103

CCL
S crudelium dat poenarum, et bonorum non facit

Y crudelium dat poenarum et bonorum / non facit

104

CCL
S incremen(ta) meritor(um). Huius etiam

Y incrementa meritorum huius etiam

105

CCL
S conflationis ignis qui extra catholicam

Y conflationis ignis qui extra catholicam

106

CCL
S toleratur Ecclesiam, quam nullius

Y toleratur ecclesiam quam nullius

107

CCL
S omnino uirtutis sit, Paulus apostolus insinuat,

Y omnino uir/tutis sit. paulus apostolus insinuet

108

CCL
S dicens: Si tradidero corpus meum ut ardeat,

Y dicens. / si tradidero corpus meum ut ardeat

109

CCL
S caritatem autem non habeam, nihil mihi

Y caritatem autem non habeam nihil mihi

110

CCL
S prodest. Alii quippe praua de Deo sentiunt; alii

Y prodest. / alii quippe praua de d(e)o sentiunt. / alii

111

CCL
S recta de auctore tenent; sed unitatem cum

Y recta / de auctore tenent sed unitatem cum

(Beinecke 516 (f.) verso).

112

CCL
S constat quia proximum non amat, quem habere

Y constat quia proximum non amat quem have

113

CCL
S sociu(m) recusat. Quisquis ergo ab hac unitate

Y socium recusat quis quis ergo ab hac unitate
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S ex quo quid: It is possible that this was rendered *exquoquit* in the exemplar, the *qu* being an unusual but not unknown alternative spelling for *c* (it is spelt this way by Ambrose and Jerome: see *TLL* 1280-1282), or the word could even have been spelt *exquoquid*, as *t* has been known to be replaced by *d*. Whichever spelling was used, the scribe was clearly unfamiliar with the word and has turned the letters into Latin words as best he could, regardless of the sense produced. S ta: *

S om. Paulus apostolus: This is a slightly strange omission. Possibly the scribe thought it unnecessary to give the source of the quotation, which is a well-known one, or perhaps the phrase is in fact an interpolation in *Y* and the MSS used in *CCL*, but it is odd, then, that it did not find its way into *S*. *Y* insinuet: *CCL*’s MS *C* (*s.x²* and *xi*, two codices from Monte Cassino, containing libb.XVII-XXII, XXVIII-XXXV) also has this variation.

S abeam: The omission of the aspirate is a typically southern continental spelling variation, probably influenced by an Italian, French or Spanish exemplar: the MS certainly seems to have a number of readings in common with *CCL*’s *M*, which was copied in Spain. *S* is not consistent in the use of aspirates. The use of the word *habeam* is
interesting here, where it comes in the middle of a quotation from St. Paul's first letter to the Corinthians, Chapter 13, v.3. As Cora Lutz points out [12], the Beinecke fragment has habeam as a recension to the old Itala version of the Bible, while the Vulgate has habuero. However, our other text and the printed edition have the same reading (apparently with no dissensions among the MSS used in CCL), seeming to indicate that either Gregory used the Itala version himself, or this is a very early and common "correction" to the text (see 1.2 above).

110 S qui: Possibly this is a rendering of something only partly legible in the exemplar: if so, the scribe did not consider the balance of alii...alii in his efforts.

112 Y habe: A later hand has filled in re at the end of the line. Possibly the scribe meant to add an abbreviation mark of some sort.
CCL matris Ecclesiae, siue per haeresim de Deo
S matris ecclesi(es)i(a)e siue p(er)heresi(m) de d(e)o
Y matris ecclesiae siue per heresem de d(e)o

CCL peruersa sentiendo, seu errore schismatis
S p(er)uersa / sent'ilendo. seu errore scismatis
Y per / uersa sentiendo seu errore scismatis

CCL proximum non diligendo diuiditur, caritatis
S proxi / mum non diligendo diuidit(ur) caritatis
Y proximum non diligendo diuiditur caritatis

CCL huius gratia priuatur de qua hoc quod
S hui(us) gratia / p(ri)uat(ur). De qua hoc qu(o)d
Y huius / gratia priuatur de qua hoc quod

CCL praemisimus Paulus dicit: Si tradidero
S praemisim(us)- paulus dic(it)- / Si tradidero
Y praemisim / paulus dicit- si tradidero

CCL corpus meum ut ardeat, caritatem autem non
S corp(us) meu(m) ut ardeat caritate(m) / aut(em) n(on)
Y corpus meum ut / ardeat caritatem autem non

CCL habeam, nihil mihi prodest. Ac si aperta uoce
S habea(m) nichil m(ihi) p(ro)dest. Ac si ap(er)ta / uoce
Y habeam nihil mihi / prodest Ac si aperta uoce

CCL diceret: Extra locum suum conflationis mihi
S diceret. ext(ra) locum suu(m) conflati- / -onis m(ihi)
Y diceret extra locu(m) / suum conflationis mihi

CCL ignis adhibitus tormento me cruciat, mundatione
S ignis adhibit(us). torm(en)to me cruciat / mundatione
Y ignis adhibitus tormen't'o / me cruciat mundatione

CCL non purgat. Hunc omnes sanctae pacis amatores
S n(on) purgat. Hunc om(ne)s s(an)c(ta)e / pacis amatores
Y non purgat hunc / omnes s(an)c(tae) pacis amatores

CCL summo studio locum quaerunt, hunc quaerentes
S su(m)mo studio locu(m) quer(unt). / hunc querentes
Y summo studio / locum quaerunt hunc quaerentes

CCL inueniunt, hunc inuenientes tenent,
S inueniunt. hunc inueni- / entes tenunt.
Y in / ueniunt hunc inuenientes tenent
118 Y praemisim: A later hand has added us at the end of the line. See 1.112 above.

120 CCL, S, Y habeam: for the use of habeam here, see 1.109 above. S nichil: This is a standard alternative spelling, usually more likely to be continental than insular.

125 S tenunt: *
Lib. XXI, 12:

126
CCL manifestat, dicens: Hoc enim nefas
C manifestat dic(en)s: Hoc eni(m) nefas /
S manifestat dicens hoc enim nefas
P ....................cens..... / hoc.....efas

127
CCL est et iniquitas maxima; ignis est usque ad
C est.& iniquitas maxima. Ignis est usq(ue) ad
S est./ & iniquitas maxima. ignis est usq(ue) ad
P est et iniquita/

128
CCL perditionem deuorans et omnia eradicans
C p(er)diti / one(m) deuorans & om(n)ia eradicans
S p(er)di- -tionem deuorans & om(n)ia eradicans /
P perditionem deuorans et o./

129
CCL genimina. Hoc inter peccatum distat et crimen
C genimina: / Hoc int(er) peccatu(m) distat & crim(en).~
S genimina*. hoc inter peccatum distat & / crimen.
P hoc inter peccatum distat et crim./

130
CCL quod omne crimen peccatum est, non tamen
C q(uo)d om(n)e crimen / peccatu(m) est. n(on) tamen
S quod omne crimen peccatum (est) / non tamen
P peccatum est non tamen

131
CCL omne peccatum crimen. Et in hac uita multi
C om(n)e peccatu(m) crim(en). Et in / hoc uita multi
S om(n)e peccatum crimen.* & / in hac uita multi
P omne pec/ uita multi

132
CCL sine crimine, nullus uero uiuere sine peccatis ualet.
C sine crimine* nullus u(ero) esse sine / peccatis ualet.
S sine crimine. nullus / uero esse sine peccatis ual&;
P sine crimine nullus u/

133
CCL Vnde et praedicator sanctus, cum uirum
C Vnde & pr(a)edicator s(an)c(tu)s. cu(m) uiru(m) /
S Vnde & / predicat(s)or s(an)c(tu)s cum uiru(m)
P unde et praedicator s(an)c(tu)s cu./

134
CCL dignum gratia sacerdotali describeret,
C dignu(m) gr(ati)a sacerdotali describeret.*
S dignum gr(atia)e / sacerdotali describer&.
P sacerdotali describeret

135
CCL nequaquam dixit: Si quis sine peccato; sed: Si quis
C nequaqua(m) / dixit. si quis sine peccato. sed si quis
S nequaquam / dix(it) si quis sine peccato sed si quis
P nequaq./
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Lib. XXI, ch. 12: This passages expounds Job 31, vv.11-12. It differentiates between venial and mortal sin, and shows how the flames of corruption can destroy even that which was done well. In the final section, the author discusses the difficulties involved in giving to the poor and the rewards therefrom. This covers the text in the fragment Pierpont Morgan G.30, our P.

131 C hoc: *

132 C, S esse: CCL's MS M and the Maurists have this reading. It could easily have arisen from the sensible interpretation of an illegible word in an exemplar: esse is a more common word than uiuere. However, uiuere could easily have been generated from u esse or uero esse, particularly after uita in the line above. The passage in St. John's Gospel about the woman taken in adultery (ch. 8, 7) reads: Qui sine peccato est uestrum, primus in illam lapidem mittat, so there is precedent for the use of esse with sine peccato/is.

134 S gratiae: CCL's MS M has gratie, as does their MS C, but corrected. The distinction between these endings might well have meant little to a scribe of this period, and it is unusual to see a correction of this sort.
136 CCL sine crimine est. Quis uer(e) esse sine peccato
C sine crimine / est. Quis u(e)ro esse sine peccato
S sine / crimine est. Quis uer(e) esse sine peccato /
P sine crimine. / peccato

137 CCL ualeat, cum Ioannes dicat: Si dixerimus quia
C ualeat "cu(m) ioh(anne)s dicat. / si dixerimus qu(ai)a
S ualeat cum iohannis dicat. / si dixerimus q(uia)
P ualeat cum iohannes dica/

138 CCL peccatum non habemus, nos ipsos seducimus et
C peccatu(m) non habemus· nos ipsos / seducimus· &
S peccata non habemus noms& / ipsos seducimus· &
P peccatum non habemus nos ipso/

139 CCL ueritas in nobis non est. In qua uidelicet
C ueritas in nob(is) n(on) est. In qua uide / licet
S ueritas in nobis non est: / in qua uidelic&
P tas in nobis non est in qua uidelic/

140 CCL peccatorum et crimini distinctione pensandum
C peccator(um) & crimini(m) distinctione pensan / d(u(m)
P peccatorum & crimini(m) / distinctione pensandum

141 CCL est quia nonnulla peccata animam polluunt,
C est q(ui)a nonnulla peccata anima(m) polluunt.
P peccata animam polluunt

142 CCL nam crimina extinguunt. Vnde beatus Iob crimem
C na(m) / crimima extingunt. Vnde beatus iob crim(en)
P nam cr/ unde beatus iob crimem

143 CCL luxuriae definiens, ait: Ignis est usque ad
C luxu / ri(a)e definiens ait. Ignis est usq(ue) ad
P luxuriae/ est usque ad

144 CCL perditionem deuorans, quia nimirum reatus
C p(er)ditio(m) de / uorans. Quia nimiru(m) reatus
P pe.ditionem de.or/ tus

145 CCL facinoris non solum usque ad inquinationem
C huius facinoris n(on) / usq(ue) ad inquinatione(m)
P facinoris non usque ad in.in/
S iohannis: see 1.2 above. **CCL, C, S quia:** The Vulgate has *quoniam* (see 1.2 above). Each seems to make sense in the context.

S peccata: This version makes sense, but is not that of the Vulgate, and may just be a misreading of *peccatū*. **S nosmet:** The Maurists have this reading, which appears in some Old Latin versions of the Bible [13]: the others seem to have *nos ipsos* while the Vulgate has *ipsi nos*. For variations in Biblical readings in *Moralia*, see the passage at the end of this section.

S animum: On the whole it seems more likely that sins would pollute the soul rather than the mind, although S's mistake is evidence of the fine line drawn between the meanings of these two words.

C huius: This makes *facinoris* much more specific, referring back to *crimen luxuriae* (11.142-3), and does not spoil the sense: **PL** also has this reading. **C, S, P om. solum:** *non solum* is so set a phrase that it is tempting to think that the MSS on which the **CCL** reading is based have interpolated *solum*, but it changes the sense. **Non usque...sed usque,** which is how the passage continues, draws a contrast between the two punishments, rather than explaining that not only the lesser but also the greater will happen. **CCL's MSS M and C also omit solum.**
habitationem Dei? Si ergo per cordis
C habitationem Dei? Si (ergo) p(er) cordis
S habitationem Dei? si ergo p(er) cordis
P tionem di si erg/

munditiam libidinis flamma non extinguitur,
C munditiam libidinis / fla(m)ma non extinguitur.
S munditiam libidinis / fla(m)ma non extinguitur.
P si ergo per cordis

incassum quaelibet uirtutes oriuntur, sicut per
C incassum / quaelibet uirtutes oriuntur.
S incassum / quaelibet uirtutes oriuntur.
P tur sicut per

Moysen dicitur: Ignis exarsit ab ira mea et
C moysen dicitur. Ignis exarsit ab ira mea et
S moysen / dicit(ur) ignis exarsit ab ira mea
P mosen dicitur ignis ex /

ardebit usque ad inferos deorsum; comedet
C ardebit usq(ue) ad infernus deorsu(m) / Comedet
S ardebit / usq(ue) ad inferos deorsum /
P debit usque ad inferos deorsum /

terram et nascentia eius. Ignis quippe terram
C terra(m) & nascentia eius. Ignis q(ui)ppe t(er)ra(m) /
S t(er)am & nascentia eius; Ignis quippe terram /
P ascentias eorum ignis quippe terram /

atque eius nascentia comedit, cum libido carnem,
C atq(ue) eius nascentia comedit. cu(m) libido carne(m) /
S atq(ue) eius nascentia comedit. cu(m) libidino / carne(m)
P s comedit cum libido carnem

atque per hanc omnia bene acta consumit. Nam
C atq(ue) p(er) hanc om(n)ia bene acta consumit. Na(m)
S atq(ue) p(er) hanc om(n)ia bene acta con / -sumit; Nam
P atque /

quicquid prodit ex fruge rectitudinis, hoc
C q(ui)cq(ui)d / p(ro)dit ex fruge rectitudinis hoc
S quicquid p(ro)dit ex fruge rec / -titudinis / hoc
P quidquid prodit /

nimirum concremat flamma corruptionis. Dicat
C nimiru(m) concre / mat fla(m)ma corruptionis. Dicat
S nimirum concremat / flamma corruptionis; Dicat
P nimirum concremat flamma /
If the usual abbreviation mark was there, it is now invisible as it has been cut off.

-mundicia: -ti- and -ci- are frequently interchanged around this time. The scribe probably failed to see the abbreviation mark above the a.

CCL, C, S, (P apparently) Ignis exarsit...
nascentia eius: The Vulgate version of this differs considerably: Ignis succensus est in fureore meo, et ardebit usque ad inferni nouissima: deuorabitque terram cum germine suo (see 1.2 above).

C infernum: The scribe possibly thought that infernum and deorsum had to agree, or else simply confused the endings. The passage's topic with mentions of ignis and ira may have led the scribe's mind to wander towards thoughts of hell.

S comedit: CCL's M also has this spelling. It may have been influenced by the use of comedit in 1.152 below, or it is possible that the scribe did not differentiate between the two endings.

P -ias eorum: This is not right, as nascentia is already accusative plural. CCL's MSS M and C have nascentias, as do two minor codices and three codices of Paterius, Liber Testimoniorum. None of these, however, seems to have eorum, which must have been influenced by the scribe's attempt to pluralize nascentia. The Vulgate has cum germine...
suon (see 1.2 above).

P -s: see 1.151 above. Exactly the same MSS are involved here. S libidino: *
156
CCL ergo: Ignis est usque ad perditionem deuorans
C (ergo): Ignis est usq(ue) / ad p(er)ditione(m) deuorans.
S (ergo) ignis (est) / usq(ue) ad p(er)ditionem deuorans
P ergo ignis est usque ad perditionem /

157
CCL et omnia eradicans genimina, quia si
C & om(n)ia eradicans geni / mina: Quia si
S & omnia / eradicans genimina: Quia si
P eradicans gen.mina quia si

158
CCL corruptionis malo non resistitur, et illa procul
C corruptionis malo n(on) resistitur. & illa p(ro)cul
S corruptio / -nis malo n(on) resistitur. & illa p(ro)cul
P corrup / stitur et illa procul

159
CCL dubio pereunt quae bona uidebantur. Sed solent
C dubio p(er)eunt· qu(a)e bona uidebant· / Sed solent
S dubio / p(er)eant qu(a)e bona uidebant(ur): Sed sol&
P dubio pere / antur sed solet

160
CCL nonnulllos ad humilitatem uitia sternere,
C n(on)nullos ad humilitate(m) uitia sterne / re.
S n(on) / nullos ad humilitate(m) uitia sternere. /
P nonnullos ad hu/ rnere

161
CCL atque ad tumorem mentis uirtutes eleuare.
C ad tumore(m) u(ero) m(en)tis uirtutis eleuare.
S atq(ue) ad tumore(m) mentis uirtutes eleuare.~/
P atque ad tumorem mentis/

162
CCL Quaerendum ergo nobis est, si beatus Iob in
C Qu(a)eren / dum (ergo) nobis est· si beatus iob· in
S querendum (ergo) nobis est si beatus iob / in
P uaerendum ergo nobis est si beatus/

163
CCL tanta castitatis munditia etiam humilis fuit. Sed
C tanta mundicia / castitatis. etia(m) humilis fuit. Sed
S tanta castitatis munditia &iam humilis / fuit; Sed
P tis munditia etiam humilis fuit /

164
CCL sanctus uir cum alta uirtutum teneat,quam
C s(an)c(tu)s uir cum / alta uirtutu(m) teneat·qua(m)
S s(an)c(tu)s uir cum alta uirtute teneat / quam
P uirtutum ten..t quam

165
CCL de se humilia sentiat, repente aperit, cum
C de se humilia sen.. / at· repente .... ap(er)it cu(m)
S de se humilia sentiat; Repente / apperit cum
P de se humilia /
S pereant: This possibly stems from a misreading of -u- as an open-topped a. C uidebant: It is possible that the scribe did not notice the abbreviation mark in his exemplar, or accidentally omitted it at the end of a line. The version is grammatically correct but unlikely in the context. S, P solet: Possibly an omission mark was unclear, or the scribes thought that uitia was singular, but it is a common word in monastic Latin, so this is unlikely. This version does not make sense.

C om. atque: It would be relatively easy to omit this connective here, particularly as the next word also begins with a. Its inclusion is not absolutely essential. C uero: This possibly arose from the erroneous interpretation of an erased u before mentis, where the scribe of the exemplar had begun to write uirtutis and had then changed his mind. C uirtutis: see 1.2 above.

C mundicia castitatis: *
S uirtute: *
S apperit: *
Lib. XXI, 15-16:
166
CCL subiungit:
C subiungit·
S subiungit;
P subiungit

167
CCL cognoscamus. Sequitur: Si negaui quod uolebant
C cognoscamus. Seq(u)itu(r). Si nega / ui quod uolebant
S cognoscamus Seq(u)itu(r) Si negaui quod uolebant
P / camus/ si negaui quod uol/

168
CCL pauperibus et oculos uiduae exspectare feci.
C paup(er)ibus & oculos uidu(a)e expectare feci·
S paup(er)ibus & oc(u)los / uidu(a)e expectare feci;
P et oculos uiduae ex/

169
CCL Per haec dicta uir sanctus ostenditur, non
C P(er) h(a)ec dicta uir s(an)c(tu)s ostenditur / n(on)
S Per h(a)ec dicta uir / s(an)c(tu)s ostenditur· n(on)
P Per haec dicta uir s(an)c(tu)s os/

170
CCL solum ad inopiam pauperibus, sed etiam ad
C solum ad inopiam paup(er)ibus· sed etia(m) ad
S solum ad inopiam paup(er)ibus / sed &iam ad
P pauperibus sed etiam /

171
CCL habendi desiderium deseruisse. Sed quid si ipsa
C ha / bendi desiderium deseruisse· Sed q(ui)d si illa
S habendi desiderium deseruisse; / Sed quid si ipsa
P sed quid si ipsa

172
CCL uellent pauperes quae fortasse accipere non
C uel / lent paup(er)es· qu(a)e fortasse accip(er)e n(on)
S uellent paup(er)es qu(a)e for- / tasse accip(er)e non
P uellen/ non

173
CCL expediret? An quia in scriptura sacra dici
C expediret~- / An quia in scriptura sacra dici
S expedir&.-'an quia in scrip- / -tura sacra dici
P expediret an quia i./

174
CCL pauperes humiles solent, ea sola aestimanda sunt
C paup(er)es humiles / solent· ea sola estimanda s(un)t
S paup(er)es humiles solent~/ Ea sola (a)estimanda sunt~/
P humiles solent ea sola/

175
CCL quae accipere pauperes uolunt, quae humiles
C qu(a)e accip(er)e paup(er)es // uolunt qu(a)e humiles
S quia accipere / pauperes uolunt qu(a)e humiles
P pauperes uolunt quae/
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C illa: The exemplar could have been slightly obscure at this point. Either version makes sense, and there is little distinction between the meanings at this time.

S quia: This could have arisen from the misunderstanding of an abbreviation. It does not make sense here.
petunt? et procul dubio oportet ut incunctanter
petunt- et p(ro)cul dubio o portet ut incunctanter
appetunt- / et p(ro)cul dubio oportet ut incunctanter /
oportet ut inunctant/
detur quicquid cum uera humilitate requiritur; id
detur quicquid cu(m) uera / humilitate requiritur. id
detur- quicq(ui)d cum uera humilitate / requiritur; Id
litate requiritur id
est, quod non ex desiderio, sed ex necessitate
est quod n(on) ex deside / rio. sed ex necessitate
est quod n(on) ex desiderio / sed ex necessitate
cessitate
postulatur. Nam ualde iam superbire est, extra
postulatur. Na(m) ualde ia(m) / sup(ere)bire est. extra
postulat(ur); Nam ualde / iam sup(ere)bire est. extra
postulatur/
metas inopiae aliquid desiderare. Vnde et
metas inop(a)e aliquid deside / rare Vnde &
metas inop(a)e aliq(ui)d / desiderare; Vnde &
metas inopiae aliquid/
superbe petentibus dicitur: Petitis et non
sup(ere)be petentibus d(icitu)r. Petitis & η(on)
sup(ere)be petentibus(us) d(icitu)r- / petitis & non
tibus dicitur petitis/
accipitis eo quod male petatis. Quia ergo illi sunt
accipitis- eo quod male petatis. Quia (ergo) illi s /
accipietis- eo quod male / petatis; Quia ergo illi sunt
tatis quia ergo illis/
eraciter pauperes, qui inflati per
ueracit(e)r paup(ere)es. qui inflati
ueraciter / paup(ere)es. qui inflati 'p(er)'
per
superbiae spiritum non sunt, quos aperte
sup(ere)bie sp(iritu)m non s(un)t / quos ap(ere)te
sup(ere)bia sp(iritu)m n(on) sunt. / quos ap(ere)te
sp(iritu)m no/
Veritas exprimit, cum dicit: Beati
ueritas exp(ri)mit cu(m) dicit. beati
ueritas exprimit cum dicit. / Beati
primit cum dicit bea./
176 S appetunt: Someone seems to have intended to indicate that this part of the word was wrong, by placing dots above and below it. It would be equally sensible here, but the weight of numbers is against it.

182 S accipietis: S shares this version with CCL's C and with an Old Latin text of the Bible copied in Spain. The Vulgate has accipitis (see 1.2 above). C s: This was probably intended to represent sunt, but the scribe has omitted the abbreviation mark.

183 C om.per: CCL's MS M also omits this word. S inserts it later. Possibly confusion arose because of superbiae, or because of an obscured abbreviation. Without per, the clause seems senseless.
Lib. XXI, 16-17:

186
C CL uiduam exspectare noluit, ut non solum
C uiduam expectare noluit. ut n(on) solu(m) /
S uiduam expectare noluit- / ut n(on) solu(m)
P uiduam /

187
C CL ex munere, sed etiam ex celeritate muneris,
C ex munere. sed etiam ex celeritate muneris
S ex munere sed etiam ex celeritate muneris
P ex munere sed etiam /

188
C CL bonorum operum merita augeret. Vnde alias
C bonorum operum merita / augeret. Vnde alias
S bonorum operum merita / augeret. Vnde alias
P . operum merita augeret /

189
C CL scriptum est: Ne dicas amico tuo: uade et reuertere,
C scriptu(m) / est. Ne dicas amico tuo. uade & reuertere.
S scriptum est. / ne dicas amico tuo uade & reuertere //
        s amico tuo uade et reuer /
P

190
C CL et cras dabo tibi, cum statim possis dare. Sed
C & cras / dabo tibi. cu(m) stati(m) possis dare. Sed
S & cras dabo t(ibi). cum statim possis dare; / Sed
P possis dare sed

191
C CL nonnulli solent exterius multa largiri,
C nonnulli / solent exterius multa largiri.
S nonnulli solent ext(er)ius multa largi- / ri-
P nonnulli /

192
C CL communis autem uitae gratiam repellentes
C co(m)munis aute(m) / uit(a)e gra(tia)m repellentes.
S co(m)munis aute(m) gr(ati)am uit(a)e repellentes /
P ommunis autem uitae /

193
C CL habere pauperes socios in domestica
C habere paup(er)es socios / in domestica
S habere paup(er)es socios. in domestica
P .peres socios in domestica /

194
C CL conversione refugiunt. Vnde beatus Iob, ut non
C conversione refugiunt. Vnde / beatus iob ut n(on)
S conversione refugiunt- / one refugiunt- unde beat(us) iob ut non
P beatus iob ut non

195
C CL solum se insinuet exterius multa praebuisse, sed
C solu(m) se insinuet exterius ... / ta pr(a)ebuisse. sed
S so- / lum
P solum / buisse ..d
CCL, C, S et: This word does not appear in the Vulgate (see 1.2 above).

S gratiam uitae: *

S om. se insinuet... sed apud: As the next section also starts with se, this line was probably omitted through parablepsy. The omission does not make sense.
196
CCL apud se quosque inopes etiam in domestica
C etiam apud se quosq(ue) inopes / etia(m) in domestica
S se quosq(ue) inopes etiam in domestica /
P apud se quos /

197
CCL conversatione recepisse, protinus adiungit: Si
C conversatione recepisses. / nus adiungit. Si
S conversatione recepisse. Protinus adiungit; / Si
P nuersa.ione recepis /

198
CCL comedici bucellam meam solus et non comedit
C comedici buccella(m) meam solus / & n(on) comedit
S comedici bucella(m) mea(m) solus.~ & non come- / dit
P /olus /

199
CCL pupillus ex ea. Scilicet pietati se
C pupillus ex ea. Scilicet pietati se fa / cere
S pupillus ex ea; Scilic& pietati se
P ea /

200
CCL praeiudiciu[m] facere aestimans, si solus comederet
C pr(a)eiudiciu(m) estimans. si solus comederet.
S pre / iuditium facere aestimans. si solus comed(er)& /
P acere aestimans si solus /

201
CCL quod Dominus omnium communiter creasset.
C q(uo)d / d(omi)n(u)s om(n)ium co(m)muniter creasset.
S quod d(omi)n(u)s om(n)iu(m) co(m)munite(er) creass&~
P uniter .reasset

202
CCL Quae prefecto communio conversationis esse
C Qu(a)e p(ro)fecto co(m)munio conversationis esse
S qu(a)e pro- / fecto co(m)munio. conu(ers)ationis esse
P qu(a)e /

203
CCL cum talibus intra domesticos parietes debet, ex
C cu(m) talibus intra do / mesticos parietes debet. ex
S cu(m) talib(us) / intra domesticos parietes debet ex
P cum talibus /

204
CCL quibus aeternae proficiant
C quibus (a)et(er)n(a)e p(ro)ficiant /
S quib(us) / (a)et(er)n(a)e p(ro)ficiant
P quibus aeternae pro /
C etiam apud: The scribe here is trying to balance this phrase more directly with the following phrase, etiam in domestica. It is unnecessary here, but may be an interpolation.

C recepisses, C om.proti-: This is an obscure piece of text, and may have been an attempt to transcribe something illegible in the exemplar.

C buccellam: Insular scribes frequently confused double and single consonants.

C facere praedictum: *
Overview of the quality of transmission in the above MSS:

C  The text of this MS is generally quite good, although there are a few slips (e.g.1.131 hoc) and small omissions (e.g.1.161 om. atque). The scribe confuses c and t here and there (e.g.1.147 mundicia). At one point we have a very confused line where he might have been trying to read something obscure in the exemplar, but he has made little sense of it (1.197 recepisses. / nus).

D  The quality of this text varies from quite good to careless. There are changes in word order (e.g.1.53 adhuc unum), interpolations (e.g.1.13 est) and some mistakes which demonstrate a lack of attention to the sense of the text (e.g.1.21 spiriti). The confusion of c and t is common throughout (e.g.1.92 terciam).

B  This MS has been slightly carelessly produced but the text itself is quite good. Mistakes are minor for the most part (e.g.1.79 fii), although the scribe does omit a line at one point (11.85-6 carn...patris).

O  This is a very well produced text, with very few mistakes or variations (1.18 signari).

S  This MS is of poor quality, with frequent mistakes, showing a lack of familiarity with Latin (e.g.1.175 quia). Word order varies (e.g.1.74...
anima filii...anima patri), and there are many omissions, mostly of small words (e.g. l.9 sui) but also of phrases and at one point of a whole line (l.195-196 se insinuet...sed apud). The scribe's ability to interpret illegible passages in his exemplar varies from adequate to poor (l.75 peccati erit).

This fragment gives the impression of being from an excellent MS. In the part of the text now extant, we have one spelling variation (l.98 uacus) and two small omissions (l.112 -re, l.118 -us).

The text of this fragment is generally quite good, with only one variation (l.151 -ias eorum) and a small omission (l.146 di).

It has been clear from the notes above that where the Bible is quoted in these MSS, the Vulgate text is hardly used at all. Indeed, the texts of other Bibles appear so frequently in texts of Moralia that there has been some dispute as to which version of the Bible Gregory himself would have used. Marcus Adriaen, editor of the CCL edition, refuses to enter into the argument, but quotes Gregory himself as saying in his introductory letter to Leander:

Nouam uero translationem dissero; sed cum probationis causa me exigit nunc nouam nunc
The argument concerning Gregory's own Bible text is studied in Jean Gribomont's "Le Texte Biblique de Grégoire" [14].

The Vulgate version was at Jarrow-Monkwearmouth in the seventh century [15], so it was well-established by the time most of these MSS were copied. However, for several centuries the Vulgate seems to have coexisted peacefully beside at least two older versions, and it is debatable to what extent a scribe would have changed a quotation he was copying to fit the Bible of his choice, so it would be difficult to use these quotations in establishing a stemma.

In the quotations which appear in our passages, no firm pattern emerges, either of consistent use by one scribe of one version, or of Gregory's own selection of a version at any one point. The instances are listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agreeing with Vulgate</th>
<th>Against the Vulgate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>D, O, S</td>
<td>CCL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>CCL, D, B, S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>CCL, D, S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>CCL, D, S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>D, B</td>
<td>CCL, S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>D, B, S</td>
<td>CCL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>CCL, S, Y (Itala)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This is evidence that the use of Biblical texts other than the Vulgate is common in the tradition of this text, though whether this is because Gregory himself used it or because the scribes preferred it is not clear. As S's reading in 1.138 may be accidental, it does not prove that there was more than one version available.

The Insular tradition of this text seems to be very fragmentary, and because of this I have brought in some of the MSS used in the CCL edition, to which I have already referred in the notes above, to give a little structure to some parts. The Insular MSS themselves are difficult to place in a tradition because we have only one full MS, S, so comparison is awkward.

The comparison of the MSS has been divided into four sections: the readings in 11.1-33, in 11.34-97, in 11.98-125, and in 11.126-204.
In 11.1-33, all three MSS seem to have derived from the same source, as *terra* has been used in place of *terrae* in 11.2, 4, 11 and 25.

None of our MSS is derived from any other: 1.13 D *est*, 1.18 O *signari*, 1.7 S *lanimenta*.

DO share the following significant readings: 1.7 *liniamenta*, 1.8 *excelsior est*.

In 11.34-97, all three MSS seem to derive from the same archetype: e.g. 1.36 *qui reddis...filiiis* (with CCL but not with Vulgate), 1.46 *morietur* (with PL and the Vulgate).

None of the MSS is derived from any other: e.g. 1.52 D *solvatur* (this is corrected in CCL's M), 1.37 B *generationem* (with the Vulgate), 1.74 S *anima filii...anima patris*.

DB share the following significant readings: 1.36 damage to *peccata*, 1.42 *obstupere*, 1.43 *ultra uobis* (word order: shared by Vulgate), 1.66 *imitator*.

In 11.98-125, neither of our MSS derives from the other: e.g. 1.107 S *om. Paulus apostolus*, 1.98 Y *uacus*. 
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In 11.126-204, all three MSS seem to derive from the same archetype: 1.145 om. *solum* (with CCL's M and C), 11.149-51 *ignis exarsit...nascentia eius* (not Vulgate).

None of the three derives from any other: e.g. 1.163 C *mundicia castitatis*, 1.195-196 S om. *se insinuet...sed apud*, 1.151 P *-ias eorum*.

CS share the following significant readings: 1.132 *esse* (P lacuna: with CCL's M and PL), 1.137 *quia* (P lacuna: in CCL but not Vulgate), 1.190 *et* (P lacuna: in CCL but not Vulgate).

CCL's M seems to have a certain amount in common with S, a MS showing a strong continental influence, and with readings also in common with CCL's C. M was copied in Spain in around 914 in Visigothic script: an insular scribe, copying this, might well have made some of the careless mistakes that the scribe of S made. The two MSS are a century apart, and S need not have been copied directly from M.

O is said by Ker to be the direct exemplar of Lambeth 56 [16].
Notes to Chapter IV, 3:

2. MLGB. For Ingram and Henry of Eastry, see Ch. III, 3, nn. 2 + 3.
5. Ker, "E.M.M." p. 79n.: Bodley 301 is our Augustine, In euangelium Iohannis, MS B.
6. Durham catalogue, pl. 28.
13. Examples of this are in the Codex Amiatinus in Florence (s. vii-viii, Northumbria) and British Library, Add. 11852 (s. ix).
15. Bede, Historia Abbatum, II, 15. This was possibly not a pure Vulgate edition.
Chapter IV, 4:

**DIALOGI**

(PLLXXVII) The first and third books of *Dialogi*, written in 593, contain the lives of Italian saints, and the fourth points of doctrine highlighted by accounts of further saints. Questions are put by the character of Peter, Gregory's deacon, to clarify certain incidents. The second book, following the same format, is Gregory's famous account of the Life of St. Benedict. The importance of the work in the Middle Ages can be seen both from Bede's comment on its fame and teaching [1], and from Lanfranc's recommendation that monks should hold it equal in authority to their Rules [2]. In his edition of *Dialogi* [3], Adalbert de Vogüé comments briefly on the manuscript tradition of the text:

> Seuls quelques manuscrits très anciens, encore peu atteints par la contamination, sont intéressants.

His text is based on that of Umberto Moricca [4], and neither editor comments on the texts produced or owned in England up to the twelfth century. There are in fact four of these and two fragments, not widely distributed in date of production, ranging through the tenth and eleventh centuries. However, copies of Gregory's book were at the Anglo-Saxon foundations of St. Gall and Augsburg in the eighth century [5], sources which may well have contributed to the English tradition in the centuries following. The surviving manuscripts and fragments are as follows [6]:
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C Cambridge, Clare College 30 (Kk. 5.6) s.xi.med.
A Canterbury Cathedral Add. 32 (f.) s.xi in.
L Lambeth Palace 204 s.xi'
B Bodleian, Tanner 3 (9823) s.xi'
S Salisbury Cathedral 96 s.x
R Rouen, Bib. Mun. 506 (A. 337) (f.) s.x ex.

C Cambridge, Clare College 30 (Kk. 5.6)
s.xi, vellum, 325 x 219mm., ff. 97 + 110, 30 lines
to a page, "in a fine hand".

Contents:
1. S. Gregorii Dialogi
   Incipit prefatis subsequentis libri dialogorum.
   Gregorii (pape erased) de uita sanctorum.
This title is in red, blue and green capitals.
Text: Quadam die nimis quorundam secularium tumultibus
   depressus
There is a remarkably fine initial with dragon-forms in
   outline, and ground of purple, red and green. The first four
   lines of the text are in large capitals, red, black and
   green, the next four are in small rustic capitals, blue,
   green, black and red. f. 2 is now bound as f. 7. f. 3 is f. 5.

   Preface ends f. 7b: didici relatione quod narro. Expl.
   Prefatio. inde sequuntur capitula libri primi dialogorum
   Gregorii.
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Capitula follow on 7b, continued on 5a. Text of Liber I begins on 5a with a fine initial in white, red, green and purple. The first words are in large capitals, black, green and red, and a line in small green rustic capitals follows. Marginal notes of the subjects of the chapters have been added by various hands. Each book has a good initial, and is preceded by capitula. That to Book III has a fine dragon: also that to Book IV. Ends with quire 13, deo hostia ipsi fuerimus. Amen.

Expl. liber dialogorum beati Gregorii (pape erased) urbis Rome.

Omnipotenti . deo . laus . honor . uirtus . et . gloria
2. Incipiunt capitula libri qui dicitur scintillarum
3. Prefatio in librum Prognosticorum Juliani Pomerii Toletane urbis episcopi, etc.
4. Albini solutiones questionum de sancta Trinitate.

(Clare catalogue)

Ker confirms Gneuss' Worcester provenance [7]. The word pape was probably erased in both places in the sixteenth century during the Reformation, when the bishop of Rome was recognized as such but not as the Pope.

A Canterbury Cathedral Add.32

No catalogue entry is as yet available for this fragment, and its mediaeval provenance is unknown. Dialogi is the only
text which appears in it.

Lambeth Palace 204

s.x-xi, vellum, 275 x 181mm., ff.131, 28 lines to a page, black Carolingian minuscule: 2 hands appear. Probably from Ely, since it has the arms of Prior Steward.

Contents:

1. At top of f.1 is (xiii-xiv) Dialogü gregorii.
   In red capitals: In nomine dñi incipiunt / de libro primo papae Gregorii dialogorum
   f.1
   Inc. praeif. libri dialogorum Gregorii papae Romanae urbis de vita scorum.
   guadam die
   "A very fine initial of interlaced work, the lines broken at the intersections: with beasts' heads, of which the inner lines, ears, etc., are drawn in red, the rest being black. There are occasional glosses. Many small initials are filled with red: the names of interlocutors (Gregorius and Petrus) are in red unceials.
   Expl. lib. primus. Inc. capitulatio lib. secundi
   At top of 38b is a gloss on tripedicam: hfunc(?) rap i. ligamentum uel funem.
   Expl. lib. sec. Inc. capitula de lib. tertio
   Expl. lib. tert. Inc. capitula libri quarti
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Expl. cap. lib. quarti feliciter.

In nomine D.N.I.C. Inc. lib. quartus

Rough sketch of a man on 100b. Some rubrics of chapters (rare elsewhere) occur in this Book.


2. In nomine Domini. Inc. liber beati Efrem diaconi qui primus sedit in libro geronticon

The first words are glossed in Anglo-Saxon:

min sar me benet to segen 7 min unrihtþnesse me браед

...дейet ic spîge sar me for...

Then in a good hand (xi?):

Da æfter aeadgares cininges forðsiðe on  świadom gepalce

Below this. The arms of Steward in colour. Hec sunt arma domini Robarti Stewarde Prioris monasterii elien... and below: Francorum Carolus sic uult hec stemmata gessi.

Singula cum ualeant sunt meliora simul.

f.120a is occupied by a large wheel, drawn in black and coloured yellow: eight spokes, which with the tyre are inscribed with verses. The ends of the spokes and the hub are O's in which rude faces are drawn...The same rota occurs in MS.326 at Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, an Aldhelm of about the same date, from Christ Church, Canterbury [James here reproduces the verses on the wheel].

(Lambeth Palace catalogue)

Ker cites the usual inscription and a mention by
Leland to conclude the mediaeval provenance of this manuscript to be Ely [7]. The rota mentioned, aside from the Christian Latin verses, bears a remarkable resemblance to a representation of the Indian Wheel of the Doctrine.

B Bodleian Tanner 3 (9823)

s.xi, small folio, ff.191.

Contents:

Epistola Alexandri III papae ad Rogerium Wigorniensem episc., f.1a
S.Gregorii Magni libri dialogorum. f.2
Praecedit effigies S.Gregorii picta.
Tit. Dialogorum Gregorii papae urbis Romae libri numero iii. de miraculis patrum Italicorum.

In calce,

Explicit liber dialogorum sanctissimi Gregorii papae urbis Romae.

Catalogus librorum forsan possessoris hujusce codicis

f.189b

(Tanner catalogue)

Ker initially attributes the mediaeval provenance of this manuscript to Keynsham, but changes his conclusion to Worcester, a conclusion based on the contents [7]. A passage in mediaeval French appears at the end of the MS.
S Salisbury Cathedral 96

s.x, vellum, 281 x 200mm., ff.111.

Contents:

Dialogi, Bks.II to IV, "very imperfect".

(Salisbury catalogue)

This appears as 46 and 47 in Patrick Young's catalogue: Dialogus Gregorii imperfect. bis. fol. MSS.95, s.xii and 96 s.x. [8]. Its mediaeval provenance is unknown.

R Rouen, Bib.Mun. 506 (A.337)

s.x, parchment, 258 x 164mm., ff.98.

Contents:

..Dialogorum libri II-IV

Commence: (II,12)...tot calices non bibistis...

Finit: (IV,62)...hostia ipsi fuerimus. Explicit liber

S Gregorii de uita sanctorum.

f.98 De quodam imagine Christi. Nam et in isto nunc tempore per credulitatem...-...per obscure noctis tenebras domum.

(Omont's catalogue)

The mediaeval provenance of this manuscript is unknown, although Gneuss mentions Christ Church, Canterbury.
Comments:

Both C and B have Worcester as their provenance, a possible clue as to their history. L and B both have links with France, B in its contents (although these may not necessarily indicate France after the Conquest), L in its script (although even if its origin is French, this MS must have been in England early as it also has notes in Anglo-Saxon in it). L, whose provenance is Ely, has one feature in common with a manuscript from Christ Church, Canterbury: the wheel on f.120. Since this second wheel is in a copy of Aldhelm, it is unlikely to be something that simply went with this edition of Dialogi, and therefore provides us with a strong link between L and Canterbury, which itself was well connected with France. R is only a fragment, containing nothing, apparently, but part of Dialogi, and from the catalogue entry shows nothing in common with any of the others except a French link which is as yet undatable but may form a link between this and both L and B.

Notes to Chapter IV, 4:
5. St. Gall 213, s.viii med.; Augustodunensis 20, s.viii².
6. The following MSS and fragments also exist, although they do not appear on Gneuss' List and I cannot find as
yet enough information about them to be confident about their inclusion:

B. L. Sloane 1044 is a collection relating to printing and engraving, and includes single sheets of old MSS.

Wroclaw Bibl. Uniwersytecka Akc. 1955/2 + 1969/430, possibly Northumbrian, c. 700 A.D. (f.)

Barcelona Biblioteca Capitular s.n., c. 700 A.D. (CLA XI 1626: Lowe says this may have Anglo-Saxon connexions)

Stuttgart Landesbibl. Theol. et Philos. Qu. 628, c. 700 A.D. (CLA IX 1356: Lowe says this may have Anglo-Saxon connexions)

The Wroclaw fragment has been found to have a portion of text not appearing in the PL edition (David Yerkes, "An unnoticed omission in the modern critical editions of Gregory's 'Dialogues'", Revue Benedictine 87 (1977), pp. 178-9).

7. Ker, MLGB.
Chapter IV, 5:

HOMILIAE IN EUANGELIA

(PLLXX) In the first year of his pontificate, Gregory wrote forty homilies on the Gospels, which were read out at various services and in 593 were bound into two books. They were addressed to Secundinus, Bishop of Taormena, in Sicily, and he explains in the prologue to Secundinus that he is writing the homilies because he feels that many people are seizing his explanations of the Gospels too fast, before they are complete, qui prius escas edere appetunt quam plenius excoquantur, so he is now setting out all his exegesis without ambiguity. Such a work would have been popular throughout the history of the Christian Church: a directive issued by Charlemagne to the clergy of his empire in 802 is just one example of instructions to learn homilies for feast days, and it is clear that on the continent at least those who had to preach or read out sermons chose to learn from Gregory [1]. The text has been much copied as a result, yet seems to have changed little [2].

There are six manuscripts extant from our period, including a palimpsest. They were written from the eighth to the twelfth century, which is in itself some evidence of sustained popularity. They are as follows:

C Cambridge, Corpus Christi 69 s.viii
D Durham Cathedral B.III.11 (ff.1-135) s.xi ex.
E Edinburgh, Nat.Lib.Advoc. 18.7.8 s.viii ex.
C Cambridge, Corpus Christi 69

s.viii-ix, vellum, 300 x 218mm., ff.83, double columns of 31 and 36 lines, "in a fine Hiberno-Saxon hand, with initials of Celtic type".

Contents:
Homilies on the Gospels. The Gospel Lections are given in full.

Omelia euangeliorum gregorii papae urbis rom. numero uiginti.sec.marcum

In illo tempore maria magdalene et maria iacobi et solomae - uidebitis sicut dixit uobis

Initial I, in green, pink and yellow, with panels of interlaced work. The ground around it is thickly dotted with red. The letters N ILLO are filled in with pink and interlacing.

The Homily follows:
Multis uobis lectionibus fratres karissimi

The Homilies are irregularly numbered: the last, imperfect, should be the XIth. (on Dives and Lazarus). The initials are of rather rough execution. A peculiar feature is that every page is bordered on right and left and between the columns with lines of red dots, in groups of three. The hand varies
in closeness but may very probably be the same throughout.

(Corpus Christi catalogue)

Bischoff suggests that in this MS there are red strokes added to the abbreviation symbols because the scribes thus emptied their pens [3]. It seems a little unlikely that so valuable a commodity as ink should be used up in so needless a way, unless the scribes did see it as decoration.

CLA II 121.

...Colophons and titles in red, in script of the text.

Punctuation: main pause marked by medial virgula, often duplicated in red, or occasionally by the group ... . Citation denoted by . , in the left margin. Omissions marked by  in the text, by  before and after the insertion in the upper margin (foll. 6, 57). Accents over monosyllables and over long i in final syllables. Abbreviations include the normal forms of nomina sacra, recurrent terms like frās crās (fratres carissimi), the Insular forms h, ṣ, eḡ, ḩ, ṣ, q: , ṭ = autem, con, ergo, est, per, post, quae, tur, and the following: n = non; nēā, nē, nēum (but redemptoris nē, dominum nē) = nostra, -i, -um; nē = nunc; ṣ, ṣp = pro, propter; q:, ġ, quō, qā = que, qui, quoniam, quod; sae = sunt. The abbreviation stroke is, as a rule, duplicated in red. Spellings show Insular faults...Initials of the Insular type, rather crude in design and mediocre in execution,
with interlacing lines, grotesque heads, bull's eye and the usual red dots around the entire letter. The colours employed are green, vermilion and yellow... Capitals enlivened with one or two colours. Vellum the Insular kind, coarse and rough to the touch. Script is a diluted Anglo-Saxon majuscule by a rather awkward and inexpert scribe... For the last line or lines on each page the scribe drops into Anglo-Saxon minuscule.

Written in England, probably in a Northumbrian centre. It is very likely that this was written in a Northumbrian centre, as the north of England had at that time a stronger connexion with Ireland and the Irish influence seen in this script than had the south. The mediaeval provenance of this manuscript is unknown.

D Durham Cathedral B.III.11 (ff.1-135)

s. xi, 313 x 240mm., 159ff., two columns of 33 lines, "more than one large hand... with red headings and capitals, the latter sometimes on silvery blue grounds... F.1 is a paper flyleaf with a note on the contents by Rud.

"Lacking first leaf which contained a list of the 40 Homilies. Followed by another collection of sermons by various authors, details given in Rud's catalogue and by Schenkl, who points out that it agrees in most respects with part of that ascribed to Haymo, Bishop of Halberstadt
It is not certain that this volume is the 'forty homilies' mentioned in the list of Bishop William's library, since the catalogue of 1395 records another copy, now lost; but there is nothing against the identification. At end (ff.136-59) a s.xi antiphoner with music noted...

"There is the early s.xv Durham inscription on f.2, mostly cut off by the binder."

(Durham catalogue)

The provenance of this manuscript is unknown.

E  Edinburgh, National Library of Advocates 18.7.8

"1796. Fragments of St. Augustine, De Trinitate, and of other works. 8th. and 9th.cent."

(Advocates' catalogue)

"Parchment, 34ff., 202-125mm. England, s.viii-xi.

"This manuscript, together with two others in the National Library [4], once formed a single volume, which belonged in the Middle Ages to the Benedictine abbey of Thorney (Cambridgeshire) and in the 17th. century to Henry Savile of Banke (d.1617). By 1637, it was in the possession of Sir James Balfour, and came to the Advocates' Library in 1698 with others in the Denmilne collection. It contains mainly classical verse and prose, together with some mediaeval verse, written in Caroline minuscule scripts of
the late 10th and 11th centuries.

"The manuscript has the particular interest of being in its later part (Adv.MSS.18.6.12, 18.7.8) a palimpsest, one of the few English examples of the practice. Four earlier manuscripts have been identified in the underwriting...(under) Cicero, In Catilinam...appears a fragment of St. Augustine, De Trinitate, in an Anglo-Saxon majuscule script of the 8th century. The text in its original form probably extended to some two hundred folios...The other manuscripts are in Insular minuscule of the 8th or 9th century (passions of SS. Syxtus, Laurence, and Hippolytus), Caroline minuscule of the beginning of the 11th century (a service book, probably a missal), Insular minuscule perhaps of the early 9th century (unidentified).

(Catalogue from the exhibition Treasures from Scottish Libraries exhibit 1.)

This was used in Kurfess' Teubner edition of the Appendix Sallustiana [5]. Ker confirms the Thorney ex libris, and says it was mentioned by Leland [6].

CLA Suppl.1691 (with notes from 1689):

...Abbreviations seen include the Insular symbol Æ = est and the common form p = per. A typically Anglo-Saxon initial, the height of the three lines, projects into the margin. Script is fairly expert Anglo-Saxon minuscule of the Northumbrian type with
descenders ending in hair-lines.
Written apparently in England, to judge by the script...

Ker calls the visible traces of text MSS 1-4. Our Gregory, although unidentified by him, appears to be his MS 4.

Description based on the photograph of 18.7.8, ff.26 + 33. A complete leaf with a written space measuring 195 x 157mm. 23 long lines. Slits (not pricks) as guides for the ruling on each side of the page along the edge of the written space. Script is a loose and rather current insular minuscule, perhaps of the early ninth, rather than the late eighth, century: rounded and upright forms of d; low l (not a feature of MS 1 [Aug. De Trinitate] and probably only near a line end in MS 2 [Passions]); a narrow and pointed.

"Of consecutive words I can read only (f.26) d(omi)ni misericordiae uiscera coniungant and (f.26v) est. Cur hoc nisi ut nos (line 1) and quis quis ei qui in caelo est (line 2). [7]

B Bodleian, Bodley 314 (2129)
s.xii, parchment, 350 x 244mm., v + 99ff., written in England. Presented by Exeter Cathedral in 1602.

Contents:

- 167 -
Prologue

Omeliarum Gregorii xii quaterniones, the 40 sermons...but the last sermon is not transcribed beyond the words implere dicta rennuunt ei, about ¼ being left out. The flyleaves (ff.ii,99) contain parts of a missal relating to Easter Eve, Easter Day, Ascension Day and Whitsun Eve, of the 10th. cent.

Liber Sancti Petri Exoniensis (late 13th.cent.?).

(Bodleian Catalogue)

Ker says that this is written in Norman script [8], and confirms the Exeter ex libris [6].

S Salisbury Cathedral, 132

s.xii, vellum, 247 x 175mm., ff.126.

Contents:

"Lectiones SS.Evangeliorum cum omeliis suis", ie., S.Gregorii Magni. At the end, f.126, is added Gregory's sermon De mortalitate, ad populum in basilica beati Johannis quae appellatur Constantiniana.

(Salisbury catalogue)

This is one of the manuscripts written in the efforts to furnish the new Salisbury library between 1089 and 1125. It is among the forty manuscripts now in the
library but not listed by Patrick Young. The reason for their omission is unknown: some service and law books were omitted because he was uninterested in them [9]. Consequently, this manuscript's mediaeval provenance is unknown.

W Worcester Cathedral Q.21
s.x.

Contents:

IN XPI / OMNI/POTEN/TIS NO/MINE / CONTINENTVR INHOC /
CODICE OMELIAE DE / DIVERSIS LECTIONIBVS / EVANGELII
BEATI / GREGORII PAPAE / VRBIS ROMAE / NUMERO XL. f.1
Inc. prologus ad Secundinum. f.1, Reuerendissimo, etc.
Expl. ibid. certiores fiant.
The capitula follow, ending on f.2v, then the Homilies.
Expl.imperf. l.139v. hanc ipsam corruptibilitatem corporis
appello...

This ending is quite near the end of Homily 40, so that evidently one leaf only is missing from this manuscript, one of the oldest in the Library. This book was formerly bound in oak boards, one half of one of which had been broken off, with the result that the leaves at the beginning have been much rubbed and crumpled. Some writing underneath the title (in a xviith.cent hand) has been practically obliterated. The capitals in the title and the initials throughout are in
Ker says that this was originally in a Continental hand, but that there is twelfth century re-inking and changing of the form of g, as well as the addition of 'tick and point' punctuation [10]. There is no trace of this manuscript's location in the Middle Ages, but it seems to have been in England by the twelfth century.

Comments:
There seem to be two groups of manuscripts here, those linked with Ireland, Germany and the north of England, and those connected with the south of England and the Continent. The Northumbrian group are C (Hiberno-Saxon, and thought by Lowe to be Northumbrian), D (now in Durham, so likely to have had a long connexion with it, as well as having a possible link with Halberstadt) and E, eventually at Thorney, but with Lowe commenting that the script is "of the Northumbrian type". In contrast, there is no reason to link B with the north of England, although its origin does seem to be English: S is almost certainly from Salisbury, but W, although it must have been in England by the twelfth century when it was re-inked, is in Continental script.

The two groups differentiated above have no chronological link, although here, too, we have two groups
of three. D, B and S are all late s.xi MSS, while the others are all earlier by at least a century, but are well spaced out.

Notes to Chapter IV,5:
4. Advocates' MSS 18.6.12 (our Persius MS E) and 18.7.7.
6. MLGB.
Chapter IV,6:

**IN EZECHIELEM**

(PLLXXVI) This text was put into general circulation in 593, in response to enthusiastic demand. It forms two books of homilies on capp.1-4 and 40 of Ezechiel, itself a popular book of prophecy. This text was much copied for many centuries, and we have a strong manuscript tradition, although mainly of incomplete MSS, mostly from the seventh and eighth centuries. Those from England are as usual slightly later than the Continental tradition, in this case almost all from the eleventh century. There are in total eight extant manuscripts of Gregory's *In Ezechielem* which show evidence of having been in England before 1100. They are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Cambridge, Univ.LIB.FF.3.9</td>
<td>s.xi</td>
<td>ex.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Cambridge, St.John's 35 (B.13)</td>
<td>s.xi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Durham Cathedral B.IV.13</td>
<td>s.xi</td>
<td>ex.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Lambeth Palace 96, ff.1-112</td>
<td>s.xi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Bodleian, Bodley 223 (2106)</td>
<td>s.xi</td>
<td>med.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Bodleian, Bodley 707 (2608)</td>
<td>s.xi</td>
<td>ex.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>Windsor, St.George's Chapel 5</td>
<td>s.xi</td>
<td>ex.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Vatican Pal.Lat. 259</td>
<td>s.viii/ix</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**C Cambridge, University Library FF.3.9**

s.xiii, parchment, folio, ff.102, 39 lines to a
"The initial letters are curiously illuminated".

Contents:
Ezechiel I, v.3
Letter to Marinianus

**OMELIE BEATI GREGORII PAPE IN EZECHIELEM**

Begins:

Dei omnipotentis aspiratione...

Ends:

...ad hereditatem perpetuam erudit. Sit itaque gloria &c.

(Cambridge Catalogue)

The date given here fails to tally either with Gneuss' s.xi ex. or with Ker's s.xii. Ker gives its provenance as Christ Church, Canterbury, from its appearance in Henry of Eastry's catalogue and on W.Ingram's list of 293 books from Christ Church in 1508 [1].

---

J Cambridge, St.John's College 35 (B.13)


Contents:

Gregorius super Ezechielem f.1
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Pars prima Ezechielis prophetae.

Et factum es. in tricesimo anno.

f.49 is replaced in a hand of s.xiii. In quires L, M, etc., ff.81 sqq., the hand is very large and tall.

Liber secundus


On f.173b a note on the three Maries.

(St.John's catalogue)

Ker confirms the Bury ex libris, the de refectorio part of which this manuscript shares with B.L.Egerton 2782 and Wisbech 1 [2]. The size of this MS would make it suitable for reading aloud in the refectory. The erasure of the word papae probably dates from the sixteenth century.

D Durham Cathedral Library, B.IV.13

s.xi ex., 245 x 170mm., 30 lines to a page, 163ff., "good late-XIth.-century hand, with red headings and plain capitals in red and blue (on f.96v a washy purple). Ff.7v and 8 have initials drawn in red and filled in with washes of colour. F.6:4 is an added leaf in another hand,
Contents:

"Gregory the Great, Commentary on the Prophet Ezechiel, preceded (f.7v) by a Prologue.

"On f.163 (together with some contemporary notes) is an unusual XIIth.-century inscription Liber sancti Chutberti. The usual inscription of the XII/XIIIth.-century occurs on f.8 and again on f.6; that of the early XVth.-century on f.8, and also a number 18, whose meaning escapes me".

(Ker regards the mediaeval provenance of this MS as unknown, but the ex libris referring to St. Cuthbert can apply to few places other than Durham itself.)

Lambeth Palace Library 96, fols.1-112

(i.e. vol. I) s. xi, vellum, 325 x 225 mm., ff.113, 34 lines to a page, "in a fine clear hand: damaged at the end. The name W.de folkyngham is the only clue I see to the provenance of vol. I. Folkingham is in Lincolnshire."

Contents:

1. Letter from E(gidius) bishop of Evreux (Aegidius du Perche 1170-9) to Alexander III reporting the rejection of the offers made by Henry II to his son. Unfinished. Not in
the hand of the main text. [Here M.R. James transcribes the
letter].

f. 1

2. Beginning of a letter on the same subject in a different
hand. [As before].

lb

3. Table at top of page (viii): Gregorius super Ezechielem:
added W.de folkyngham.

Heading in rustic capitals.

Pars prima Ezechielis prophetae Et factum est uicesimo
- signum est domus Israhel. Inc. omelie b. gregorii
etc. (rubric continued in margin).

Prol. eiusdem operis

Omelias greg. in beatum ezechiel - auidius redeatur. Finit
prol.

Inc. liber primus etc. (red rustic capitals).

De ezechiele propheta locuturus

Lib. II (heading in red rustic capitals). Text occupies
60b - 61b. Then follows a later rubric (as for Lib. I Expl.
lib. primus etc.

Quoniam multis curis

The last leaves are injured by damp in their inner edges.

Ends 112b: hereditatem ad perpetuam e... Sit itaque gloria
et... per omn. sec. sec. Amen. Expl. Lib. II
omelialrum b. greg. papae urbis Romae super
extremam partem Ezechielis prophete, deo gratias.

(Lambeth catalogue)

Ker lists the Llanthony ex libris, and corrects
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his attribution from Peterborough accordingly [1].

B Bodleian, Bodley 223 (2106)

s.xi, parchment, 319 x 206mm., iii + 158ff., "with
coloured capitals, &c...Presented by the Dean and canons of
Windsor in 1612: with library mark."

Contents:

Liber beati Gregorii pape super Ezechielem; the 22 Homilies,
with marginal notes: f.iii, I, bearing the above title, the
preface, and part of the first sermon, as far as aliquando
prophetantis, and ff.154,155, commencing flamma sermo in the
last Homily, are supplied in a 12th.cent. hand.

At the end are added in 12th.cent. hands,

(a): (f.155v.) a letter from Reinaldus Cisterciensis and
Bernardus Claraevallensis to Pope Innocent II...(PL182,
col.552):

(b): (f.156r.) a letter from Archb. T[omas à Becket] to
Alfred Bishop of Worcester, printed by PL199, col.51, as by
John of Salisbury...

(c): (f.156v.) a copy of the foundation charter of the
Benedictine priory of St.Mary in the Isle (S.Maria de
Insula) at Alcester, 1140.

Another early deed was on f.ii, but is almost entirely cut
off. These seem to connect the volume with Worcester.

(Bodleian Catalogue)
Ker confirms the origin and provenance as Worcester, but he would date this manuscript slightly later, perhaps s.xi ex. [1]. However, he points out that manuscripts of this origin and rough date are difficult to place precisely before or after the Norman Conquest as handwriting at first changed so little [2]. The codex was in the possession of St. George's Chapel, Windsor, but formed part of a substantial donation (seventy volumes) to the Bodleian in 1612 [3].

E Bodleian, Bodley 707 (2608)

s. xi ex., parchment, 297 x 206mm., ii + 177ff., "with illuminated capitals, &c.: stained with damp, and in poor condition and injured at beginning". Presented by Exeter Cathedral in 1602.

Contents:

Incipit liber primus Omeliarum beati Gregorii papae urbis Romae in primam partem Ezechielis prophetae quae sunt numero duodecim

with prologue:

At f.91v.

Incipit liber secundus Omeliarum...in extremam partem Ezechielis prophete. (que sunt) numero decem.

(Bodleian Catalogue)
Ker appears to date this as s.xi, but confirms the Exeter ex libris [1], describing this as Norman script [4].

W Windsor, St. George's Chapel 5

s.xii, vellum, quarto, ff.146, 42 lines to a page, "in a fine delicate hand, provenance Christ Church, Canterbury. The ancient press-mark .F. is on fol.1 of the text, and there is a title on the fly-leaf:

Dist. iii² Gra. xiij° dem(onstr). p(rome) added.

Contents:
Gregorius super Ezechielem omelie x [ecclesie Christi Cant. added]

Item [Beda] super parabolas Salomonis libri tres.
(James, "The MSS of St. George's Chapel")

The ex libris shows that this volume belonged to Christ Church, Canterbury [1].

V Vatican Library, Pal.Lat. 259

s.viii, quarto, ff.96.

Contents:
S. Gregorii homiliae in Ezechielem; codex initio
In the copy of this catalogue in the University library of St. Andrews, W. M. Lindsay has stroked out VIII and written VII-VIII, and added "in Anglosaxon minuscule (and half-uncial) by many scribes". This date is unlikely.

CLA I 190:

"Foll. 97 (fol. 1 is a small mounted fragment); 280 x 205 mm. <220-230 x 165-175 mm.> in 23-28 long lines... Colophons in black minuscule or in red majuscule. Punctuation usually the simple point, but ., is used by one hand. Omissions numerous, marked by ⓗ in the text answered by ⓙ in the margin, or by ⓛ in the text answered by ⓕ. Accents on monosyllables. Abbreviations vary somewhat with the various scribes; they include the Insular symbols: ⓝ, ⓞ, ⓟ, ⓠ, ⓢ (and ⓣ) = autem, con, enim, est, per; also b: or b; = bus; ⓝ, ⓞ, etc. = nostri (but normally ⓝ, ⓞ, etc.); omnis = omnipotens; ⓜ, ⓠ = prae, pro; q: and q; = que; ⓡ, ⓞ = quod, quoniam; ⓥ = ter; decorated and filled with colour. Parchment defective and of poor quality, prepared in the Insular style. Written by many scribes, most of whom use mixed Anglo-Saxon majuscule, some pure minuscule, and one hand (ff. 16-18) is clearly attempting to imitate Anglo-Saxon characters. Corrected
throughout in rapid contemporary Anglo-Saxon minuscule...

Written in an Anglo-Saxon centre on the Continent. The last page (fol. 97v) is filled up with probationes pennaer, Insular alphabets, and the tag Omnium inimicorum suorum... found often in Würzburg MSS.

Insular Majusculae and Minuscule, s.viii.

Although this only covers Lib.II, Hom.3-10, it is the oldest extant manuscript source for that part of the text, with a Zurich manuscript the second oldest. It ends slightly differently from the Zürich manuscript in that it adds after the Amen

expliciunt sermones sancti gregorii in extrema parte ezechielis numero decem deo gratias.

Bernhard Bischoff uses this MS to illustrate the state of minuscule around 800 [5]. Its mediaeval provenance is unknown.

Further notes:

The CCL In Ezechielem uses the following manuscripts in its edition:

St. Petersburg, Q.v.I, 14, Corbie s.vii
+ Turin F.IV.1, Bobbio s.vii
Zürich, Zentralbibliothek,
Rh.92, Rheinau s.viii/ix
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Supplementary to this are the Bodleian MSS 223 and 707, used as late codices, and three early printed editions:

Editio Romana 1588-1593
Editio Petri Goussainville, Parisiis 1675
Editio Maurinorum, Parisiis 1705.

At least two of the eight manuscripts (B and E) contain a total of 22 homilies. E's Incipits refer to twelve homilies in Book One and ten in Book Two. V, although incomplete and lacking Incipits to either book, also refers in the Explicit of Book Two to ten homilies in that book, and to judge from the portion of facsimile in CLA (I,90), Homily Eight of Book Two corresponds to Homily Eight, Book Two in CCL, which also has two books of twelve and ten books respectively.

Ker says that he thinks C and W, both of the same date from Christ Church, Canterbury, are twins, or rather triplets with B.L.Royal 4.B.i from Rochester [6].

---
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Notes to Chapter IV, 6:
1. MLGB, James, Canterbury and Dover.
2. Ker, Eng.MSS, p.22.
5. Bischoff, Palaeography, p.94.
Chapter IV, 7:

Works also by Gregory of which there are insufficient copies to form stemmata:

Registrum epistolarum, PLLXXVII. The collection of his correspondence, arranged in 14 books.

C.U.L.II.3.33........s.xii, or.unknown, prov.Canterbury, folio. Also De nativitate Sanctae Mariae, Conversio Berengarii ab heresi sua de sacro altaris, and an imperfect version of letters of Pope Paschal II and St.Anselm.

Durham B.III.9.......early s.xii, or.Durham, prov.Durham, 305 x 203mm.

Bodl.193.............s.xii, or.England? prov.Exeter, 319 x 216mm.

Speculum,

C.Trin.B.4.27 (141)...s.x, or.Insular? prov.Canterbury, 344 x 238mm. Also Isidore, Quaestiones, Augustine, Epistola ad S.Iohannem and an inscription confirming the primacy of Canterbury.

Sal.101..............s.x, or.unknown, prov.unknown (not identified as being one of the original Salisbury books), 331 x 213mm. Also contains Isidore In ueteris testamentum
(part) and Augustine's *In epistolam Iohannis*.
Chapter Five

St. Isidore

of Seville
CHAPTER FIVE
ST. ISIDORE OF SEVILLE

Isidore was born in around 560 A.D., the son of Severianus who may have come from Cartagena on the east coast of Spain. In about 600 A.D. he succeeded to the bishopric of Seville, and remained in that post until his death on the fourth of April, 636 A.D.

His works are scientific and informative, with less emphasis on the pastoral instruction or even Biblical exegesis favoured by the other great Church Fathers. His principal work was an encyclopaedia in 20 books, the Etymologiae or Origines, and his historical works included Chronica maiora, a history of the world to 615 A.D., and Historia Gothorum Wandalorum Sueborum, a history of the Goths, Vandals and Suevi from 256 A.D. to 624 A.D.

The strong Spanish themes of his histories may account for the fact that they seem not to have been widely published in Anglo-Saxon England. We have no surviving copies from this period, even though the Moorish invasions of Spain caused unusual patterns in the spread of his works [1]. The encyclopaedic and lexicographical texts were numerous, however, and, with Gregory, Isidore was the most copied author in England before the ninth century [2]. Just before the Conquest, too, Ker shows that the "right" books were hardly being copied, and the only Church Father in an output of late Christian authors was Isidore. We know that
Bede referred to Isidore's writings in his own scientific works, and we can see from a study of the manuscripts that Isidore's works are frequently grouped with computistical texts and paschal calendars, indicating that probably they were also considered to be serious works with an everyday application: one has only to read Bede's *Ecclesiastical History* to realize how important to orthodox Christians was an accurate calculation of the date of Easter.

All our manuscripts of Isidore's works here which are now in libraries outside the British Isles are from the eighth or early ninth century. It was likely that they were used as teaching aids by early Anglo-Saxon missionaries.

Notes to Chapter V, l:
Chapter V, 2:

SYNONYMA

PLLXXXIII) The PL edition lists the titles by which this work is known: Soliloquia, rarely Dialogus inter rationem et appetitum, and most commonly, Synonyma de lamentatione animae peccatricis. It follows the thoughts of a man, in several of our MSS thoughts delineated as a dialogue between HOMO and RATIO, who laments at the present age but turns from the sins of the world to the mercy of God.

It is written in a style easy to read and understand, even for one whose Latinity was not advanced. There is a considerable degree of rhetorical repetition to emphasize almost every point. Such an easily read text must surely have been a work more appropriate to the presbytery than to the cloister, although its use would be easy to understand in both scholastic and monastic education. There are six manuscripts extant from this period, and evidence for the existence of others. Those extant are:

C Cambridge, Corpus Christi 448 s.x', x/ix
V British Library, Cotton
   Vespasian D.xiv, ff.170-224 s.ix
H British Library, Harley 110 s.x ex.
R British Library, Royal 5.E.xix s.xi ex.
S. Salisbury Cathedral 173 s.x ex.
W Würzburg, Univ. M.p.th.f.79 s.viii
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Contents:

1. Prosper, Epigrammata  
2. Prosper's meditation to his wife, in Anglo-Saxon.  
   
   In nomine d.n.I.C. Inc. prol. in libro synonimae Bedae (sic) Ysidoris spalensis urbis episcopi  
   In subsequenti hoc libro qui nuncupatur synonima  
   Inc. Synonima  
   Anima mea in angustiis est.  
   Lib. II,  
   - tu mihi supra uitam meam placeas.  
   Expl. synonima Ysidori ep.  

Initials are filled in with red. At each paragraph is the letter K in the margin. (Cf. Trin. Coll. O.1.18, O.2.31). There are a good many interlinear glosses, but I [M.R. James] have seen none that are not in Latin.  

4. Versus Sybillae.  
5. De trimoda leonis natura.  
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7. Terribilis ad negligentes inuectio.
8. VERSUS seu hymni Prudentii de historia ueteris et novi testamenti.
9. Septem miraculi mundi (related perhaps to the Charleville MS.220, of s.xii).

Henr. dei gratia Wint. ecclesie minister Rich. archidiacono suo sal.

(Corpus Christi catalogue)

The mediaeval provenance of this MS is unknown. It appears to have been a gift from Winchester, thus explaining the Winchester connexion and also how it left there, possibly for Glastonbury. The manuscript is written in an easily-read Anglo-Saxon minuscule, glossed quite frequently. The initial letters starting the prologue and each book are large and plain but coloured, and the capitals throughout the text and those added by the rubricator are filled in with colour. The letter k, as mentioned above, appears often in the margin and seems to be a signal to the rubricator [1]. Abbreviation is infrequent and conventional:  for qui,  for per,  sometimes for enim, .é. for est. & and other ligatures are commonly used, including  for ae. Punctuation is the medial point, , and . Syllabification is fair. Some of the word-spacing, e.g. ne quis simum in 1.18, seems to indicate a lack of complete familiarity with Latin but a determination to make sense.
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British Library, Cotton Vespasian D. xiv

ff. 170-224, late s.ix, vellum, 55 leaves, 128 x 188mm, 22 lines to a page, written on the Continent, possibly in Italy. "Written in minuscules, rather ragged and uneven; the stems of the tall letters thickened or clubbed. Titles are in fanciful uncials; and, in common with the initials and larger letters of the text, are filled with patches of red and yellow paint."

Contents:

1. LIBER SOLILOQUIORU[M] [sive Synonymorum] S[AN]C[T]IYSIDORI SPALENSIS URBIS EPISCOPI. f. 170b. A few English glosses of the tenth century (see f. 172b) are interlined with a hard point.


3. FIDES S[AN]C[T]I GREGORII PAPE URBIS ROME. f. 218b.


5. EXPOSITIO FIDEI CATHOLICE S[AN]C[T]I HIERONIMI. f. 220

"At the end of the last article (ff. 223b, 224a) was added by another hand what was apparently part of a church service; but the greater part has been erased, and over a portion of the erasure (f. 223b) is written, in an English hand, the common form of computation: Si uis scire quot sint anni ab incarnatione, etc., with an example worked out on the year in which it was written, qui est xiii. regni
eadweardi saxorum regis, A.D. 912.

"On the first page (f.170) also in an English hand of the same period, are written the opening verses of Boethius, De Consolatione Philosophiae, lines 10-22 being written continuously as prose; followed by seven lines, also written as prose, from the same work, lib.I, metr.ii 21-27. These extracts are continued, in another hand, on the last leaf (f.224b), which contains lib.III, metr.viii, and lib.IV, metr.vii 12-35.

"Bound up with a MS of AErfic's Homilies and other pieces in England, of the twelfth century.

(Thompson & Warner, Ancient MSS)

Ker originally attributed the provenance of this to Christ Church, Canterbury, but later decided that this was incorrect [2]. To judge by the date of the computation, the MS was in England by 912A.D. The script is a fluid but untidy minuscule, widely spaced. The ligatures rt, ra, ct, re and et occur in a very forceful style, occasionally even between words. There is a frequent but not consistent use of c in place of t, and the form Í is frequently used for n. Accents are used, and the following few abbreviations appear: ð, ð for per, pro, e for ae, e for est, ſ for non, and qð for quod. & is also used.
H British Library, Harley 110
s.x ex., long quarto, Anglo-Saxon hand.

Contents:
1. Epigrammata Prosperi uiri eruditissimi, sc. Tyronis Prosperi Aquitani, ex Dictis Augustini Episcopi deflorata.
2. Versus Prosperi ad Conjugem suam.

Fol. I et ultimum habent fragmentum Libri ritualis, cum Notis musicis seculi X'.

(Harley Catalogue)

The mediaeval provenance of this MS is unknown. The clear script is made to look untidy by the copious glosses between the lines. The page is long and narrow, and the layout changes slightly throughout the text: where there are more glosses, the text is set out in paragraphs of only a few lines each, wasting a great deal of space, but where there is a space in the line above, the writing below will run up into the space before taking a new line below. All rubrics have a small k beside them in the margin and where, at the beginning of Book II, the initial Q is missing, so also is the k [3]. The few abbreviations used are as follows: p for per, q: for que, e for ae, ee for esse, n for non, c for con, and the ampersand. Some accents are used.
R British Library, Royal 5.E.xix

s.xi-xii, vellum, 228 x 163mm., ff.52, Salisbury.

Contents:
1. S.Isidore of Seville, Liber sinonimi [i.e. Synonymorum], in 2 books, preceded by a prologue; the 2nd. prologue is omitted. (Cf. 5.E.i, art.2, which is s.xii and has both prologues).
2. Homilies, anonymous, in several different hands.
3. Secundum Alcuinam...
4. Commentary (anon.) on the Song of Solomon. At the head of it is a note, apparently in the hand of Patrick Young (who edited Alcuin's commentary), referring to another copy in bibliotheca Iacobaea, and a copy of a fuller commentary in musaeo nostro.

(Royal and King's Catalogue)

Notes from Ker's B, C & L:
This MS contains the writings of scribes A, B and C as distinguished by Ker, and is divided thus: B², who "wrote a distinctive hand of markedly English type", executed the following work: "ff.1-6/4, 6v/1-18v/10, 21/1-34, 23/18-25/29, 26v/1-28v/17, 29/1-34/14, 35/20-36v/26 (end), that is to say most of art.1, Isidore, Synonyrna, and most of art.2 c-m, Homilies..." p.162.
Scribe A wrote "ff.6/4-37. Scribe A suited his hand to Scribe B²'s and wrote smaller than usual."
Scribe C's writing appears on "ff.19/31-38, 19v/34-20v/22, 21v/1-23/17, 25v/1-26/33, 28v/18-32, 34/15-35/20, that is to say part of art.2a, all art.2b, and parts of art.2c-m." p.165.

Patrick Young noted this manuscript in his catalogue as

"31: Isidori synonima / sermones uarii incert. / glossa in canticum Alcuini, in fine Sira sirin explicit. / anon. commentarius in idem canticum 4to. s.xi ex.-xii."

All the text examined here, on ff.4v, 8v and 10v, is the work of Scribe B² at Salisbury. It is a small neat hand, well but closely spaced, with the lines also close together. Some folios are very dark. Few abbreviations are used, the only frequent ones being p for per, c for tur, and the ampersand.

S Salisbury Cathedral 173
s.x ex., vellum, 194 x 134mm., ff.143, 16 lines to a page, Continental.

Contents:
1. Augustine, Soliloquioia f.1
2. Isidore, Synonyma 70

On f.141v is the name 'Aefelmer'. Imperfect at end: last three leaves are torn.

(Salisbury catalogue)
This appears in Patrick Young's catalogue as

13: *Augustini soliloquia...* 8vo. s.x.

If this dating is correct, as it seems to be, it is unlikely that the manuscript is originally a Salisbury production. If it had been, it would most probably not have been considered good enough for the library to keep after it had collected and written its new manuscripts. It is rather more likely that this was imported from some other source, perhaps Canterbury, or from the continent via Canterbury, as with B.L.Add.23944 and Hereford Cathedral O.iii.2, as an exemplar for the scriptorium. This being so, its relationship with the above MS, R, must be examined closely.

It is well and clearly written in continental minuscule on well-preserved membrane, only really damaged towards the end of the codex. Prickings for line scorings remain in the outer margins of some leaves. The capitals of the Isidore text, extending a little below the line, are washed with colour, usually red but sometimes blue and occasionally yellow. There are copious scrawlings in the margins, mostly apparently an aid to speaking the lines aloud. Abbreviations are consistent but not over-used: the following appear: p, -p for per, pro, q; for que, b; for bus (once the abbreviation symbol occurs under the letter at the end of a line), s for sunt, c for con, êê for esse, e for ae, œ for est, ò for tus, the ampersand and the st ligature, and also the amalgamated version of nt, ñ.
No catalogue entry is as yet available for this MS, and its mediaeval provenance is unknown. The first of two scripts in the passages selected is fluid and confident but untidy and difficult to read. The lines and words are closely spaced, the letters of various sizes and executed with great flourishes, particularly in the minor capitals Q, P, A and any ligatures beginning with E. Lower case t and l are also flamboyant. The second script is almost as difficult to read, though the first impression is that it is neater. Again the strokes are confident but here they are longer, the hand narrow, taller and heavily written. The lines become more crowded at the end of the page, and the words more crowded at the end of a line, leaving the impression of poor planning. The membrane is scarred and rough in places, and repaired in others. Ligatures of all kinds are common, and the following abbreviations are used: nomina sacra,  p,  p for per, prae,  pp for propter, the insular  † for enim and  ‡ for est,  ū for non, and the supralinear omission line. This last is the only abbreviation that appears in the first hand, and it appears only once at the end of a page. Punctuation is common but not always clear: a variety of groupings of points and dashes, both ’ and  , are used. Hyphens seem to be used where a word is split over two lines. There are several corrections and erasures throughout the first hand.
Comments:

The origin and provenance of H are unknown, and those of C seem a little uncertain, although probably the origin is south-west England. H contains, in this order, Prosper's Epigrammata, Prosper's meditation with his wife, and Isidore's Synonyma. These also form, in that order, the first three articles in C, although there they are joined by six other articles, all short. A careful study of both texts should show if there is any further evidence of a link between them.

In the following pages, I have collated C, V, H, R and W from microfilm, and S from the actual MS.
Lib. I, capp. 41-43:

1
PL Nihil sane, nihil prorsus, nihil penitus, nihil
C Nihil sane, nihil prorsus, Nihil poenitus. Nihil /
V Nihil sane, nihil prorsus, nihil / poenitus. nihil
R Nihil sane. nihil prorsus. nihil / penitus. nihil
S Nihil sane, nihil prorsus, nihil penit(us). / nihil
W Nihil sane nihil prorsus: Nihil p.enitus / nihil

2
PL omnino, nihil habeo, quod contradicam: cedo
C omnino. Nihil habeo quod contradicam: Cedo
V omnino habeo quod contra / dica(m). C(a)edo
H omnino. Nihil habeo quod contradicam; / Cedo
R omnino. nihil habeo quod contradicam; Cedo
S omnino. nihil habeo quod contra / dica(m). Credo
W omnino. Nihil habeo quod contradicam: C're'do

3
PL ueritati, negare non possum, fateor esse uerum;
C ueritati. Negare non possum. Fateor esse uerum; /
V ueritati negare non possum. Fateor esse uerum; / fateor esse uerum.
H ueritati. Negare non possum. Fateor e(ss)e ueru(m); / fateor e(ss)e ueru(m).
R ueritati negare non possu(m) / fateor e(ss)e ueru(m).
S ueritati negare non possum / fateor e(ss)e ueru(m).
W ueritati negare non possum: Fateor e§§e uerum;,

4
PL quis hoc dubitat? quis istud ambigit? quis istud
C Quis hoc dubitat. q(ui)s istud a(m)bigit. q(ui)s istud
V Quis hoc dubitat. quis / istud a(m)bigit. quis istud
H Quis hoc dubitat. Quis / istud ambiget.quis istud
R Quis hoc dubitat. Quis / istud ambiget. Quis istud
S Quis hoc dubitat. Quis / istud ambiget. Quis istud
W Quis hoc dubitat. / quis istud ambiget. quis ıştud

5
PL negat? Si ita est, si ita existimas, si certum
C negat; ratio / Si ita est. Si certum
V negat RATIO / Si ita e(st). Si certum
H negat RATIO / Si ita est. Si certum
R negat RATIO / Si ita est. si certum
S negat RATIO / Si ita e(st) si certu(m)
W negat:. Si ita est si certum

6
PL habes, si perpensum est, si exploratum est,
C habes. Si perpensum est. / si exploratum est; /
V habes. si p(er)pensum est. si ex / ploratum e(st);
H habes. Si p(er)pensum est. / Si exploratum est; /
R habes. / si p(er)pensum est. si exploratu(m) est;-
S habes. si p(er)pensu(m) e(st). si ex / ploratu(m) est
W habes / si perpensum est si exploratum est-
Passage I: This section orders the reader to tear himself away from his sins, although the speaker fully admits that this is dreadfully difficult, and that he himself cannot see how eternity itself could wash away his sin.

1 S prossus: *

1-2 V nihil omnino habeo: The scribe of V may have considered that four nihil were enough, and that any further repetition might be a mistake on the part of his exemplar. More simply, perhaps, with so many repetitions of the word, the scribe accidentally omitted one where the omission makes sense. S, W credo: This version means believing in or committing oneself to the truth, rather than yielding to it as is implied by cedo. Either version is perfectly good grammatically, but in the context cedo seems the more likely, as the beginning of the passage has the general meaning of discussing surrender to the truth rather than belief in it. W and S seem to have their versions independently of each other, as W would seem to have left England before S was copied and might not even have had the version credo then, as it has been added later. We may assume that the variation was widespread, if not common.

4 V dubit&: The subjunctive rather than the indicative might be equally sensible here, but it
is more likely that the scribe either mistook an a for an e or assumed that & could stand for either et or at. H ambiget: *

C,V,H,R,S Ratio: These MSS present this passage as a debate between Reason and Man, in which this is the beginning of a speech by Reason. C,V,H,R,S,W om.si ita existimas: None of our MSS contains this phrase, so that it must be assumed that it was omitted through parablepsy at an early stage. The PL edition makes no mention of variation in its MSS here, which might mean that it is unlikely to have been an interpolated gloss. Little difference is made to the overall sense.

W explanatum: *
aufer a te iam uitium, a uitio et peccato te retrahe;
Aufer a te iam uitium.
Aufer a te iam uitium(m).
Aufer a te iam uitium.
aufer a te uitium(m).
Aufer a te iam uitium(m).
Aufer a te iam uitium:

fuge iam uitae maculam, fuge uitii cultum, crimen
Crimen
Crimen(en) /
Crimen
crimen
crimen
Crimen

remoue a te; a uanitatis te malo coerce;
remoue a te; a uanitatis té malo coherce. / A uitio &
remoue a te; / A uanitatis te malo coerce / A uitio &
remoue a te; A uanitatis te malo coherce. A uitio et
remoue a te a uanitatis te malo coherce // ce. a uitio &
remoue a te A uanitatis te malo coerce:—A uitio et /

peccato te re // trahe fuge iam uitae maculam
peccato te retrah(a)e. Fuge
peccato te retrahe; Fuge iam uitae / maculam.
peccato te retrahe; / Fuge iam uite maculam.
peccato te retrahe; fuge / iam uitae maculam. fuge
peccato te retrahe; Fuge iam uite maculam;

fuge turpitudinem uitae,
Fuge turpi / tudinem uitae.

iam uitii / cultu(m) fuge turpitudin(e) uitae.
Fuge turpitudin(e) uitae;
Fuge turpitudin(e) uitae.

puritatem uitae tene; ueteres maculas ablue.
puritatem uitae maculas ue / teres ablue;
'im'Puritate(m) uit(a)e / maculas ueteres ablue
Purita / te uitae: maculas ueteres ablue;
Puritate uite / maculas ueteres ablue;
purita / te uit(a)e maculas ueteres ablue(a)e.
puritate:γ Uitae maculas ueteres ablue:γ
Rom. iam: This is the only MS to omit this word, a mistake which might have arisen as a result of the confusion of minims.

7-10 C,V,H,R,S,W move a uitio et peccato te retrahe to after coerce: The highly repetitious style of the author in this passage makes mistakes of this kind almost inevitable. In PL, the clauses seem jumbled in order, whereas in the insular MSS there seems to have been some effort to restore order. In them, all clauses involving a te are put into the first group, te into the second group, and the third contains clauses involving non-reflexive imperatives, fuge and ablue. The insular MSS also separate uitium and a uitio (11.7 and 9), which might well have sounded clumsy to the ear of the scribes copying these MSS. By accident or design, they placed the clause beginning a uitio directly after the one beginning a uanitatis and produced an example of alliteration which fits very well with the rhetoric of the passage, and might indeed be the original version.

9 C,R amoue: This could easily be a misinterpretation of something illegible in an exemplar, which has been passed on from C to R. There is a phrase in Classical Latin, crimen remouere, meaning to attempt to shift a charge (from oneself to another) (OLD), which could
conceivably have been changed to *amoue*, particularly as *amouere* is a good classical Latin word and commonly used in Christian Latin (*TLL* 1975-1977). It can mean to remove suspicion from a person or to remove the threat of punishment (*OLD*), either of which could be seen as similar in sense to the meaning here. However, despite the fact that *amoue* is stronger, *remoue* seems to be more accurate in the context. C & *uanitatis*: Again this and the following & could easily be the misinterpretation of something unclear in the exemplar. Upper case A's in many hands can easily be mistaken for ampersands.

10

**V om. fuge iam uitae maculam:** This may be parablepsy, but see below.

10-11

**V, S fuge iam uitii cultum:** Although both clauses appear in S and in the MSS used in *PL*, and although tricola are common enough in this text, it is possible that one clause is in fact a contorted version of the other. *uitii cultum* and *uitae maculam* look very alike, and the latter version could have been influenced by the appearance of *ueteres maculas* in 1.12. S has both, seeming to indicate that two different sources may have come into the transmission of this text, although the second source was possibly only a gloss.
V 'im'puritatem: The scribe of V, copying puritatem, omitted tene and was left with a sentence abjuring the reader to wash away the purity of life. Realizing that this made little sense, he inserted 'im' before puritatem to improve this. C,V,H,R,S,W om.tene: All these MSS except V read puritate rather than puritatem, so that consequently the meaning of the clause is "wash away old stains with the purity of life", possibly sensible enough. It could further be argued that if the exemplar of some MS used in PL were to have the version puritate uite ueteres, run together and indistinct, that the copying scribe could easily have interpreted puritate as puritatem and picked up tene from the te at the end of uite and the ue, badly written, at the beginning of ueteres. Conversely, however, tene could have disappeared in much the same way, and it seems likely that in fact the PL MSS have the correct version, as two short clauses are more in keeping with the style than one long one: moreover, since the author has just referred to the turpitudinem uitae, he is hardly likely to ask his readers to rely upon the puritate uitae to wash away old stains. C,V,H,R,S,W maculas ueteres: This change of word order is significant in that all our MSS share it.
Bene dicis, bene doces, bene
HOMO RESPONDIT / Bene dices. Bene doces· Bene
instruis· Bene ad· mones. Bene p(er)suades. Bene
ins'trues / bene admones· bene persuades· bene
in's'trues / bene admones· bene persuades· bene /
instru's: bene ad'mones· bene p(er)suades. Bene
in's'trues / bene admones· bene persuades· bene /
instruis· Bene ad 'mones. Bene p(er)suades. Bene
HOMO· / Bene dices· bene doces· bene
insti'tuis; / Ego optabam a peccati nexu resolui,/
its'tiui's; / Ego optabam a peccati nexu resolui.
institui's; / & ego [[op]]taba(m) a peccati nece resolui.
institu'is & ego optabam a peccati nexu resolui.~
institu's; Et ego optabam a peccati / nexu resolui.~
institu'is; Et ego optabam a peccati / resolui.~
institu's; Et ego optabam a peccati / resolui.~
cupiebam a consuetudine mala retrahi,~
cupiebam / a consuetudine mala retrahi.~
cupiebam / a consuetudine mala retrahi~
cupiebam a consuetudine mala retrahi~
cupiebam a consuetudine mala retrahi~
cupiebam / a consuetudine mala retrahi~
.../ Cupiebam a consuetudine mala retrahi:

desiderabam a uitio et peccato recedere, quaerebam
Desiderabam a uitio recedere. quaerba(m) /
Desiderabam / a uitio recedere: quaerem
Desideraba(m) / a uitio recedere: quaerem
Desiderabam a uitio recedere. / quaerebam
Desiderabam a uitio recedere: Quaerebam
Desidera(m) a uitio recedere· Qu(a)erebam
Desiderabam a u(iti)o / recedere· Querebam

usum nequissimum superare. Sed heu! difficile est
usum nequis / simum superare~ / Sed heu difficile est
usum nequissimum superare· sed heu / difficile est
usum nequissimum / superare; Sed heu difficile est
usum nequissimum superare~sed heu / difficile est
usum nequissimu(m) superare. / Sed heu difficile est
usum nequissimum superare~ Sed heu diffi- / cile est
13  C Homo respondit, V, H, R, S homo: see 1.5 above. C, V, H, S dices: This is probably a slip influenced by doces coming after it.

14  V, S, W instrues: see 1.13 above. There is some evidence that the scribes did not always distinguish between -is and -es at this time.

15  V, S, W institues: see 1.13 above. C, H om. et: Et is the kind of small word easily lost at the beginning of a sentence or particularly of a line, as these both are. The following word beginning with E makes the mistake all the more likely. S peccatis: * V nece: It is possible that the scribe thought that what he saw in the exemplar was an incorrect form of the ablative of nex, necis, whereas it is in fact the correct form of the ablative of nexus, nexus. W nexibus: the plural seems unnecessary here.

16  W has an erasure of three letter spaces, but nothing is missing in this text that appears elsewhere.

17  C, V, H, R, S, W om. et peccato: This is possibly an example of parablepsy early in the transmission of this text, so that all the insular scribes omit it.
praam consuetudinem uincere, praus usus uix
praam consuetudinem / uincere. Praus usus uix
peccati consuetudine(m) uincere. / Praus usus uix
praam consuetudinem uincere; / Praus usus uix
praam consuetudine(m) uincere; Praus usus uix
praau consuetudi / ne uincere. praus usus uix
praam consuetudinem uincere:~ Praus usus uix
aboletur, assidua consuetudo in
aboletur. As / sidua consuetudo in
ablutur. Adsidua consue / tudo in
aboletur; / Assidua consuetudo in
abolet(ur); / Assidua consuetudo in
ab- / oletur:~ Adsidua consuetudo In
naturam conuertitur, assiduo usu
naturam conuertitur. / Assiduo usu
natura(m) conuertitur. adsiduo usu
naturam conuertitur; / Assiduo usu
naturam conuertitur. assiduo usu
natura conuer / titur. Assiduo usu
naturam conuertitur; Assiduo- / usu
in naturam mutatur uitium, animus sceleribus
in natura(m) uitium. Animus / sceleribus
in / natura(m) uertitur uitium. Animus scelerib(us) /
in naturatur uitium; Animus / sceleribus
in natu / ratur uitium; Animus sceleribus
in naturatur uitiu(m). / animus scelerib(us)
Innaturatur uitium: animus sceleribus
astrectus diuelli ab eis uix potest; tanta sunt
adstrictus diuelli ab eis uix pot / est. Tanta sunt
adstrictus deuelli ab eis uix potes. tanta sunt /
adstrictus diuelli ab eis uix potest; / Tanta sunt
adstrictus diuelli ab eis uix / potest Tanta sunt
adstrictus. Diuelli / ab eis uix possit. tanta s(unt)
adstrictus diuelli / ab eis uix potest:~ Tanta sunt
in me uitia, ut uix euelli possint, uix credo
mea uitia ut uix euelli possint. / Uix credo
mea uitia ut uix elui possint. uix credo /
mea uitia ut uix elui possint. / Uix credo
mea uitia ut uix euelli possint. uix credo
mea uitia ut uix // elui possint.~ Vix credo
mea uitia ut uix elui possint,~ / Uix credo
19 V peccati: This must be an interpretation of something in the exemplar of which at most the p was legible. Peccati was a good guess, as it is certainly a word used in this text, and the balance of prauam consuetudinem...prauus usus probably did not occur to the scribe. S praua consuetudine: This probably results only from the omission of the omission mark.

20 V abluitur: This verb, meaning to wash off, out or away, or to dispel, to cleanse or bathe (OLD) is almost entirely poetic in application in Classical Latin, but is used more frequently by Christian authors and appears in the Itala (TLL 109). However, it seems rather weak for use at this point. Aboletur, by contrast, can mean to destroy or obliterate, to banish, to efface the memory of, or possibly even more appropriate than these in this case, "to allow (a practice, charge, etc.) to drop" (OLD).

21 S natura: Probably this is a result of the omission mark being left out, but it is also possible that it is influenced by the words assidua and consuetudo in the line above.

22 C in naturam (om.mutatur), V in naturam vertitur, H,R,S,W in naturatur: H,R,S and W show a contraction that makes no sense (even if we allowed that it might be a rare verb, the word
uitium would not fit with the apparent grammar) but which the scribes might have taken to mean "is made natural". In C, the m at the end of naturam is unclear and it appears that it is written over the erasure of -ur. It is glossed Innaturat(ur) uertitur. Either mutatur or uertitur would be susceptible to contamination in this context, and either could be the attempt of a scribe faced with either the version in C or the version in H,R,S and W to make sense of the sentence: it is more likely on the whole that the scribe was faced with the version in H,R,S and W, rather than the version in C, in order that he might have a clue to the original version. Uertitur is a much more appropriate verb than mutatur, as the former can have the meaning of developing and passing from one state to another (OLD), whereas mutatur's closest meaning is changing quality or translating (TLL 1722-1729).

23 V potes: * S possit: This is possibly an attempt to read po...t in the exemplar.

24 C,V,H,R,S,W mea: This is an easy mistake to make, as in me and mea would look similar in manuscript form, and in the context make equal sense. Mea could equally well be the original reading. V,S,W elui, H eleui: All these words could easily be confused with one another. Eleui would apparently
mean to lessen, diminish, relieve or allay, but it is not an existing form of the verb. Elui means to wash away or wash out, and in the case of V, its appearance here is possibly influenced by the use of abluitur in 1.20 above. Euelli would mean to tear out by the roots or get rid of (OLD). If it is wrong, it seems likely that the version in C, R and the printed edition has been unduly influenced by the use of diuelli in 1.23 above. I am inclined to think that elui is the original reading here, as diuelli...euelli...exsolescere is an ordinary tricolon, while diuelli...elui...exsolescere makes a descending tricolon which emphasizes the author's despair at the immutability of his sinfulness.
Lib. II, capp. 5-6:

PL peccata mea ullo spatio temporis exolescere; /  
C peccata mea ullo spatio te(m)poris exolescere; /  
V peccata mea ullo spatio temporis exolescere; /  
H peccata mea ullo spatio temporis exolescere; /  
R pec- / cata mea ullo spatio temporis exolescere; /  
S peccata mea / ullo spatio te(m)poris exolescere;  
W peccata mea ullo spatio temporis exolescere; /  

26

PL Per unum enim peccatum multae iustitiae  
C Per unu(m) / enim peccatum multae iustitiae  
V Per unu(m) eni(m) peccatu(m)· multe iustici(a)e /  
H Per unum / enim peccatum:· multae iustitiae  
R Per unum enim peccatum· multe iusti / tie  
S Per unu(m) eni(m) peccatu(m) mult(a)e ius / titiae  
W p(er) unum enim peccatum / multe iustitiae

27

PL pereunt. Per unum malum multa bona possunt  
C pereunt· P(er) / unum malum multa bona possunt  
V pereunt· p(er) unu(m) malu(m) multa bona poss(un)t  
H péréunt‡ / Per unum malum· multa bona possunt  
R p(er)eunt Per unum malum· multa bona posse dico  
S pereunt· Per unu(m) malu(m)· multa / bona posse  
W pereunt per unum malum multa bona / posse

28

PL subuerti. In id, quod delectatur corpus, animum  
C subuerti· / In id quod delectatur corpus animum  
V sub / uerti· In id q(u)o) d delectatur corpus· animu(m)  
H subuer / ti; In id quod delectatur corpus animum  
R subuerti; / In id quod delectatur corpus· animum  
S subuerti· In id quod de / lectatur corpus· animu(m)  
W subuerti· In id quod delectatur corpus animam /

29

PL non declines,  
C non / declines·  
V non / declines·  
H n(on) declines; /  
R non declines;  
S non declines· / QVI LIBIDINOSUS EST·/  
W n(on) declines·  

30

PL delectationi consensum non praebas. Non des  
C delectationi consensum non / praebas· Non des  
V delectatione co(n) sensum / n(on) prebeas· Non des  
H delec'ta' tioni consensum non prébeas‡ / Non des  
R de / lectationi· consensum non prebeas· Non des  
S delectationi· consensu(m) / non prebeas· Non des  
W delectatione consensum n(on) prebeas· / N(on) des
Passage II: This describes the contaminating influence of sin in destroying that which is good, and explains how to guard the body against such contamination. The mind and spirit, too, must be purged, as God can see even them, so sin must be crushed at its very source.

R posse dico, S, W posse: The version in S and W leaves the clause with no finite verb, while that in R seems to be an effort to correct the poor grammar of the second. The mistake might have arisen from a misreading of posse in the exemplar: this abbreviation occurs in V.

W animam: This is possibly just a slip of the pen, easily made as anima is frequently the contrasting noun to corpus in Christian literature. Here animam is almost certainly correct, particularly when consensum in 1.30 below is taken into consideration: the theme of the passage is reason and will, rather than the soul.

S qui libidinosus est: This is a subtitle for the following section. S is the only one of our MSS to add these titles, which it does only three times altogether in our three passages.

V, W delectatione: This could be a common slip of the pen, or it could have been influenced by the
prefix con- in consensum, which the scribe might have assumed would govern the ablative.
animam tuam in potestatem carnis, refrena
animam tuam in potestatem carnis. Refrena
anima(m) tua(m) in potestate / carnis refrena
anima(m) tuam in potestatem carnis. / Refrena
animam tuam in potestate / carnis refrena
animam tuam in potestate(m) carnis. Refrena
animam tuam In potestate carnis refrena
mentem ab appetitu illius. Cor tuum
mentem ab appetitu illius; / Cor tuum
mente(m) ab ap&itu carnis. / Cor tuu(m)
mente(m) ab a'petitu illius; / Cor tuum
mente(m) ab a'petitu illus! Cor tuu(m) /
m(en)te(m). ab ap / petitu carnis. Cor tuu(m)
mente(m) ab appetitu illius; Cor tuu(m)
mentem / ab appetitu illius; Cor tuum
cotidie discute, cor tuum cotidie examina,
cotidie discute. Cor tuum cotidie ex / amina.
cotidiae discute. Cor tuu(m) cotidiae e / examina.
cotidie discute. Cor tuum cotidie exa / mina;
cotidie discute. Cor tuum cotidie examina.~
cotidiae discute, Cor tuum cotidiae examina.
cotidie discut(a)e / Cor tuu(m) cotidiae examina.
cotidie discut(a)e cor tuuum co / tidie ex...na~

priuata examinatione occultorum tuorum
Priuata examinatione occultorum / tuorum
Priuata examinatione occultorum tuorum(m) /
Priuata examinacione occultorum tuorum(m) /
Priuata / examinatione occultorum tuorum(m)
priuata / examinatione occultorum tuorum(m)
priuate examinatione OCultorum tuorum /

latebras discute. A cogitatione noxia custodi
discute laterbras. A cogitacione // noxia custodi
discute laterbras; A cogitatione noxia.~ Custodi /
discute laterbras; A cogitatione / noxia.~ custodi
discute laterbras; A cogitatione noxia, custodi /
discute laterbras; A cogitatione noxia.~ custodi

animam tuam, mentem tuam turpis cogitatio
animam tuam
anima(m) tua(m). mente(m) tua(m) turpis / cogitacio
animum tuum; Mente(m) tua(m).~ turpis cogitatio
anim[al]um tuum; Mentem tuam~turpis co~ / gitatio
anima(m) mente(m) tua(m). turpis cogitacione(m) /
animam // mentem tuam turpis cogitatio
V, W potestate: This is presumably a slip arising from a failure to notice the omission mark.

V, S carnis: This variation must arise from the interpretation of something illegible in the exemplar, or from an interpolated gloss.

V, W occultorum, S oculorum: V and W have copied occultorum with only one c, and the scribe of S has further omitted the t. His version makes little sense in the context. Doubling consonants was something not always understood by earlier insular scribes.

C, V, H, R, S, W discute latebras: This change in word order is significant only in that all our MSS share it. By distancing the sibilants, it might sound a little better than the version preferred by the MSS used in PL. It is a good Classical clausula, but Isidore may not have considered this.

H animum tuum, R anim[a]um tuum, W anima, S, W om. tuam: It seems more likely that animus rather than anima would indulge in cogitation, but the weight of numbers in our MSS here is for anima, which at least ensures that we do not have two synonymous phrases, animum tuum and mentem tuam, side by side. W could easily have lost both an omission mark and tuam at the end of a page, and for both MSS the omission of tuam is anyway an
easy mistake when the phrase *mentem tuam* follows immediately. H and R share the same version. S *cogitationem*: The scribe here has misread *cogitatio non* (or possibly *n*) for *cogitationem*.

*C* om. *mentem tuam...ut apparuerit*: It is difficult to imagine what could have caused this omission in C, which would have taken up about half of one side of a page in manuscript form of this date. The last word in the missing passage and the word immediately before the passage both end in *-am*, but this is scarcely sufficient to explain an accidental omission. We have no external evidence to suggest this, but perhaps, as the Latin of this text is simple, it was abridged as a Latin reader. It omits a lengthy passage about keeping oneself from sin and moves straight on to the image of the scorpion that comes at the end of the passage, something dramatic that a novice in the language might be likely to remember. However, there are at least two arguments against this theory: one, the whole work itself is so short that it seems hardly worthwhile to abridge it, and two, there is nothing extraordinarily difficult or unusual in the missing passage to show that it should have been taken out for any reason other than brevity. The missing passage was not later inserted at the end of the page or even at the end of the text.
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37
PL non subripiat; discerne cogitationes tuas,
C n(on) subripiat.
V h(n(on) subripiat; Discerne cogitatione tua.-
H n(on) / subripiat; Discerne cogitationes tuas.-
R non subripiat; Discerne cogitationes tuas.
S subripiat.
W n(on) subripiat discerne Cogitationi / nes tuas

38
PL quid uites, quid facias; munda conscientiam
C Munda consciencia(m) /
V quid uites:/ quid facias; Munda conscientiam
H quid uites:/ quid facias. Munda conscientiam
R Munda conscientia(m)
S quid uites quid facias munda conscientiam

39
PL tua(m) a peccato. Sit animus tuus ab omni
C tua(m) a peccato. Sit animus tuus ab omni
V tua / a peccato / to~
H tua a peccato.
R tuam a peccato.
S tua(m) a peccato. Sit animus tuus ab omni
W tuam / a peccato

40
PL pollutione purgatus. Sit mens tua pura, nullae ibi
C pollu / tione purgatus. sit mens tua pura. Nulla ibi /
V pollu / tione purgatus. sit mens tua pura. Nulla ibi
H Sit mens tua pura; Null(a)e ibi
R Sit mens / tua pura~ Nulle ibi
S pol / lutione purgatus. Sit mens tua pura~ / nulle ibi
W sit mens tua pura~ nullae ibi

41
PL sordes resideant. Sic uitium absterge a te,
C sordes resedeat.
V sordes reside / ant; Sic uitium abste ab's'terge~
H sordes resideant; Sic uitium abste abster / ge~
R sordes resideant; Sic uitium absit absterge~
S sordes resideant~ Sic uitiis / a te absterge
W sordes resideant~ sic uitiis / a te absterge

42
PL ut nec animo quipiam apud te remaneat. Scito
C quippia(m) apud te remaneat~ / Scito
V ut nec animo quip / piam apud te remaneat; Scito
H ut nec animo quippiam apud te remaneat; Scito
R ut nec animo quippiam apud te remaneat; Scito
S ut nec animo quippia(m) / apud te remaneat. Scito
W ut nec animo quippiam apud te remaneat, scito
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S om. non: See 1.36 above. H cogitatione tua: This version makes just as good sense as cogitationes tuas grammatically, but weight of numbers seems to indicate that the latter is correct.

V, S om. discerne...quid facias: The length of this omission seems to indicate that a scribe left out a line in his exemplar.

H, R, W om. Sit animus...purgatus: This is parablepsy.

V nulla...resedeat: The scribe of V has decided that sordes is the nominative singular and has thus changed the other words. It makes equal sense here, but more MSS have the plural version.

W uitiis: This could be just a slip of the pen. H, R abste absterge, S absit absterge, W a te absterge: Clearly the word order shown in W is again that of the insular MSS, but the small words a te have become corrupted, influenced by absterge in the case of H and R, and rendered at least into a real Latin word by S, even if it fails to make sense in the context. It is difficult to say whether or not Isidore would have used abs with te: t is the only consonant with which classical Latin writers would have been likely to have used abs (TLL 2).

V om. sic uitium...animo: It seems that another line has been omitted. The result makes no sense.
PL te de cogitationibus iudicandum
C te de cogitacionibus iudicandu(m)
V te de cogitationibus iudicandum
H te & de cogitla / tionibus iudicandum
R te de cogitationibus iudicandum
S te et de cogitla / tionibus iudicandum
W te & et de cogitationibus Iudicandum

Deus conscientias iudicat. Deus non solum
C
V D(eu)s cons / cientias iudicat; d(eu)s non solu(m)
H D(eu)s conscientias iudicat; / D(eu)s non solum
R D(eu)s conscientias iudicat; D(eu)s non solum /
S D(eu)s conscientias / iudicat; D(eu)s non solum /
W d(eu)s conscientias iudicat, / d(eu)s non solum

carnem, sed et mentem examinat. Deus iudex
C
V carne(m) s& & men / te(m) examinat; D(eu)s iudex
H carmen sed et mentem examinat; / D(eu)s iudex
R carmen sed et mentem examinat; D(eu)s iudex
S carne(m) sed & m(en)te(m) / examinat; D(eu)s iudex
W carmen sed et mentem examinat; D(eu)s iudex

et de cogitationibus iudicat animam. Quando
C
V & de cogitationib(us) / iudicat anima(m); Quando
H & de cogitationibus iudicat animam; / Quando
R & de cogitationib / us iudicat animam; Quando
S et de cogitationib(us) / iudicat anima(m); Quando
W ex cogita / tionibus Iudicat animam; Quando

titillat praua cogitatio, non consentias illi.
C
V te tangit praua / cogitatio n(on) co(n)sentias illi.
H titillat praua cogitatio; non consentias / illi4
R titillat praua cogitatio; non / consentias illi;
S titillat praua // cogitatio non consentia illi.
W titillat praua cogitatio; / non sentias illi:—

Quando suggerit aliquid illicityum, non ibi
C
V quando aliquid sug / gesserit inlicityu(m); N(on) ibi
H Quando agere inlicityum aliquid sugerit;—/ non ibi
R Quando agere inlicityum aliquid sugerit; non / ibi
S Quando / aliquid sugerit inlicityu(m); non ibi
W Quando aliquid sugerit Inlicityum n(on) ibi
43 H, R, S, W et: This makes good sense here, and could easily have been lost in the other versions between te and de.

45 W examinat: *

46 W ex cogitationibus: This is probably a misreading of et. W quondo: This is a common spelling variation.

47 V te tangit: This seems to be quite a sensible effort to read something half-legible in the exemplar. S consentia: * W sentias: This is probably the result of the scribe's failure to read an abbreviation mark for the prefix con-. W quondo: see 1.46 above. V aliquid suggererit inlicitum, H, R agere inlicitum aliquid suggerit, S, W aliquid suggerit inlicitum: The version in H and R, in which aliquid and inlicitum have become inverted, does seem to require explanation of some kind in the form of agere. V's subjunctive is unnecessary here.
teneas animum; primam peccati suggestionem

c contemne, non sinas eam in corde

tuo manere. Quacunque hora uenerit, expelle

illam; ut apparuerit scorpio, contere eum.

Calca serpentis caput, calca prauae suggestionis

initium.
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V prauam: This would be an easy mistake to make in the context, if the exemplar were a little unclear. H,R suggestionem peccati: The other version is probably better word order, since it has two accusatives neatly surrounding the genitive which refers to them.

S contepne: Spelling contemne with a p is perfectly acceptable, but the scribe must have omitted an omission mark for the m. H,R & euades cetera: This seems likely to have been an interpolated gloss. It is unnecessary and obtrusive in context. V,S sines: The scribe of S seems to have copied this, the future tense, from the same tradition as V, but in failing to understand it, he tried to make sense of it, running it together with the next word which he rendered as că, presumably regarding the whole as a verb.

H 'si': This seems to be an unnecessary interpolation, possibly of a gloss. W eam: This slip is possibly influenced by illam at the end of the previous clause.

W calca capud: The scribe seems confused here, inverting the word order, an easy mistake, and misspelling caput. If we consider the variation aput for the spelling of apud, this seems less unlikely.
V inimicum: This is an easy mistake to make, but it is interesting to note that through two slips of this kind, the scribe of V seems entirely to have missed the point of this part of the passage. It is at the very first sign of evil that the writer is abjuring the reader to stamp it out, but V has prauam for primam in 1.49, and replaces initium here.
Lib. II, capp. 23-24:

55
PL Qui enim sibi uilis est, ante Deum magnus
C Qui enim sibi uilis (est) ante d(eu)m magnus
V Qui enim apud / se e(st) uilis ante d(eu)m magnus
H Qui enim sibi uilis est ante d(eu)m magnus
R Qui enim sibi uilis est ante d(eu)m magnus
S Qui eni(m) sibi uilis e(st)-ante d(eu)m magnus
W qui sibi (enim) uilis (est) ante d(eu)m magnus

56
PL est; qui sibi displicet, Deo placet; esto
C est. Qui / sibi displicet d(e)o placet. Esto
V e(st). qui sibi disli / c&-d(e)o plac&. Esto
H est; Quis sibi displicet d(e)o placet; Esto
R est; Qui sibi displicet d(e)o placet. Esto
S e(st). / Qui sibi displicet d(e)o placet. Esto /
W (est) qui sibi displicet d(e)o pla.. / Esta

57
PL igitur paruus in oculis tuis, ut sis magnus in
C igitur paruus in / oculis tuis ut sis magnus in
V igitur paruus in oculis / tuis. Ut sis magnus in
H igitur paruus. / in oculis tuis. ut sis magnus in
R igitur par / uus in oculis tuis-ut sis magnus in
S igitur paruus in oculis tuis. ut sis / magnus in
W igitur paruus in oculis tuis. ut sis magnus in

58
PL oculis Dei. Tanto enim eris ante
C oculis d(e)i. Tanto eni(m) / eris apud
V oculis d(omi)ni. Tantu(m) eni(m) / eris ante
H oculis d(e)i. Tanto / enim eris apud
R oculis d(e)i. Tanto enim eris ante /
S oculis d(e)i. Tanto eni(m) eris / ante
W oculis d(e)i. tanto (enim) / eris ante

59
PL Deum pretiosior, quanto fueris in oculis
C d(eu)m praetiosior- quanto fueris / ante oculos
V d(eu)m pra(e)etiosior. quanto fueris / ante oculos
H d(eu)m pra(e)etiosior. quanto fueris / ante oculos
R d(eu)m pretiosior. quanto fueris ante oculos
S d(eu)m pra(e)etiosior. quanto fueris / ante oculos
W d(eu)m pra(e)etiosior. quanto fueris ante oculos

60
PL tuis despectior.
C tuos despectior; / Porta quoque
V tuos despectior; / Porta quoque /
H tuos despectior; / Porta quoque
R tuos despectior. por / ta quoque
S tuos despectior- / DE VERECUNDIA. / Porta quoque(ue)
W tuos despectior; / porta quoque(ue)
Passage III: A man who is nothing in his own eyes is great in the sight of God. He should always be humbly aware of his own sinfulness, and embrace the practice of mourning and weeping as a medicine for the wounds of sinfulness.

55 V apud se: This may be the result of an effort to transmit something illegible in the exemplar. It is difficult to see how else such a reading could have arisen, and it is an intelligent guess which fits the context well, rhetorically balancing ante Deum, although it is perhaps a less likely guess than sibi itself. If we consider that, perhaps it is more likely that V's was the original reading, although it is possible that either was an interpolated gloss.

58 V domini: This is the incorrect expansion of an abbreviation. V tantum: This is probably the result of a misreading of tanto for tantū, but see also 1.59 below. C,H apud: This makes equal sense, and being the slightly rarer word might be supposed to be the more likely original reading. However, older MSS in our insular group have ante, and it is possible that it is instead a reading of something illegible in the exemplar.

59 V quantum: This error could have arisen in the same way as the one in 1.58 above, although it is not unlikely that this scribe made an effort to
match the two endings.

59-60 C,V,H,R,S,W ante oculos tuos: All our MSS have this version, which must have made more sense to the scribes, as well as balancing the previous phrase, ante deum..., for those MSS which had that reading. Ante oculos is a set phrase, and the version in our MSS could well be the original text.

60 W disfection: * S de uerecundia: see 1.29 above.
uercundiam in uultu de recordatione

PL delicti, porta pudorem in facie de memoria

C commissi peccati. Peccati pudore oculos tuos

V commissi peccati. Peccati pudore oculos tuos

H commissi peccati. Peccati pudore oculos tuos

R commissi peccati. Peccati pudore oculos tuos

S commissi peccati. Peccati pudore oculos tuos

W commissi peccati; [[peccati]] pudore oculos tuos

ad tollere erubesce. Incede deposita facie,

PL lugubri ueste, sacco inuolutus, opertus

C Lugubri ueste; / Sacco inuolutus. Opertum(m)

V Lugubri ueste; / Sacco inuolutus. Operto\n
H lugubri ueste; / Sacco inuolutus. Operto
to

R lugubri ueste; / sacco inuolutus. Op(er)to

S lugubri ueste; / sacco inuolutus op(er)to

W lugubri ueste; sacco inuolutus op(er)to
61 C, H, R, S, W semper: The emphasis produced by this reading is not out of place here, and is possibly original. R uerecundia: It is probable that the scribe saw the rec of recordatione and accidentally repeated uerecundia.

62 S delicta: This error possibly arose out of the same confusion which made the scribe of V first write delicto before correcting it.

63 C commisi, W conmisi, H commi's'si: To our eyes, this seems wrong, but it is likely that to an insular scribe of the date at which W was copied, -s- and -ss- were interchangeable, so we cannot assume ignorance of Latin based on this variation. R lacrimas fac: This might possibly be an attempt to fill a gap in the exemplar, and makes sense. W erases peccati: Looking back, the scribe of W evidently decided that he had erroneously repeated peccati. R om. tuos: *

64 W erubescere: * V, S om. incede deposita facie: This is haplography, if the scribe was following a MS in the same tradition as our others. It is possible that one or other of these clauses is an interpolated gloss, since they are virtually synonymous: in that case, if the same contamination is in the MSS used by PL, it has been interpolated in a different place, after mesto ore rather than before. Perhaps it is more
likely that following the verb *Incede* there deliberately is a tricolon of almost synonymous expressions concerning the appearance of the face, and our MSS C, H, R and W have only interpolated a second *Incede*, while V and S are, as I first suggested, guilty of haplography. For their apparent efforts to correct their mistake, see 11.66 and 67 below.

65 C, H, R, S incede abiecto uultu, V incede abiectus uultu, W incede objectu uultu: Effectively, these are all the same word order. W's corruption would be an easy mistake to make here: he has simply misread an a as an o, and then been influenced by the ending of *uultu*: the word *objeeto*, correctly spelt, would make less sense in the context than *abieeto*. V's ending may have been an attempt to copy an obscure ending in the exemplar: if so, he may have thought that *abieectus* refers to the person addressed, rather than to his face. C, H, R mesto ore perculso corde: This inversion of word order is probably significant only in that these three MSS share it. V humiliato ore: The similarity of *ore* and *corde* may have led to the omission of the second phrase. S humiliato ore percusso corde: This version is clearly related to V as no other MSS have the version *humiliato*, from *humiliare* which was common in late and Christian
Latin (TLL 3100-3103). However, S, copying from something other than V, did not omit the second phrase. Percusso is presumably a misreading of the 1 in perculso as a long s, although either verb can mean to strike with emotion or dismay. W mesto opculso corde: The scribe of W has muddled ore and perculso to give us a nonsensical phrase, but at least shows us that his exemplar had a form of the version in C, H and R.

66 C opertum, H, R, W operto, S opertus: The last syllable of this word must have become indistinct in an early exemplar, so that scribes were left to decide which ending to select. C probably arose from a misreading of operto as opertu. H, R and W's reading is probably the result of influence from cilicio in the next line. S's opertus is less likely to be the result of a direct line of descent from the original than of an intelligent reconstruction.

66-67 V om. Lugubri... corpus: This omission is of about the right length to indicate a missing line in the text. It could also have been caused by parablepsy as the word immediately preceding the omission is corde.
cilicio corpus: fatiscentes artus

deposita facie fati[[.]] / [[.]]entes artes

cilicio corpus:

cilicio corpus

cilicio corp(us): // Deposita faciae Fatescentes artus
cilso corpus:

cilicum et cinis inuoluat, squalentia et

ciliciu(m) & cynis Inuoluat / Esqualenci(a)e

cili / cium & cinis inuoluat Squalentia / et

tabescentia membra - saccus operiat, exustum corpus

tabescencia membra - saccus / operiat. Exaustu(m) corpus

tabescentia membra - saccus operiat / Exaustu(m) corpus:

luctuosus habitus tegat. Terra sit tibi

luctuosus tegat / abitus. Terra sit tibi

luctuosus tegat habit(us) / terra sit tibi

incessanter cubile, stratus humus: puluis es, in

cubile - stratus humus / Puluis és in

cubile - Stratus - humus / Puluis és in

puluere sede; cinis es, in cinere sede

puluere sede. cynis és in cinere / sede.

puluere sede. Cinis és / in cinere uiue. DE
W cilso: * V, S deposita facie: These are the two MSS that omitted incede deposita facie in 1.64 above. It is interesting that both MSS replace the phrase in the same place, even though the line before it in V is missing: perhaps a common exemplar had the missing phrase inserted later than it should have been, over the line. * V artes: 

C, H, R, W om. fatiscentes... cinere sede: There are no clear clues as to why this section should have been omitted. It is too long for a missing line and too short for a missing page. See 11.36-52 above regarding abridgement of the text.

V esqualenciae: This variation is perhaps influenced by Spanish or French vernacular spelling, which might be a clue as to the origins of the tradition. Since Isidore himself was Spanish, however, it is possible that something of Spanish influence remained in the MSS of his work, and a scribe, faced with a word that is slightly unfamiliar, might well attempt to spell it as he found it.

V, S exaustum: Exustum in this context should mean burned out, parched or scalded, while exaustum would mean exhausted, drained or weakened (OLD). Exustum is stronger and less common, but tends rather to mean burnt to ashes, rather than drained.
of all strength, so perhaps *exaustum* is more likely to be the correct version here.

70  V tegat abitus: As in 1.68 above, this spelling variation might have been influenced by Spanish vernacular pronunciation. S tegat habitus: Both this and V follow the same word order.

71  V, S om. incessanter: This omission only removes the emphasis from the sentence, not its sense.

72  S uiue: The scribe of S may have thought that the repetition of *sede* in his exemplar was a mistake, and produced an equally fitting verb to replace it.

72-73  S De compunctione: see 1.29 above.
semper lugens, semper moerens,
Semper lugens. Semper moerens.
 Semper lugens semp(er) moerens. //
 Semper lugens. Semper moerens.
 Semper lugens semp(er) me / rens. 
CONPVNCTIONE. / Semp(er) lugens. semp(er) moerens.
Semp(er) lugens; semp(er) me. ens

semper gemens, semper suspiria cordis emittens;
Semp(er) gemens. / Semper suspiria cordis emittens; /
Semp(er) suspiria cordis emittens.
Semper gemens. / Semper suspiria cordis emittens; /
semp(er) gemens. / se(m)p(er) suspiria cordis emittens.
semp(er) ge..ns / suspiria cordis emittens;

sit compunctio in corde, sint gemitus creberi
Sit compunctio in corde. Sit lamentum
sit compunctio in corde. Sint gemitus. c'rebri's
Sit compunctio in corde. Sit lamentum
Sit con / punctio in corde. sit gemitus creber /
Sit compunctio in corde s... mentum /
in pectore; frequenter oculis lacrymae
in pectore. /
in pectore. / Frequenter oculis lacrim(a)e
in pec / tore.
in pectore.
in pectore. Frequenter oculi lacri / mas
in pectore,

profundantur, ad lacrymas esto paratus;
Ad lacrimas. semper esto paratus.
 p(ro)fundantur. /
Ad lacrimas. semper esto paratus. /
Ad lacrimas / semp(er) esto paratus.
p(er)fundantur. Ad lacrimis esto se(m)p(er) / paratus.
ad lacrimas semp(er) esto para'tus' /

dilige lacrymas, suaues sint tibi lacrymae
Dilige lacr (i) mas. Suaues tibi sint lacrimae.
Dilige lacrimas. suaues tibi sint lacrimae. /
Dilige lacrimas. Suaues tibi sint lacrimae /
Dilige lacrimas. Suaues tibi sint lacrime. /
Dilige lacrimas suauis tibi / sint lacrime.

dilige lacrimas suaues // tibi sunt lacrimae;
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V om. semper gemens: This would be an easy error to make, as there is only three letters' difference between this phrase and the previous one.

R sic: * C,H,R,W? sit lamentum: This variation must arise from an early attempt to read something illegible in the exemplar. V crebris: * S sit gemitus creber: This is possibly an attempt to reproduce something unclear in the exemplar.

S oculi lacrimas: This makes little sense.

C,H,R,W om. frequenter...profundantur: Again there seems to be little reason for this omission, which is a little shorter than one line. See 11.36-52 above concerning abridgement of the text.

S perfundantur: This is probably the result of the incorrect expansion of an abbreviation. Profundo is a verb much more often applied to bodily fluids such as tears, and means to lavish or pour out generously, not just to pour through or drench. V om.ad lacrimas esto paratus: * S lacrimis: *

C,H,R,W semper esto, S esto semper: see 1.61 above. The scribe of S, on previous evidence, is quite capable of changing the word order if he dislikes the sound of two sibilants together.

S suauis: This was probably considered an equally correct spelling. C,V,H,R,S,W tibi sint: This change in word order is significant in that all our MSS share it.
79
PL delectet te semper planctus et luctus.
C Delectet te planctus et luctus.
V Dilectes tibi semper luctus et planctus.
H .................. Delectet te planctus & luctus.
R Delectet te planctus & luctus.
S Delectet te semper planctus et luctus.
W dilectet te semper planctus et luctus.

80
PL Planctum et compunctionem fac tibi semper:
C planctum et compunctionem fac tibi semper.
V planctu(m) /
H Planctu(m) & c(on)punctione(m) fac tibi semper.
R Planctum & compunctionem fac tibi semper.
S Planctu(m) & compunctione(m) fac tibi semper.
W plan'ntcum / et compunctione fac tibi semper.

81
PL planctum et lacrymas nunquam deseras.
C Planctu(m) et lacrimas nunquam deseras.
V planctu(m) et lacrimas nunquam deseras.
H Planctu(m) & lacrimas nunquam deseras.
R Planctum & lacrimas nunquam deseras.
S Planctum & lacrimas nunquam deseras.
W planctum / et lacrimas nunquam / deseras.

82
PL Tantum sis promptus ad lamenta quantum
C Tantu(m) sis pru(m)p tus ad lamenta.
V Tantu(m) sis pru(m)p tus ad lamenta.
H Tantu(m) sis promptus ad lamenta.
R S PAENITENTIA / Tanto sis promptus ad lamenta.
S PAENITENTIA / Tanto sis promptus ad lamenta.
W PAENITENTIA / Tanto sis promptus ad lamenta.

83
PL fuisti pronus ad culpam; qualis fuit tibi ad
C fuisti pronus ad culpam; qualis fuit tibi ad
V fuisti pronus ad culpam; qualis fuit tibi ad
H fuisti pronus ad culpa(m). Qualis tibi fuit ad
R fuisti pronus ad culpa(m). Qualis / tibi fuit ad
S fuisti pronus ad culpa(m). Qualis / tibi fuit ad
W fuisti pronus ad culpa(m). Qualis / tibi fuit ad

84
PL peccandum intentio, talis sit ad poenitendum
C peccandum intentio, talis sit ad poenitendum
V peccandum inten / tioTalis sit ad poenitendum
H peccandum intentio / tioTalis sit ad poenitendum
R peccatum(m) intentio / talis sit / ad penitendum(m)
S peccatum(m) intentio / talis sit / ad penitendum(m)
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V dilectes: * H ras.: The scribe of H must have made an error which was erased after he had carried on writing, for the space erased would be too great to have been left blank during writing. C, H, R om. semper: see 1.61 above. V luctus et planctus: * W planctus et luc: This was presumably copied from a damaged exemplar, although the damage could be as little as an obscured Ɪ.

W compunctione: *

V om. et compunctionem...planctum: A simple version of parablepsy, the length of this omission would indicate that one planctum was probably below the other in the exemplar.

C, H, R, W deseras: The subjunctive is much more appropriate here than the indicative.

S de paenitentia: See 1.29 above.

S tanto...quanto: See 11.58-9 above.

C, H, R, W om. tantum sis...desiderant: The passage ends here in these MSS for no apparent reason. The gap may arise from a scribe hastily omitting the last few lines of a chapter at the top of a page. It is also possible that it is caused by the confusion of desiderant (1.88), which might be shortened to desider, and deseras (1.81).

V, S tibi fuit: This change in order is significant in that these two MSS share it.

S peccatum: *
deuotio; ita reuertere, sicut in profundum

deuotio. Ita reuertere sicut in profundum

deuotio. Ita reuertere sicut in p(ro)fundum

recesseras: secundum morbum impertienda est

recesseras: Secundum morbum impertienda est

recesseras: Secundum morbum impertienda est

medicina, iuxta uulnus sunt adhibenda medicinae

medicina. Iuxta uulnus adhibenda sunt

medicina. Iuxta uulnus adhibenda

remedia. Grauia peccata grandia lamenta

remedia. Grauia peccata grandia lamenta

remedia. Grauia peccata grandia lamenta

remedia. Grauia peccata grandia lamenta

desiderant.

desiderant.
V adhibenda sunt (om. medicinae), S adhibenda (om. sunt medicinae): The scribe of V may have omitted medicinae by accident, or he may have thought it a needless repetition. The clause still makes sense without it and is understandable in context. Once the larger word is omitted, the smaller word, sunt, especially if reduced to sē, is easily left out.

V grando alimenta: This stems from a bad misreading of a passage possibly damaged in some way. If this is an attempt to restore the original text, it is a very poor one.
Overview of the quality of transmission in the above MSS:

C

The main feature of this MS is the long omissions made by the scribe, omissions of such length and apparently random character that they would render any related MS instantly recognizable (ll.36-52 on its own, with HRW e.g.11.82-88). On the whole, apart from the omissions the text is good: there is only one other place where C differs on its own, at 1.66, where the end of the word opertus seems to have been indistinct in the tradition.

V

This MS is not as accurate as the one above. There are plenty of senseless mistakes (e.g.1.88 grando alimenta) and examples of poor spelling (e.g.1.25 exsoliiscere), and some individual lines and words have been omitted (e.g.1.1 nihil, 11.41-42 sic uitium...animo, 11.66-67 lugubri...corpus). Word order is sometimes confused (e.g.1.79 luctus et planctus). In several places, variations seem to be efforts made to render sensible something odd or illegible in the exemplar (e.g.1.19 peccati, 1.47 te tangit): in about half of these cases the scribe makes his version sensible. It seems likely that the exemplar was poor.

H

Apart from the lengthy omissions, all of which correspond to omissions made in C, this text is quite good. There is a spelling mistake (1.4
ambiget) and a slip (1.24 eleui), but in one place a sensible variation occurs (1.37 cogitatione tua) apparently unique to H.

The reading in this MS, with the exception of some minor variations (e.g. 1.27 posse dico, 1.61 uerecundia, 1.63 lacrimas fac), is almost exactly the same as that in H.

This is an unreliable MS because it seems that the scribe is ready to correct the reading of the exemplar in front of him as he goes along. Occasionally this works well, but makes it difficult to reconstruct the original reading. There are a few omissions, several examples of poor spelling (e.g.1.1 prossus), and several bad mistakes (e.g.1.72 uiue, 1.76 oculi lacrimas), which would lead one to believe that the scribe had more confidence than skill in Latin.

There are many slips in this text (e.g.1.45 examinat, 1.65 opeculso, 1.67 cilso), and some examples of poor spelling (e.g.1.6 explanatatum), but apart from one or two long omissions, corresponding to those in H and R, the readings are more careless than poor.

All our MSS are related to each other and derived from a common ancestor: 11.7-10 (word order), 1.65 incede abiecto uultu.
None of our MSS is derived from any other:
11.36-52 C's omission, 11.41-42 V's omission, 1.24 H eleui,
1.63 R lacrimas fac, 11.29, 60, 72-3, 81-2 S headings, 1.23
S possit, 1.65 W opeculso.

VS share the following significant readings: 1.32
carnis, 11.37-38 omission, 11.64-67 move deposita facie,
1.70 tegat (h)abitus, 1.71 om.incessanter, 1.83 tibi fuit,
1.87 adhibenda sunt.

CH share the following significant readings: 1.15
om.et, 1.58 apud. They also both have the mark k in the
margin [4].

CR share the significant reading, 1.9 amoue.

HR share the following significant readings: 1.36
animum tuum (R corr.), 1.41 abste absterge, 1.48 agere
inlicitum aliquid suggerit, 1.49 suggestionem peccati, 1.50
et euades cetera.

CHR share the following significant readings: 1.65
mesto ore perculso corde, 1.79 om.semper.

CHRW share the following significant readings:
11.10-11 fuge iam uitae maculam, fuge turpitudinem uitae,
11.67-72 om.fatiscentes...cinere sede, 1.75 sit lamentum,
11.76-77 om. frequenter...profundantur, 11.82-88 om. tantum
sis...desiderant.

HRW share the significant reading, 11.39-40 om. sit
animus...purgatus.

The archetype (ω) appears in Britain in about the
eighth century, when it is copied into (α) and (γ). From (α)
is copied W and later, perhaps in south-west England, (β),
the common ancestor of H and R. C was also copied later from
(β), probably in the same area. Meanwhile, (γ) is taken to
an English centre on the continent, where first V, in the
ninth century, and then S in the late tenth century, are
copied from it. It seems then that they were returned to
England before the early sixteenth century.
Notes to Chapter V, 2:
1. See MS.H below, and Appendix II.
2. MLGB.
3. See MS.C above.
4. See Augustine, *Enchiridion*, MS.T.
(PLLXXXIII) Addressed to "Florentina", Lib.I examines the Old Testament for evidence of Christ's coming in order to refute the beliefs of the Jews. The text sums up the attitude of the mediaeval Christian world towards Judaism, instantly contrasting damnation and salvation. However, it has been demonstrated that the book was really designed to inform the clergy about the beliefs of the Jews, with examples drawn from older writers. It was not deliberately polemic, but perhaps became so [1]. The work is divided into sections offering separate evidence for various points of Christian doctrine: "The significance of the Trinity", for example (Lib.I, cap.iv), and each stage of the Passion (capp.xx-lvi). Lib.II demonstrates how the Old Testament calls all to Christ, but how on Judgement Day the Jews will be found wanting and the Christians rewarded. Isidore explains how the Old Testament foresaw the giving by God of the New Testament, talks of the sacraments of baptism and the Eucharist, and sums up his pity for the Jews and the value of the Scriptures. There are only four manuscripts, all from the later part of our period.

S British Library Royal 5.E.xvi s.xi ex.
R British Library Royal 6.B.viii s.x/xi
B Bodleian, Bodley 319 (2226) s.x²
E Bodleian, Bodley 394 (2225) s.xi
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Contents:

1. Liber differentiarum Isidori...

2. Isidore of Seville, De fide catholica; in two books, each preceded by a table of chapters. The dedicatory epistle begins Quedam que diversis temporibus; the treatise, Iudei nefaria incredulitate Christum. At the end, Explicit liber Isidori Ispalensis episcopi ad Florentinam virginem de miraculis Christi.

Notes from Ker's B, C & L:

This MS does not contain the writing of Scribes A and C, but was written in the busy period of Salisbury's scriptorium, somewhere between 1089 and 1125. It is worth comparing with Bodley 319 (an Exeter book), for the copy of this text, although this MS is "notably poor looking". It appears in Patrick Young's catalogue as

23. Isidorus a semetipso ad semetipsum, "Cum me peruigil cura fecisset" et caet. Idem de miraculis Christi ad sororem Florentinam 4to. s.xi ex.

"The incipit given by Young shows that the MS began with the text printed in PL42.1207-1212 among the spuria of St. Augustine, and called there De unitate sanctae trinitatis. The first words now in superna et perfecta
trinitate (= col.1211, 1.23) are not far from the end, one or two leaves having been lost since 1622. The text ends with the words

Contuli ut potui cum omni sollertia. qui legis ora pro me. Explicit ispalensis episcopi.

and is likely therefore to have been similar to that of the Rheims MS noted in PL, which began with the title

Incipit tractatus sancti Augustini episcopi a semetipso ad semetipsum

and ended with the same formula Contuli...ora pro me. What follows in the Royal MS (ff.1-19v), though not distinguished by the cataloguers, should be treated as a separate article. It is on a composite treatise derived from the works of Isidore, with the title Liber differentiarum Isidori and beginning Inter deum et dominum quid interest.

"This MS was at Salisbury in the Middle Ages and was annotated then...by a scribe who wrote vz occasionally in the margins in pencil. I do not understand the meaning of this symbol, which has often been crossed through, but it is associated with other pencilled marginalia and is probably by the hand which wrote Totum lectum at the beginning and end of MS.115, Totus lectus est liber iste in MS.168, and Lect' alibi in MS.117 f.164, in pencil of perhaps the early s.xiii." (pp.196-197.)
"outlined figures in first initial; others in red."

Contents:
Theological works by S. Isidore, Bishop of Seville, and Alcuin, viz.:-
1. Incipit prologus Isidori ad sororem suam directam. (sic): the 1st. of the two books De Fide Catholica contra Iudaeos. Prefatory letter beg.
   Sancte sorori Florentiniane Isidorus. Quedam diuersis temporibus.
   Table of capitula follows. Text beg. Iudei nefaria incredulitate. Colophon,
   Expl[i]cit liber sancti Ysidori scriptus ad sororem suam. quia Christus a deo patre genitus est. f. 1b
   After art. 1 2½ pages are left blank.
2. Letters and opuscula of Alcuin.
3. As above but s. xii.

(Old Royal and King's catalogue)

The mediaeval provenance of this MS is unknown.

B Bodleian, Bodley 319 (2226)

s. x ex., parchment, 322 x 234 mm., iv + 80 leaves, "with illuminated capitals, etc.", written in England.
Contents:
The treatise De fide catholica contra Judaeos by St. Isidore of Seville, here with no title: the praefatio, beg.
Sancte sorori Florentinae Hysiodorus. Quedam que diversis temporibus
the work beg.
Quod Christus a Deo Patre genitus est. Iudei nefaria incredulitate
in two books, each preceded by a list of chapters. The last chapter (f. 74) is headed xxvii. Recapitulatio operatio
(sic, pro operis) and has a nearly contemporary interlinear O.E. translation...The lower 2/3 of f. 75, after the
colophon, is cut off, and the lower margins of ff. 49 and 59.
At the top of f. 1 is a title in a s. xiii hand,
Liber de miraculis Christi.
(Bodleian catalogue)

Ker confirms the Exeter provenance [2], and includes it in the list left by Bishop Leofric in 1072 [3].

E Bodleian, Bodley 394 (2225)
s.xi and s.xii (made up of two MSS, of which only A concerns us), parchment, 300 x 213mm., iii + 130 leaves,
"with coloured capitals, etc...A. may be no. 53 in the list of books given to Exeter by Bishop Leofric."
Contents:
A. s.xi? written on the Continent (in France?) I (f.1)

Liber sancti Isidori ad Florentinam [de] miraculis Christi

an added title: the treatise is generally known as De fide catholica contra Judaeos. After a list of chapters comes

Incipit prefatio. Sancte sorori Florentine Hysidorus.

Quedam que diversis temporibus

at end, Explicit hic liber. The outer margins of ff.30, 52 are cut off.

(Bodleian catalogue)

Comments:

Ker [3] points out that B is worth comparing with S, and Exeter is only ninety miles from Salisbury.

Notes to Chapter V, 3:
2. MLGB.
(PLXXXIII) King Sisebut commissioned this work, probably in 613 [1], to instruct him in the matter of natural phenomena and their causes. Superstition was growing in the kingdom, and this seems to have been a major reason for the treatise. Isidore's work sets out the causes of cosmic phenomena, particularly those which might make people believe that the Apocalypse was close, in a scientific and mostly unemotive way, but a way which is based very firmly on the Christian faith. Its practical value must have been as great in early mediaeval England as it was in Spain as a basic reference book on Christian principles. Five MSS which contain it remain extant:

E Exeter Cathedral 3507 s.x^2
D B.L. Cotton Domitian i s.x med., x^2
V B.L. Cotton Vitellius A.xii s.xi ex.
A Bodleian, Auct.F.2.20 (2186) s.xi^2
B Basle Univ.F.III.15 f s.viii

---

E Exeter Cathedral 3507

No catalogue entry is as yet available for this MS. It also contains, among other things, Hrabanus Maurus, De computu, probably seen as an equally useful scientific text [2]. Ker has identified its mediaeval provenance as Exeter [3].
D British Library, Cotton Domitian i

Contents:

1. Liber Isidori, Hispalensis Episcopi de natura rerum.
2. Glossae diuersae, siue expositiones difficilium uocabulorum...
3. Tabula de quatuor legitimis jejuniis.
4. Libellus ad instruendos pueros, sub nomine Prisciani compositus...
5. Versus Bedae Presbyteri de die judicii...
6. Paruus index librorum Athelstani...
7. Itinerarium Giraldi Cambrensis...
8. Ejusdem descriptio Kambriae, ad eundem.
9. Tractatus retractationem... and a list of books compiled by Giraldus.
10. Chronica uenerabilis Bedae, et aliorum up to 1288...
11. De successione Episcoporum Meneuensium...
12. Carmen Satyricum in Monachos.
13. Cognatio & genealogia Brychain...

(Smith, Cotton catalogue)

Traditionally, this is supposed to have belonged to King Athelstan and to have been one of his gifts to Canterbury, because of the Anglo-Saxon list on f.55. However, this inscription cannot be earlier than s.xi, and it seems more likely that this referred to an Exeter churchman of that name [4].
Contents:
2. Abbo on Circles, spheres and the courses of the planets.
3. Computo of Rabanus.
4. Verses on the zodiac.
5. Seven wonders of the world.
7. The sounds of letters.
8. Gildas' Computo.
10. Old calendar.
11. Verses on the constellations and winds.
12. Calendar of saints' days.
13. Letters about the moon.
16. The same.
17. Verses on the capture of the city of Bajocensium.
18. Verses on morals.
19. The Life of St. Mary of Egypt.
20. Verses on the 12 plagues of Egypt.
22. Verses on the 12 emperors of Rome.
23. Invective against kings.
26. Ancient penitential, etc., from the Church Fathers.
27. A Doxology.
28. Story of a bishop who could tell whether or not communicants were worthy of Communion by looking at them.

(Smith, Cotton catalogue)

Notes from Ker's B, C & L:

"This MS, written in the second half of the eleventh century, has a tenuous connection with Sherborne, and therefore with Salisbury, by being a probably direct copy of a tenth-century MS at Exeter (3507) written in the same scriptorium as the Sherborne Pontifical now in Paris (B.N.Lat.943)."

The mediaeval provenance of this MS is Salisbury [5]. Thomas Smith has accidentally omitted De natura rerum from the list of contents, where it forms one of the collection of astronomical texts.

A Bodleian, Auct.F.2.20 (2186)

s.xii in., parchment, 291 x 206mm., i + 65 leaves:
"with one illuminated capital (f.17), coloured diagrams, etc.", written in France.

Georgius Chudleh, Walterus Struchlegh [for Strechlegh?], Devonienses (s.xvi) is on f.62. Presented by Sir Henry Savile in 1620.
Contents:

1. (f. 1) Opus de natura rerum, the work by Isidore of Seville, here anon., with the prologue.


3. (f. 19) Commentum Macrobi i Ambrosii in Somnium Scipionis preceded by the Proemium...

4. (f. 62) De sibyllis et earum prophetiis...

(Bodleian catalogue)

Basle Univ. F.III.15 f

s.viii, vellum, 340 x 255mm., ff.13, Anglo-Saxon minuscule.

No catalogue entry is as yet available for this manuscript. It contains no texts other than De natura rerum, and was at Fulda in the Middle Ages, although it was written in England. It was left unfinished, although some initials were filled in by a Fulda scribe.

Further Notes:

Rabanus de computo, & Ysidorus de natura rerum.

Two surviving English manuscripts copied from a (lost) common exemplar - B.L.Cotton Vitellius
A.xii (s.xi) and Exeter Cathedral Chapter Library MS.3507 (s.x) contain these two items...The latter manuscript was at Exeter during Leland's lifetime; and Cotton Vitellius A.xii is a Salisbury manuscript. Another section of the Cotton manuscript shows similarities with the calendar in the Leofric missal, which raises the possibility that the exemplar(s) for various parts of the manuscript came from Glastonbury. [6]

Notes to Chapter V,4:
2. Gneuss, List.
3. MLGB.
Chapter V, 5:

DIFFERENTIAE

(PLXLII) De differentiis rerum or Differentiae theologicae
uel spirituales is a dogmatical work of definitions, and
would have been appreciated as a reference book in early
monastic scholarship. There are only two extant MSS
containing all of it which would have been in England before
1100, one early and one at the very latest point of our
period. The other late one contains a work called
Differentiae but not the same as the other versions. One
early MS contains part but breaks off, and also from the
eighth century comes the two-page St.Omer fragment. They are
as follows:

R British Library, Royal 5.E.xvi s.xi ex.
S Salisbury Cathedral 125 s.xi ex.
B Basle Univ. F.III.15 1 s.viii
O St.Omer, Bib. Mun. 279 (f.) s.viii
L St.Petersburg, Q.v.I 15 (part) s.viii²

R British Library, Royal 5.E.xvi

For details of this MS, which contains a composite
treatise of Isidore's work here entitled De differentiae,
see Isidore, De fide catholica MS S above.
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S Salisbury Cathedral 125
s.xii, vellum, 272 x 200mm., ff. 80.

Contents:

De differentiis

(Salisbury catalogue)

Notes from Ker's B, C & L:
This MS, like the previous one, also lacks the writing of the prolific scribes A and C, although it, too, was written in the busy period of 1089 - 1125. It appears in Patrick Young's catalogue as

67 Isidorus de differentiis uet. et noui Test fol.
s.xiii in. (pp.145-192.)

The mediaeval provenance of this MS is unknown.

B Basle Univ.F.III.15 l

There is no catalogue as yet available for this MS, and its mediaeval provenance is unknown. We know that it also contains Gennadius, De ecclesiasticis dogmatibus [1].

CLA VII, 849:
Anglo-Saxon minuscule, s.viii.
Fol.20; 295-300 x 225-240mm. <ca. 260 x 195- 200mm.> in 29-30 long lines...Incipit and invocation in smaller letters in top margin; colophon in a more cursive form of script. Punctuation: the main pause is marked by a
medial point, — occurs at end of sections; all else added. Omissions marked by δ in text and Μ before the insertion in the lower margin (ff.13, 15v). Accents over some monosyllables. Run-overs carried to the line above are set off by two parallel oblique strokes. Abbreviations include the Insular symbols H, H, ־ = autem, enim, est; and the ordinary forms b: = bus; q: = que; nūm = nostrum; p, pp = pro, propter; qūm and qūm = quoniam; sūr = sunt; .failure. Spelling shows the usual Insular misuse of s and ss: confussa, egresi, baptisari; also some confusion of e and i, o and u. Initials are in bold black, surrounded by red dots (ff.1,15); smaller capitals are either daubed red or surrounded by red dots. F.1 opens with a black and red cross in top left corner. The membranes are poorly prepared and full of holes. Ink dark brown. Script begins on f.1 with lh and on f.15 with 2 lines of stately roundish Insular majuscule. Script is Anglo-Saxon minuscule of a very angular type...

Corrections (s.ix) by a more cursive Anglo-Saxon hand (ff.16,16v). The German gloss in Anglo-Saxon letters (s.viii) and partly in cipher: ṭkrkdf, ie.giride, is seen on f.14.

Written in an Anglo-Saxon centre, probably on the Continent. The manuscript opens with the formula: In nomine dei uiui, found elsewhere only in the Irish Orosius, Milan Ambros.D.23 sup., which suggests that
the exemplar may have been Irish. Later at Fulda; the Fulda shelfmark 'VIII or.8' (s.xv) stands on the front cover of the ancient binding. Was acquired by Remigius Faesch (†1667), professor at Basel, ca.1630.

O St. Omer, Bib. Mun. 279, ff.1 + 2

There is no catalogue as yet available for this fragment, and its mediaeval provenance is unknown.

CLA VI, 827:

Insular majuscule, s.viii.

One bifolium, used as fly-leaves in a tenth-century manuscript of 132 folios containing Hieronymus in prophetas minores; now cut down to 245 x ca.170mm. <reduced length ca.240mm. x estimated width ca.160mm.> in 26-29 (or more) long lines...Punctuation: a comma marks the main pause; various groups of commas at ends of sections. Run-overs carried to the line above are set off by an inclined curve. Abbreviations include b; = bus; q; = que; n = non; p, p, pp = per, prae, pro, propter; s = sunt; t = tur; t = uel; and the insular forms r = autem; , = est, idest; p = per; q: = quae, quam. Spelling shows the usual Insular misuse of s and ss; also defert for differt. Small crude initials, surrounded by red dots; capitals at beginning of sentences are daubed with red, now oxydized. Membranes prepared in the Insular manner. Ink brown. Script is a crude Insular majuscule by an inexpert and
probably aged hand...

Written by a scribe of modest ability either in Britain or in a Continental centre with Insular connexions. Provenance St. Bertin: a twelfth-century entry on f.132v. reads Liber S. Bertini; the familiar XIV-XV-century ex-libris stands on f.3.

L St. Petersburg, Q.v.I.15

No catalogue entry is as yet available for this MS, and its mediaeval provenance is unknown.

CLA XI, 1618:

Anglo-Saxon, Cursive, eN, and Caroline minuscule, s.viii².

Isidorus, Prooemia, De ortu et obitu pp., De officiis, etc.; Hieronymus, Epistula ad Paulinum; Carmen de Iohanne; Aldhelmus, Aenigmata.

Foll. 79...280 x 220mm. <245 x 190-195mm.> in two columns of 33-35 lines...Headings and colophons here and there in script of text, but rubrics generally rare. Opening words or lines occasionally use Insular majuscule, sometimes compressed. Punctuation varies with different hands: the most advanced marks final pauses with two dots and a dash; another uses the triangular group to mark main pauses; the simple point marks lesser pauses. Expunction by two dots above the letter (f.71). Abbreviations include the Insular forms
Spelling shows confusion of e and i, o and u, and the
Insular misuse of s and ss. Membranes: Insular vellum
of uneven quality. Ink very black. Script, by several
hands, is chiefly Anglo-Saxon: compressed, stiff
Anglo-Saxon minuscule with admixture of majuscule A, R,
and S, often dropping into a rapid and pointed script
toward the bottom of each column, mainly on ff. 1-11 and
72-79; a freer, more rapid cursive minuscule with
numerous ligatures and frequent use of e with the
reversed lower bow, mainly on ff. 11-38 and 57-63 (the
hand on f. 63r-v in particular resembles the marginalia
in the Codex Fuldensis - CLA VIII, 1196...): more
subdued cursive, mainly on ff. 64-71. The Anglo-Saxon
scribe who began Isidore's Differentiae on f. 64 stopped
in the middle of a sentence on f. 71; the work was
continued by a scribe writing eN script... but left
unfinished on f. 71v. The remaining part of this page,
the last of a quire, was filled with two poems in
Caroline minuscule s.ix in. somewhat reminiscent of the Maurdrann type. A ninth-century Corbie librarian added a table of contents on f.1.

Origin presumably South-west England. At Corbie in the eighth century...Mentioned in several Corbie catalogues. Came to St.-Germain-des-Prés, Paris, in 1638, where it bore the numbers 257 and 800. Acquired by Peter Dubrowsky in 1791 and by the Imperial Library in 1805.

Comments:

If R and S actually contain the same text, a fact which seems to be in some doubt, there is a strong possibility that being in Salisbury at the same time they are closely linked. Salisbury's sources of books to copy were not so manifold that they could ignore even a "poor looking" copy of anything, and they had a tendency to copy what they could and then make repairs from a better text later if they had the opportunity [2]. Exeter was less than ninety miles from Salisbury and would almost certainly have been one of the sources of their exemplar texts.

Notes to Chapter V, 5:
2. See, for example, Isidore, *Etymologiae*, MS.S.
Chapter V, 6:

ETYMOLOGIAE

(PLLXXXII) This work, dedicated to King Sisebut, was never finished by Isidore: the consequences of this were confusing, as it was promulgated without Isidore's permission, even before he sent it to his friend, Bishop Braulio of Saragossa, to edit. Braulio divided it into twenty books, which is how it appears today. It was immediately popular, and there are three early branches of the tradition, which have been roughly divided into French, Italian and Spanish. None of our manuscripts seems to fall into any of these national groups [1]. Later MSS were also common, as can be seen from the number extant in late Saxon England. The six manuscripts, two parts and one fragment, that survived in England cover the eighth to the twelfth centuries and onward. They are as follows:

T Cambridge, Trinity B.15.33 (368) s.x in.
R British Library, Royal 6.C.i s.xi
C B.L.Cotton Caligula A.xv (part) s.viii²
B Bodleian, Bodley 239 (2244) s.xi/xii
O Oxford Queen's 320 s.x med.
S Salisbury Cathedral 112 s.xi ex.
D Düsseldorf staat.Fragm.28 (f.) s.viii²
P Paris, Bib.Nat.lat.4871 (part) s.viii/ix
N Paris, Bib.Nat.lat.7585 s.ix¹
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T Cambridge, Trinity College B.15.33 (368)

s.ix, vellum, 250 x 169mm., ff.146, 27-24 lines to a page, "in a fine round Saxon hand. Headings in red and black uncials". Some s.xvi writing has been reproduced here, including references to the MS's having been written in A.D.833.

Contents:

Isidori Etymologiarum Libb. v-ix.

Inc. in V.xxxiii l mi non ex solis circulo . sed ex lune cursu enumerantur.

Greek words inserted in red capitals.

According to the numbering of this MS this is cap.vi. Cap.vii begins on f.2: de soli stitiis et aegui noctiis

The table of the six ages in c.xii (= xxxix) is in a smaller hand.

ExpLCIT liber qVINTVS

Inc: capitula libri sexti f.9

There are nine chapters as against 19 of edd.

FINIVNT CAPITVLA

Inc. liber sextus f.9b

c.iii de biblioticis has six divisions: so has iv de cartis et pergamenis. The table of cycles PL 245-47 is omitted. It may have intervened in a pair of leaves between quires 3 and 4; the text, however, has no other gap here. f.26 ends:

stratum annorum and 27 begins Post cuius

Expl. lib.vi.
Inc capitula liberi septimi f. 40
There are fourteen chapters as in edd.

Expl. capitula.

Inc. eiusdem liber f. 40b
By the title of c.ii. De filio dei is godes ynne

Expl. lib. septimus

Inc. capp. libri octauui f. 77
These are continuously numbered with lib.vii from xv to xxv, corresponding with the number in edd.

Finiunt capp.

Inc. eiusdem libri octauui f. 77b
Finit lib. octauus

Inc. capp. Libri noni f. 108
Numbered from xxvi-xxxiii: there are 7 in edd.

Expl. capp.

Inc. eiusdem liber nonus f. 108
On f.139 after Germani Germanae (PL359), the rest of the page is left blank.

In Saxon letters:

Finis . de ritibus historiarum (s.xvi)

On 139b is a table:

Item de predictis adfinitatibus. Auctor mei generis etc. - ego illi neptis filius aut filia, in 6 cols.

140 is blank and the portion of text from Matris meae soror onwards, with the stemmata, is omitted.

On 140b the text continues with c.xxxii (= vii) De coniugiis ending: Credo equidem nec uana fides genus esse deorum

- 270 -
(142b). 12 lines in PL are wanting to complete the book.

There are corrections in a hand nearly contemporary with the original.

(Trinity catalogue)

This is a large, two-line script, with some uncial elements, and is one of the four possible main influences on English Square Minuscule script [2]. The mediaeval provenance of this MS is unknown.

R British Library, Royal 6.C.i

s.xi, vellum, 319 x 231mm., ff.162, "initials in red, green, purple or yellow. Belonged to St.Augustine's, Canterbury, bearing pressmark dist.v. gradus iii. Ysodorus Ethimoloqiarum. Cum .A."

Contents:
S.Isidore, Bishop of Seville, Etymologiae and prefatory letters, viz.:-
1. Correspondence between Isidore and Braulio, Bishop of Saragossa (631 - 651)...

2. Incipiunt capitula libri Isidori iunioris Spalensis episcopi ad Braulionem Caesaraugustanum episcopum scripti

the twenty books of Etymologiae, with the brief preface, which occurs twice, before and after the table of books. The
chronological table at the end of Bk. V. concludes in this, as in some other MSS, with the date of the tenth year of King Recessuint, era 666, A.M. 5856. Here the *annus mundi* and regnal years appear to correspond (A.D. 658-659) and to represent an addition made long after Isidore's death, but the era computation gives a date in his lifetime (A.D. 628). The paschal table in bk. vi covers 95 years (A.D. 627-721), the last year being dated A.M. 5919. Preface beg. *En tibi sicut pollicitus sum misi opus*, and text *Disciplina a discendo nomen accepit*. f.3b

(Old Royal and King's catalogue)

Ker confirms the ex libris of St. Augustine's, Canterbury, in this MS [3].

C British Library, Cotton, Caligula A.xv, ff.3-117

s.ix, vellum, 219 x 169mm., 115 leaves, "generally with 25 lines to a page, excepting the last article, which has 39 lines, to a page...Written by different scribes in England, in rather roughly-formed minuscules. The greater part of article 5 has been touched over with darker ink. The last article is in smaller characters than the rest of the MS. Titles are, for the most part, in uncials; some of them in red...Bound with another manuscript of the eleventh century containing tables and calculations connected with the calendar."
Contents:

1. **LIBER SCI HIERONIMI DE TRACTORIBUS**, ie. *De uiris Illustribus*, with preface and table of chapters. f.3
   The table contains only 133 titles, but the text is completed in 135 chapters. On the upper margin of the last page (f.31) is the note, *isti tractatores cxxxv. scripserunt libros fere dccccxv.* in a hand of the 10th cent.

2. **Eiusdem Uita Beati Pauli Monachi.** f.31

3. **Etymologia** lib i capp 21-27 and sections 31-34 of cap.37.
   Each with its own heading. f.36

4. **Cyprian Testimoniorum liber iii.** f.38b
   At the end of it is a prayer against the cold and the names *liofric sacerd* . *garulf leuita* are scratched with a hard point, in Saxon characters.

5. **Lunar and cyclical calculations.** f.65

6. **Tractatus uario de computo Paschali** (10 of them). f.80

7. **Ordo cycli paschalis.**

   *(Thompson & Warner, *Ancient MSS*)

Ker gives the provenance as St. Augustine's, Canterbury [3].

CLA II, 183:

Pre-Caroline French minuscule, s.viii²

...Running titles in minuscule on many pages.

Punctuation: the simple point marks most pauses; a comma occurs at the end of sections, sometimes followed
by $. Citations marked by a 7-like flourish in the left margin (f.79v). Abbreviations fairly numerous, including the Insular forms: ἢ, ἢ, ἦ = autem, enim, est, and the common forms aut and aut = autem; b', q' = bus, que; ἡ (also nřl), ἢμ = nostri, -rum; ṗ, ṕ, ṙ = per, prae, pro; q = quia; qμ or quo or qum = quoniam; p = rum, s = sunt, t = tur. In the uncial titles, omitted M is indicated by τ. Some initials of Insular type, e.g. S on f.77 and several capitals L's on f.106v. Script is a rather well-formed Pre-Caroline minuscule showing clear signs of Insular influence...

Written probably in North-east France, in a centre with Insular connexions; copied from an exemplar written A.D.743, the year mentioned on f.107. Was at St. Augustine's Abbey, Canterbury in the middle ages.

B Bodleian, Bodley 239 (2244)

s.xii in, parchment, 375 x 278mm., v + 142 leaves, in double columns, written in England (?), "with illuminated capitals, etc.: stained and injured at each end by damp...This volume belonged to Exeter Cathedral Library, and appears in the inventory of 1506, but is not in the list of MSS presented by the Dean and Chapter in 1602. It was, however, almost certainly not acquired later than 1602."
Contents:
At end - Explicit liber uicesimus Ethymologiarum beati Ysidori episcopi: the whole treatise, with 4 letters from Isidore to Braulio and 2 from Braulio, by way of preface. Ff.ii-iv contain the latter part (R-Z) of a s.xv index of subjects to the work.

(Bodleian catalogue)

Ker says this manuscript is in Norman script [4], so it is too late to have been part of the bequest from Bishop Leofric which seems to have constituted the greater part of the list of books presented by Exeter to the Bodleian in 1602. However, he confirms the Exeter provenance [3].

Oxford, Queen's College 320

s.ix ex., folio, ff.177, "bene exaratus et servatus".

Contents:
S.Isidori, episcopi Hispalensis, Etymologiarum liber,
praeuia cuique parti capitulorum tabula.
Incip. "Disciplina a discendo nouem accipit;" ut in edit.
impress. 1617, p.1
Praemittuntur,
a. Versus triginta elegiaci; incip.
Sericeum tegmen gemmantia tecta laconum,
Pellibus hircinis aequiparanda loquor."

b. Capitula, f.2.
c. Isidori et Brauliensis epistolae quinque mutuae.

(Coxe, Part I)

The mediaeval provenance of this MS is unknown.

S Salisbury Cathedral 112

s.xi ex., vellum, 275 x 181mm., ff.151.

Contents:

- Etymologiae

(Salisbury catalogue)

Notes from Ker's B, C & L:

This MS does not contain the writing of Scribes A to C, but does contain the D.M note in the margin, signifying Dignum Memoria in common with 26 other manuscripts, 23 in the group containing the writings of scribes A and C and three not. Another manuscript of Etymologiae at Salisbury, MS 142 from s.xii ex., is a twin of this one, written between 1089 and 1125, but their relation is in question. This appears in Young's catalogue as "138 Isidori origines fol. par. s.xi ex." (pp.145-194.)

The mediaeval provenance of this MS is unknown.
There is as yet no catalogue entry for this MS, but the fragment in the County Record Office, Shrewsbury, is mentioned in connexion with this MS. The fragment's "script is an easy and assured minuscule, varying a good deal...The flat-topped a, an uncommon form of letter, suggests a closer relationship with Kassel Th.F.21 and Dusseldorf staat.Fragm.28" [5]. The mediaeval provenance of this MS is unknown.

CLA VIII, 1189:

Anglo-Saxon majuscule verging on minuscule, s.viii.  
Isidorus, Etymologiae (Lib.XIV, c.4)  
One imperfect folio; actual measurements 278 x 213mm.  
<ca.275 x ca.215mm.> in 2 columns of 28 lines of which 26 survive...Punctuation hardly used; the group occurs for the main pause. Abbreviations include the Insular symbols ἦ, τ, τ, ἦ = autem, enim, est, haec; ἓ, Ἕ = per, quasi; and the common forms bi, qi = bus, que; ἐν = nomen; π = prae; qg = quoque; f = rum; sG = sunt; t = ter. Spelling shows the Insular confusion of s and ss; also oppinnione. Sentences begin with somewhat larger letters. Vellum of the Insular type. Ink black. Script is a calligraphic compressed majuscule verging on minuscule...Pointed minuscule of Northumbrian type is used for the last two lines of each column. Both scripts recall the main hand of Kassel Theol.fol.21. Some late mediaeval scribbles.
Written it would seem in Northumbria, to judge from the script. Provenance unknown, presumably the monastery of Werden.

P Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale lat. 4871, ff. 161-8

There is as yet no catalogue entry for this MS and its mediaeval provenance is unknown.

CLA V, 559:

Anglo-Saxon minuscule, s.viii-ix.

Isidorus, Etymologiae (Libb. XIII.5-XIV.5)

One quire of 8 leaves, correct order being 1612, 165-8, 163-4 (in whole MS ff. 168; ff. 1-160 contain Orosius, Aethicus, Beda, Methodius Patarensis, etc. s.x); 355 x 265mm. <295 x 220mm.> in two columns of 43-44 lines...Punctuation: the medial point marks various pauses; ends of sections have two or three points on the line - an Insular practice. Run-overs to the line above set off by two or three oblique strokes. Accents occur over the long i of final syllables. Abbreviations numerous, including normal Nomina Sacra, the familiar Insular symbols h, ɔ, ð, ï, þ, p = autem, con, eius, enim, est, per; q:, ɡ, ɡ, ɡ, qnd, qsi = quae, quam, quia, quod, quando, quasi; ɔ = sed; ɔn = tamen; and the ordinary forms: ā = aut; iht, iht = dicunt, dicitur; ẹẹ, ọ = esse, est; ǹ = haec; ọọ, ọọ = nomen, nostri; ṭ, ṭ, ṭp = pri, post, pro; ǭ = quae, ọẹ = sunt; ọ = tur, ṭ =
uel. Omitted m is marked by a horizontal stroke over the vowel. Spelling shows Insular peculiarities: affrica, ussum, occassum, compresa. Characteristic bold black initials smeared with an ochre wash; smaller initials decorated by dots within the letter or washed over with lemon-yellow. Chapter headings and opening words of a section washed over with ochre. Membranes thick, greasy and defective, prepared in the Insular manner. Script is an expert Anglo-Saxon minuscule, the letters having a compressed appearance...

Origin probably Northumbria. Bound with a volume which came from the Abbey of Moissac; the following entry in an eleventh-century hand occurs on f.160v, originally blank: Hi sunt libri conditi in teca librorum cenobii Moysiacensis... Belonged to J.A. de Thou... There is little reason to suppose that our part came from Moissac. Was No.687 in the Colbert collection and No.3788.3 in the Royal collection.

N Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale lat.7585

There is as yet no catalogue entry for this MS and its mediaeval provenance is unknown. Other contents are not listed by Gneuss.
Notes to Chapter V,6:
2. Dumville, "English Square Minuscule Script: the Background and Earliest Phases", p.165 and pl.1 and VII.
3. MLGB.
Chapter V, 7:

Works also by Isidore of which there are insufficient copies to form stemmata:

Allegoria, PLLXXIII
Bodl. 444............(see Isidore, Prooemia)
Arras 764............(see Isidore, Prooemia)

De corpore et sanguine Domini
C. Trin. Hall 26........s. xi, xii, or. unknown, prov. unknown, 244 x 169mm. Also contains Ambrose, De uiduis, De virginibus, De duobus martiris Uitale et Agricola and Contra corruptas et corruptores.

De ortu et obitu, PLLXXIII
Bodl. 444.............(see Isidore, Prooemia)
Arras 764.............(see Isidore, Prooemia)

De summo bono
Lambeth 377...........s. x, or. unknown, prov. Lanthony, 228 x 175mm. No other contents.

Liber sententiarum, PLLXXIII
Sal. 7.................s. xi ex., or. unknown, prov. Salisbury, 288 x 194mm. Contains also the sayings of Fulgentius and Martinus.
Worc.Add.5.............s.viii², or.unknown, prov.unknown, fragment.

Quaestiones in Uet.Test., PLLXXXIII
C.Trin.B.4.27 (141)...s.x, or.unknown, prov.Christ Church, Canterbury, 344 x 238mm. Also contains Gregory, Speculum, and Augustine, In epistola Iohannis.
Sal.135.................s.xi ex., or.Salisbury? prov. Salisbury, 250 x 156mm. The writing of Scribe C appears in this MS.

Scholia on Priscian
B.L.Domitian i.......(see Isidore, De Natura Rerum)
Chapter Six

St. Jerome
Jerome was born in Stridon in Dalmatia, probably in 331 A.D., under the Christian rule of Constantine the Great. In his youth he was influenced by the ideals of monastic asceticism, probably against the wishes of his family, from whom he was exiled by 375 A.D. He moved east to live the life of an ascetic, taking his library with him: all his writings date from after this point.

His early works were mostly translations of writers such as Origen and Didymus into Latin, and later Biblical commentaries, initially on the St. Paul's epistles. He also wrote the Life of Paul the First Hermit and the Life of Malchus. Later he worked on the Old Testament, taking most of his material from Origen, and became interested in Hebrew. He made a list of grossly inaccurate definitions of Hebrew names and commented on the harder passages of Genesis (Hebraicae Quaestiones in Genesin).

In 391 he began his new translation of the Bible which came to be known as the Vulgate. He completed it in 405, but carried on working on the Life of Hilarion and De viris illustribus. He was a frequent correspondent and battled against poor health and depression induced by news of the fall of Rome to continue his exegetical writings until his death around 419-20.

Works of his known in Britain are many, but of the
MSS, only two of *In Ecclesiasten* and one of *In Danielem* are now on the Continent: this could be because there was little need for their export. Few works survive in many manuscripts. On the Continent they were used in the teaching of scholastic rather than monastic theology, but he was valued as a model of ascetism and as a letter-writer [1].

Ælfric was much influenced by Jerome in his Homilies, and probably used copies of his books from Winchester. Ker lists the works of St. Jerome amongst "the sine qua non" of a good library [2].

---

Notes to Chapter VI, 1:
(PLXXIII) Jerome wrote De uiris illustribus in the early years of the fifth century. It was to be an account of Christian scholarship, but it was not altogether what it set out to be: he included Seneca, and Jews like Philo, and some Arians. For the first half he translated the work of the Greek Eusebius, with no notable original thought. The second half was his own work, but consisted of long accounts of the lives of friends and of those whom he admired, at the expense of those he cared little about: Ambrose, for instance, is mentioned only in passing. The final entry is an account of himself, the self-centred culmination of the work. As a reference book for the early church it would undoubtedly have been useful [1].

(PLLXXXIII) Isidore's In libros ueteris ac noui Testamenti prooemia is an introductory exegetical work, and one of Isidore's later works. It takes the form of a list of short summaries of the books of the Bible, with longer general passages on the letters of St.Peter and St.Paul. The short prologue is straightforward and serves as a list of contents. Prooemia would have been suitable as an introductory work, or even as a quick reference work like De uiris illustribus, and it is possibly for this reason that they were grouped together so often. Seven manuscripts
contain one or other of these texts, and two or possibly three of them contain both texts. These three will be examined first.

H Hereford O.iii.2  
B Bodleian, Bodley 391 (2222)  
S Salisbury Cathedral 88

H Hereford Cathedral O.iii.2

s.ix, vellum, 250 x 194mm., 24 lines to a page, ff.206, "no ornament". On last leaf but one (s.xiv.):-

Liber ecclesie cathedralis Herefordensis.

Contents:

(1) Katalogus Ieronimi  
   Inc. Hortaris, Dexter, ut, Tranquillum sequens,  
   f.2

(2) Decretalis epistola de recipiendis et non recipiendis libris. (PL59, 167)  
   f.35

(3) Katalogus uirorum inlustrium a Gennadio, Masiliensi episcopo, post Hieronymum conscriptus. (PL33, 980)  
   f.38

(4) Katalogus Isidori Spalensis episcopi (PL83,1407)  
   f.58

(5) Retractatio Agustini (PL33, 583)  
   f.67v

(6) Liber Cassiodori senatoris de institutionibus divinarum litterarum (PL70, 1105)  
   f.127v

   f.163

   Inc. De libris noui et ueteris testamenti
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Quorundam sanctorum nobilissimorumque uirorum

(Hereford catalogue)

Ker says that this is the exemplar of our S [2]. Mynors, while agreeing that it was written in France, suggests that it is descended from an insular minuscule MS [3]. The mediaeval provenance of this manuscript is unknown.

B Bodleian, Bodley 391 (2222)

s.xii in., parchment, 306 x 206mm., i + 139 leaves, "with illuminated capitals, etc.", written in England.

Liber Sancti Augustini Cantuarie (13th.cent.):


Contents:
Theological treatises:-

1. (f.1v) Ortus, uita uel orbitus sanctorum Patrum [lxxxiv] qui in Scripturarum laudibus efferuntur by St.Isidorus of Seville: with preface and list of chapters.

2. (f.12v) Allegoriae quaedam sacrae Scripturae, by Isidorus, whose name occurs in the preface: here without title.
3. (f.23v) Katalogus beati Hieronimi de catholicis scriptoribus
with preface and a list of names.
4. (f.40v) Decretalis epistola de recipiendis & non recipiendis libris a Gelasio papa cum lxx. episcopis conscripta
a Decretum...
5. (f.42) In Dei nomine Katalogus uirorum inlustrium a Gennadio Masiliensi episcopo post Hieronimi Katalogum conscriptus incipit short lives, numbered from cxxxvi to ccxxxii, and i-xcvi, preceded by a list of the names.
6. (f.53v) Catalogus Isidori de illustribus uiris, in a shorter form than that printed by Migne (PLlxxiii, 1081).
7. (f.58) Retractatio Augustini episcopi, the Retractationes, in two books: with a list of the works reviewed.
8. (f.106) Liber primus Cassiodori senatoris Institutionum divinarum Litterarum, with a list of the 33 chapters.
9. (f.128v) Liber pr(oh)emiorum sancti Isidori e librorum Noui ac Ueteris Testamenti plenitudine...
10. (f.133v) Ejusdem Isidori De 'libri[s] Noui Testamenti' et (f.135) Ueteris.
11. (f.136v) The Itinerarium or De situ ac mirabilis terrae Hierosolymitanae of Antoninus Placentinus, here without title or author, and added in a late s.xii hand.

The back of the binding has the offset from two foll.

(Bodleian catalogue)

Ker names this as one of the MSS difficult to date as before or after the Norman Conquest because writing changed so little in the south of England during that time [4]. Mynors dates it as s.xii in., in the Canterbury hand from St.Augustine's, Canterbury [5].

**S Salisbury Cathedral 88**

s.xi-xii, vellum, 291 x 200mm., ff.121.

**Contents:**

1. Jerome, *De uiris illustribus* f.1
2. Gelasius, *Decretals* 18
3. Gennadius, *De uiris illustribus* 20
4. Isidore, *De uiris illustribus* 31v.
5. *Adnotatio Sancti Augustini episcopi operum plurimorum* 34v.
8. *Libri ueteris testamenti ob amorem doctrinae legendi* 93v.
9. Isidore, *De ortu et obitu* 95
10. Isidore, * Allegoria* 113
11. Note on grammatical construction 121v.
ff.101-108 are misplaced, and should follow f.91.  
(Salisbury catalogue)

Notes from B, C & L:
This MS contains the writings of scribes A, B3, and C as distinguished by Ker [6]. Scribe B3 is not very competent, and writes sometimes ,, and sometimes ; in his punctuation. Corrections are supplied by Scribe C. The exemplar, as stated above, is H (see note (Aa)). This manuscript appears in Patrick Young's Catalogue as

92 Hieronymus de scriptoribus...fol. s.xi/xii.

The following manuscript contains only De uiris illustribus. It is the earliest of the MSS containing this work.

C British Library, Cotton Caligula A.xv, fols.3-117
For information on this MS, see Isidore, Etymologiae MS C above.

The following MSS contain only Prooemia:
O Bodleian, Bodley 444 (2385) s.xi ex.
A Arras, Bib.Mun. 764 (739) ff.134-81 s.viii/ix
L Leningrad Q.v.I.15 s.viii²
O Bodleian, Bodley 444 (2385)

s.xii in. and s.xiii (made up of two MSS of which only A concerns us here), parchment, 213 x 147mm., ff.177. The first part, which was acquired no later than 1602, bears in a s.xiii hand Iste liber est ecclesie ///// [erasure, possibly Petrib = Peterborough].

Contents:
1. (f.1) The Allegoriae Sacrae Scripturae of St.Isidore, here without title, but with the Prologue to Orosius giving the author's name.
2. (f.10v) Liber Isidori episcopi ad Dionisium de Uetere et Nouo Testamento, usually entitled Prooemia in libros U et N Testamenti.
3. (f.17v) De ortu et gestis et obitu et uita quorundam illustrium uirorum... by St.Isidore, but here anon.: at end Explicit de utroque Testamento.

(Bodleian catalogue)

Although this is among the Salisbury manuscripts produced to furnish the new library between 1089 and 1125, it does not contain writing by the scribes identified as A and C, the main scribe of the Salisbury scriptorium and the chief corrector respectively. One feature it does contain, however, is the note D.M. in the margins, to signify Dignum Memoria. Of the twenty-seven manuscripts with this note in them, one other, Salisbury 112, has the writing of neither
scribe A nor scribe C, and two are manuscripts falling into a later group, but the other twenty-three do fall into the group containing the writing of scribes A and C. Ker notes that this manuscript was obtained by the Bodleian not later than 1602 [7].

A Arras Bibliothèque Municipale 764 (739)

Ff.134-81. No catalogue entry is as yet available for this MS, and its mediaeval provenance is unknown. However, we do know that the contents of these folios are all works of Isidore, as follows [8]:

Allegoriae sacrae scripturae
Prooemia
De ortu et obitu patrum

These are the same contents in the same order as in MS O above. This MS may have been for some time at Bath, which is not far from Salisbury.

CLA VI, 714

Anglo-Saxon Majuscule and Minuscule, s.viii.

...(foll.1-133, partly palimpsest - the lower script is s.ix - contain Rabanus, expositio in Judith, etc., in minuscule s.ix-x); 200 x 160mm. <165 x 130mm.> in 21 and 23 long lines...Colophons in Anglo-Saxon majuscule in red. Punctuation: a medial point or colon marks the main pause. Omissions are marked by ⪼ in the text and ⪽ before the insertion in the lower margin (f.143v) or by
signes de renvoi. Run-overs carried to the line above are set off by a short oblique stroke. Abbreviations include the Insular forms hr, ṭ, ṭ' = autem, eius, est, quae, tur, and the ordinary forms b:, q: = bus, que: eē = esse; ṅ, ṅm = non, nostrum; π, π̄, π̄ = per, prae, pro; qd and qr, qnn, qq = quod, quoniam, quoque; γ⁺ = rum; scri, sc = saeculi, sunt. Spelling: 'confussionem' (with the second s added by first hand), 'saepultus'. Initials of Insular style are in bold black and surrounded by red dots; they show the bull's eye motif and spiral finials; superimposed red dots are seen on initial Z on fol.177v. Vellum of Insular type, defective in part. Ink black. Script, by more than one hand, is partly Anglo-Saxon majuscule verging on minuscule. Two Old-English glosses on f.174v.: stuppa (hendu), capillis (her). The text, saec. xii, on fol.163v, originally left blank, seems to be in cipher. Written in England. Belonged to the Abbey of St.Vaast at Arras; the ex-libris Bibliotheca monasterii S. Vedasti Atrebatensis 1628 stands on f.1.

L St.Petersburg Q.v.I.15

For information on this MS, see Isidore, Differentiae MS L above.
Mynors has shown that H is the exemplar of S, and that B is also a copy of H though perhaps not a direct one. He places the centre for the copying of these and nineteen other MSS which derive from H through B at Canterbury [3]. This leaves out the fourth MS to contain De uiris illustribus, C, which is slightly earlier than the others. There is no immediate clue as to C's specific origin, but Ker gives its provenance as St. Augustine's, Canterbury, the supposed "centre of diffusion of this corpus of treatises" [5]. It is a little odd that there seems to be no link between C and the others. Perhaps it was in fact easier, in early Norman days, to import H rather than to obtain C. The fact that H was copied as a whole seems to indicate that it was the collection of works in it that was popular, rather than each individual work on its own.

L and A are close chronologically, but do not share the same list of contents. L seems to have no clear link with any of our other MSS, so perhaps it left England early for some Continental Anglo-Saxon foundation, thereby avoiding being copied in England, and accounting for its eventual presence in Continental libraries. A may well have remained in England until O was copied from it, if it was, for they share the same collection of contents: the links between England and France are so great at the time when O was copied that A could easily have left then or at any time
up to 1628 when it belonged to the Abbey of St. Vaast.

Notes to Chapter VI, 2:
2. Ker, B, C & L, p. 150.
5. Cassiodori institutiones, p. xliii.
Chapter VI, 3:
Works also by Jerome of which there are insufficient copies to form stemmata:

Contra Ioquinianum, PLXXIII
Harley 865.............s.xi/xii, prov.St.Albans.
Bodl.94...............s.xii ex., or.S.W.France? prov.Exeter, 259 x 172mm. Also contains 5 letters of Augustine and the following works of St.Ambrose: De Isaac et anima, De bono mortis, De fuqa seculi, De Iacobi et uita beata, De Paradiso, De consolatione Valentiniani and Epistola ad Uercellensem ecclesiam.

De interpretatione nominum Hebraicorum, PLXXIII. Jerome's Latin translation of the treatise by Philo Judaeus.

Epistola ad Paulinum, PLXXII
St.Petersburg, Q.v.I.15...(see Isidore, Prooemia).

Epistolae, PLXXII
Durham B.II.10........s.xi ex., or.Christ Church, Canterbury? prov.Durham, 333 x 230mm. 123 letters
to or from Jerome: a much copied collection.

Hereford O.vi.11......s.xi, or.unknown, prov.Hereford, St.Guthlac. Also Sulpicius Severus, Uita S.Martini and other works.

Hebraicae quaestiones in Genesin, PLXXIII

Durham B.II.11......s.xi ex., or.Durham, prov.Durham, 320 x 235mm. Large collection of minor and sometimes spurious works by Jerome.

Bodl.808.............s.xii in., or.France? prov.Exeter, 256 x 163mm. Also other works by or attributed to Jerome: De decem temptationes Israel in deserto, Hebraicae quaestiones in Reges and in Paralipomenon, Commentarius in Canticum Deborae and In Lamentationes Jeremiae, De terra promissionis, De distantiiis locorum, De nominibus Hebraicis.

In Canticum Canticorum

C.Trin.B.1.29 (27)...s.xi, xii, or.unknown, prov.Buildwas, no other contents.

In Danielem, PLXXV

Bodl.385.............s.xi ex., or.France? prov.Canterbury, 291 x 213mm. Also contains Bede, De
tabernaculo and Orosius, Quaestiones lxv.

Marburg Best. 3151,
Nr. 321-5, s. viii, or. unknown, prov. unknown, fragment.

In XII prophetas
Durham B. II. 9, s. xi ex., or. Durham, prov. Durham, 328 x 240 mm. No other contents.

In Ecclesiasten, PLXXIII
Kassel Theol. Fol. 21, s. viii, or. Northumbria? prov. unknown.

In euangelium Matthaenum, PLXXVI
Sal. 137, s. xi ex., or. unknown, prov. Salisbury, 291 x 200 mm., no other contents.
Shrewsbury s. n, s. viii², or. Northumbria? prov. unknown, fragment.

In Ezechielem, PLXXV
Rawlinson C. 723, s. xi ex., or. Salisbury, prov. Salisbury. The writing of scribe B² and the correction of Scribe C appear in this MS.
In Hieremiam, PLXXIV
Sal. 24................. s.xi ex., or. Salisbury, prov. Salisbury, 331 x 219mm. The writing of Scribe B² appears here, and Ker describes it as "once a very handsome book by a good scribe" [1].

In Isaiam, PLXXIV
C. Pembroke 17........ s.ix-x, or. unknown, prov. Bury, 348 x 263mm. No other contents.
Bodl. 717.............. s.xii in., or. England, prov. Exeter, 366 x 256mm. No other contents.
Sal. 25................. s.xi ex., or. Salisbury, prov. Salisbury, 306 x 219mm. The writing of Scribe B' and the corrections of Scribe C appear in this MS.

In prophetas, PLXXV
C. Trin. B. 3. 5 (84).... s.xii, or. unknown, prov. Canterbury, 316 x 219mm. Part II of In prophetas, and Bede De temporibus.

Uita S. Pauli, PLXXIII
CCCC 389.............. s.ix?, or. unknown, prov. St. Augustine's, Canterbury, 225 x 140mm. Also Life of St. Guthlac.
Caligula A. xv. 3-117.. (see Jerome, De uiris illustribus).
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Notes to Chapter VI, 3:

CONCLUSION

We can now correlate the evidence produced above to give a general overview of manuscript production in late Anglo-Saxon and early Norman England. Taking only the information on the five texts studied in greater detail, Persius, Satirae; Augustine, Enchiridion; Gregory, Cura pastoralis and Moralía; Isidore, Synonyma (and Prudentius, Psychomachia), we can see that different texts have survived the centuries in slightly different ways. Below is a diagram comparing the simplified stemmata of each of these six texts:

A solid line indicates a passage of time during which there is evidence of continuous insular transmission.

A dotted line indicates periods through which we have no evidence of continuous transmission, but where MSS identifiable from the earlier period of transmission have provided sources for the later period.

No line at all shows where we have no evidence of insular transmission, where continental exemplars, extant or not, have had to be imported to begin the stemma afresh.
As we can see, each diagram is different. *Cura pastoralis*, *Synonyma*, *Moralia* and *Satirae* all begin from one source, although none of these sources is extant. *Enchiridion* seems to begin from two. *Synonyma*'s tradition breaks into two main branches early in its transmission, each of which continues past the Norman Conquest. The stemma of *Psychomachia* is too complex to establish. *Satirae* remains in one closely connected family, although transmission seems only to begin around 900. Transmission of *Enchiridion* also begins late, and having begun in two branches it continues that way, although there is evidence of cross-fertilization. *Cura pastoralis* and *Moralia* both start early, but both break off:
in the case of Cura pastoralis, the eighth century branches can be seen to have led to the tenth century recommencement, but in the case of Moralia the line stops and does not start again until at least 800, where it seems to stem from continental imports. Psychomachia is transcribed in the tenth and eleventh centuries from apparently a variety of sources.

The correlation between four out of six of these stemmata shows that between about 800 and 900, manuscript production was poor. This date corresponds with that of the peak of Viking raids in England and their deleterious effect on monastic life. A settled existence for the production of lengthy works like Cura pastoralis, Moralia and Enchiridion was hardly to be had, and damage to livestock must have resulted in low supplies of writing surfaces. Men would also perhaps have been expected to fight for their kingdom rather than to become monks, so the scriptorium would have lacked scribes as well as material. We know, too, that while works in Anglo-Saxon were of a high standard at this time, Latinity was poor. It is understandable that the kind of scholarship which would lead to the copying of pagan literature like Satirae would not flourish under such conditions.

The reason for the continuity of Synonyma's transmission is not very clear, and we can see that whatever its history, the text has not reached us undamaged. Perhaps it was Synonyma's very brevity that saved it: if scribal
practice was to continue at all, it must be sustained in short works for which time and materials were available. Ker notes that Isidore was the only one of the principal Church Fathers to be copied in the century leading up to the Norman Conquest [1], along with many later Christian authors. This perhaps indicates fashion rather than purely lack of exemplars, and the Benedictine monastic reform around the time of the Conquest may well have reversed this trend. How precisely the reform would have affected scriptorial practice we do not know, but if we return again to the transmission of Synonyma, we may find a clue. Our MS V was copied by a continental scribe, possibly an Italian. It has been assumed that the MS therefore is continental, copied in an English centre, but it may not be so. The text in the MS is so entirely in keeping with what we have discovered of the Insular tradition of that work, that it seems unlikely that it could have been copied from anything but an Insular MS: if the huge lacunae in the text had been so common on the continent that the tradition could have entered Britain from two different sources in two different centuries, we would have more evidence of it in continental MSS, which we do not. The codex, moreover, is written on vellum, not on parchment, almost exclusively an insular practice. It seems possible, then, that a continental scribe produced this MS in Britain: could he have been brought to Britain as a foreign expert, to help restart good scriptorial production at a time when insular scribes had poor standards?
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The bar chart below shows the percentage of MSS on our original list produced in each century covered here (it must of course be taken into account that these figures cannot be absolutely accurate until we have an absolutely accurate method for dating "borderline" MSS, and that Gneuss' List officially ends in 1100, so only a few apparently twelfth century MSS are shown here).
The peak is clearly the eleventh century, when the country was a little more settled, the monastic system was increasing in strength, and the influence of continental MSS was strong. In the long run the Normans were beneficial invaders and helped manuscript production, and this eleventh century peak coincides with a peak in the reconstruction and refounding of abbeys and cathedrals and the extension of Benedictine influence.

Interesting to note, too, is the trough in the ninth century after quite a high percentage in the eighth century (particularly taking into consideration that these eighth century MSS have had to survive for longer). Of these sixteen eighth century MSS, eleven are now abroad and for the most part have been since the ninth century. The six ninth century MSS, by contrast, are all imports: B.L.Add.23944 is French, but was in England by the tenth century; Bodleian 310 is in a continental hand; Hereford O.iii.2 is continental; Paris, B.N.Lat.7585 was begun in France in the ninth century and finished in England in the tenth; Cotton Vespasian D.xiv is continental, possibly Italian; Vatican Pal.Lat.259 was written in an Anglo-Saxon centre on the continent. This has been seen as the result not only of political instability but also of poor Latinity and an increase in the production of vernacular books, frequently translations of the works of Gregory [2].

We have seen in the transcription of these texts some evidence of the methods of scribal practice in late
Saxon and early Norman England: scribes generally copied from an exemplar set in front of them, rather than to dictation; it was not unknown for scribes to use two exemplars. We can see that insular traditions exist, that many of them offer sensible variations, and that in some cases the reading preserved in the insular tradition may well be the original reading of the text. The small number of these cases may indicate that modern editors are justified in ignoring, for the most part, these MSS which are usually later in date than those available from continental sources. However, it should be taken into account that manuscript traditions which have flourished under more isolated conditions have their values, and should not be completely overlooked.

Notes to Conclusion:
2. D.A.Bullough, "The Educational Tradition in England from Alfred to AElfric: Teaching Uttriusque Linguae", p.464: this applies chiefly to Wessex, but as it was the kingdom least affected by Viking attack, the overall effect on Latin MS production was probably balanced.
Appendix I: Texts by other authors of which there are too few copies to form stemmata.

AMBROSIUS

Born around 340 A.D., of a Christian Roman family in Gaul, Ambrosius travelled to Rome as a boy and received an advocate's education. Through his success, he rose to become governor of Milan. He was made bishop by popular acclaim, was instrumental in the conversion of St. Augustine, and remained in Milan until his death in 397 A.D. He was a loyal Roman and popular bishop, whose existing work consists mostly of minor treatises on the ascetic life, and the influential Hexameron and De officiis ministrorum. He also wrote several hymns, but probably not as many as are attributed to him. For many of his minor works, there is no standard printed edition.

Contra corruptas et corruptores,
C. Trin. Hall 26 .......... s. xi, xii, or. unknown, prov. unknown (initially ascribed by Ker to St. Augustine's, Canterbury), 244 x 169mm. Also contains De uiduis, De virginitibus, De duobus martiris Uitale et Agricola, and Isidore, De corpore et sanguine Domini.

De benedictionibus patriarchum,
Bodl. 835 ................. s. xi  ex.?  or. France?  prov.
Salisbury, 238 x 159mm.  Also
contains De Ioseph patriarcha, De poenitentia and De excessu fratris sui Satyri.

**De bono mortis, PLXIV**

Bodl.94.....................s.xii ex., or.S.W.France? prov. Exeter, 259 x 172mm. Also contains De Isaac et anima, De fuga seculi, De Jacob et uita beata, De Paradiso, De consolatione Valentiniani and Epistola ad Uercellensem ecclesiam, by Ambrose, Jerome's Contra Jouinianum and 5 letters of St.Augustine of Hippo.

**De consolatione Valentiniani,**

Bodl.94.....................(see De bono mortis above).

**De duobus martiris Uitale et Agricola,**

C.Trin.Hall 26..............(see Contra corruptas et corruptores above).

**De excessu fratris sui Satyris, PLXVI**

Bodl.835.....................(see De benedictionibus patriarchum above).

**De fide, PLXVI.** A dogmatic treatise on faith, dedicated to
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Gratian.

Bodl. 739 .................. s.xii in., or. England, prov. Exeter, 322 x 206. No other contents.

Bodl. 827 .................. s.xii in., or. France, prov. Canterbury, 284 x 203mm.

Sal. 140 .................. s.xi ex., or. Salisbury, prov. Salisbury, 281 x 205mm. This contains the writings of Scribes A and C.

De fuga seculi, PLXIV

Bodl. 94 .................. (see De bono mortis above).

Bodl. 698 .................. s.xii ex., or. France? prov. Salisbury, 325 x 238mm. Also contains De Isaac et anima and De Iacob et uita beata, De consecratione ecclesiarum by Remigius of Auxerre, and 3 treatises by or attrib. to St. Augustine of Hippo.

De Iacob et uita beata, PLXIV

Bodl. 94 .................. (see De bono mortis above).

Bodl. 698 .................. (see De fuga seculi above).

De Ioseph patriarcha, PLXIV

Durham B.II.6 .............. s.xi ex., prov. Durham. Contains other works by Ambrose.
Bodl. 835................. (see De benedictorum patriarchum above).

De Isaac et anima, PLXIV

Bodl. 94.................. (see De bono mortis above).
Bodl. 698.................. (see De fuga seculi above).

De lapsu virginis consecratae,

Bodl. 768.................. s.xi ex.? or.France? prov. Salisbury, 244 x 156mm. Also contains De uiduis, De uirginibus, De uirginitate, Exortatio uirginitatis, De misteriis, De sacramentis.

Bodl. 792.................. s.xii in., or.unknown, prov. Exeter. Also the Prognosticon of Julian of Toledo, De uiduis, De uirginibus, De uirginitate, Exhortatio uirginitatis.

De misteriis, PLXVI

Bodl. 768.................. (see De lapsu virginis above).

De Nabuthae, PLXIV

Royal 5.F.xiii............. s.xi med., or.Salisbury, prov. unknown, 263 x 179mm. Also contains Epistolae and the other works of
Ambrose, De obitu Theodosii imperatoris, De sancto Protasio et Geruasio martyribus.

De obitu Theodosii imperatoris, PLXVI

Royal 5.F.xiii............(see De Nabuthae above).

De officiis ministrorum: PLXVI. A treatise on the duties of priests, based on the De officiis of Cicero, and one of Ambrose's best known works.

Bodl.92....................s.xii in., or.unknown, prov. Exeter, 247 x 156mm.

De paradiso, PLXIV

Bodl.94.....................(see De bono mortis above).

De patriarchis, PLXIV

Boulogne 32...............viii? or.unknown, prov.unknown.

Also contains other works by Ambrose.

De poenitentia, PLXVI

C.U.L.Kk.1.23..............s.xii, or.unknown, prov.Canterbury, folio. Also contains Ambrose, Hexameron, Augustine, De penitentia, De utilitate credendi, De
De sacramentis, PLXVI
Bodl.768. (see De lapsu uirginis above).

De sancto Protasio et Geruasio martyribus,
Royal 5.F.xiii. (see De Nabuthae above).

De uirginibus, PLXVI
C.Trim.Hall 26. (see Contra corruptas et corruptores above).
Bodl.768. (see De lapsu uirginis above).
Bodl.792. (see De lapsu uirginis above).

De uirginibus, PLXVI. A treatise encouraging the monastic ascetic life, and dedicated to his sister Marcellina [1].
C.Trim.Hall 26. (see Contra corruptas et corruptores above)
Bodl.768. (see De lapsu uirginis above).
Bodl.792. (see De lapsu uirginis above).
Paris, Bib.Nat.Lat.1751..s.xi, or.unknown, prov. St.Augustine's, Canterbury? Also contains, among other things, Nicetas of Remesiana, De lapsu
uirginis consecratae.

De uirginitate, PLXVI
Bodl. 768 ......................... (see De lapsu uirginis above).
Bodl. 792 ......................... (see De lapsu uirginis above).

Epistola ad Uercellensem ecclesiam, PLXVI
Bodl. 94 ......................... (see De bono mortis above).
Bodl. 516 ......................... s. x, or. continental, prov. Salisbury, 231 x 159mm. Also contains Augustine, De uidendo Deo.
Bodl. 765 ......................... Early s. xii, or. France(?), prov. Salisbury, 251 x 200mm. Also contains Augustine, Contra mendacium, De poenitentiae medicina, De mendacio, De cura pro mortuis agenda and Sermo de oratione dominica.

Epistolae, PLXVI. Mostly on church matters.
Royal 5.F.xiii .................. (see De Nabuthae above).

Exhortatio uirginitatis, PLXVI
Bodl. 768 ......................... (see De lapsu uirginis above).
Bodl. 792 ......................... (see De lapsu uirginis above).
Hexameron, PLXIV. A treatise on the Creation.

C.U.L.Kk.1.23............(see De Poenitentia above).

C.Trin.O.3.35 (1207).....s.xi, or.unknown, prov.Chichester,
250 x 157mm. No other contents.

Arras 346...............s.x ex., xi med., prov.unknown. No
other contents.

In Evangelium Lucae, PLXV

C.Trin.B.3.9 (88).......s.xii, or.Christ Church,
Canterbury, prov.Canterbury, 325 x
213mm. No other contents.
AUSONIUS

Ausonius, born around 310 A.D. in Gaul, was involved in Roman colonial administration in various parts of the Empire, but returned to spend the last years of his life in Bordeaux where he died around 395 A.D. His work consisted of rhetorical games and vivid descriptive poems, none of which would have drawn upon him the animosity of the Christian Church, but they do not appear in any mediaeval monastic catalogues in Britain [2]. The Technopaegnion, addressed to Proconsul Pacatus, consists of nearly 200 hexameters, each ending in a monosyllable, a poetic game.

Edition:


Technopaegnion

C.U.L.Kk.5.34.............s.ix or x, or.England, prov. Winchester (and Glastonbury?), small quarto. It contains a comment on the parable of the Prodigal Son, two poems against Jorbert or Jorbet, an elegiac on God and nature, a text on weights and measures, the works Culex and AEtna usually ascribed to Vergil, and the Technopaegnion. The order of the
poems does not correspond at all to the printed edition [3], and includes Oratio matutina but omits De litteris monosyllabis Graecis ac Latinis.
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CICERO

Cicero is one of the few truly Classical authors represented in the manuscripts existing from this period. He lived from 106-43 B.C., but was much regarded for his rhetorical skills for many centuries after his death, and even the great Fathers of the Church tried to imitate his style of writing as the best example of Latin prose. The Rhetorics, De amicitia and De senectute appear most commonly in the mediaeval catalogues in Britain [4]. Orationes in Catilinam is one of his most famous series of speeches, written to condemn the conspirator Catiline, whose downfall Cicero considered one of his greatest triumphs. However rarely it might have been copied in these early centuries, his philosophy, too, was seen as adaptable in places to Christian thought. De Officiis was the model for St. Ambrose's manual of ethics, De officiis ministrorum. Aratea is a rare survival of one of his poetic works, a translation of part of the work of Aratus of Soli. Cicero looked upon it as the best of his early poetry; it is certainly more learned and difficult than the rest. It is quoted by Isidore of Seville in his Etymologiae. Each of the manuscripts from this date containing Aratea also contains other works on astronomy. By Anglo-Saxon times, however, his works were not on the school syllabus in England, as Latin was taught mainly through the Bible, so study of the works was limited mostly to scholars and learned writers. The manuscript of Orationes in Catilinam here is in Caroline
minuscule of the late 10th. or early 11th. century, written over part of St. Augustine, De Trinitate, copied in the eighth century in Anglo-Saxon minuscule, and over other Insular minuscule texts of the same period or slightly later, lives of the Saints, a service book, and Gregory, Homiliae in Evangelia [5]. We have no immediate evidence for the exemplar of this text, although it was possibly French. It would therefore not be part of a major Insular tradition, but an unusual offshoot of a continental family, seemingly uncopied, although considered important enough at the time for the Augustine and popular Gregory texts to be erased to make room for it.

Editions:


Aratea

C. Trin. R. 15.32 (945).....s.xi in., or. England, prov. St. Augustine’s, Canterbury, and Hyde, 213 x 150mm. Also contains works on astronomy and astrology.

Tiberius B. v.............s.xi', or. unknown, prov. Battle,
Ely, Exeter and Winchester, quarto. Also contains Priscian, *Periegesis*, *Marvels of the East* and many astronomical texts.

Harley 647.................s.ix med., or.unknown, prov. St. Augustine's, Canterbury, 280 x 320mm., fragment. Also contains 17 works on astronomy.

In the edition cited above, all these MSS are used, and Soubiran's stemma shows Harley 647 (his H) as a common ancestor of Trinity R.15.32 (945) (his K) and Tiberius B.v (his T).

*De officiis*

C.Trin.R.16.34 (982).....s.xii in., or.unknown, prov. Lisieux?, Salisbury, 294 x 194mm. Also contains extracts from Aulus Gellius and Valerius Maximus, a short poem and Seneca, *De Beneficiis* (part).

*Orationes in Catilinam*

Edin.Nat.Lib.Adv.18.7.8..(see Gregory, *Homiliae in Evangelia*).
JUVENAL

Juvenal (A.D. 60/70-post 128) was popular with Christian scholars because he condemned the bad morals of Rome and seems, therefore, to have been the ultimate in "safe" writers: against corruption but in favour of the establishment. We have evidence in mediaeval catalogues for seven copies of Juvenal, a commentary and a gloss [6].

Edition:


Satirae

C. Trin. O. 4.10 (1241) ..... (see Persius, Satirae).

C. Trin. O. 4.11 (1242) ..... S. X, or. unknown, prov. St. Augustine's, Canterbury, 241 x 238mm. Also contains the Eclogues of Hukbald, and several scribbles and short verses.
The Metamorphoses of Publius Ovidius Naso (43 B.C.-18 A.D) were popular throughout the Middle Ages, initially because they were easily used as metaphors for Christian morality. His influence was so great that it is puzzling to find that the only surviving work from this period in England is the Ars Amatoria, immoral by most standards and not the easiest work to turn into Christian allegory. Works of Ovid are commonly mentioned in catalogues of cathedral libraries [7]. E.J. Kenney points out that our MS is connected with his R (Paris, Lat. 7311, s.ix, written in France), and shares a common ancestor with it and with his Sa (St. Gall 821, s.xi) and his b (Bamberg M.V.18, s.x (f.)) [8].

Edition:


Ars amatoria Bk. I

Auct. F. 4. 32 (2176) ....... s.ix ex., or. Wales, prov. Glastonbury (by 956 A.D.), 259 x 197 mm. [9].
Pliny the Elder was an enthusiastic scholar and a writer on a wide range of topics, but most of his work is now lost. Most of the *Naturalis Historia* was published posthumously, and although it is inaccurate and selective in its subject matter, it is still valuable for the light it sheds on ancient scientific study and the Roman world. The books which survive in the MS below contain information on the universe (Lib. II) and on the lands and peoples of Europe, Asia and Africa (Libb. III-VI). Interest in ancient science in the eighth century was strong: we have evidence of Bishop Cyneheard of Winchester seeking ancient books of secular science [10]. Two copies of this work are listed in mediaeval catalogues: one was at York in s.viii [11].

**Edition:**


**Naturalis historia:**

Leiden, Bibliothek der Rijksuniversiteit, voss. Lat. F. 4, ff. 4-33....s.viii', or Northumbria, prov. unknown, 410 x 290mm., fragments of Libb. II, III, IV, V, VI. No other contemporary contents.
SENECA
(c. 4 B.C.-A.D.65) Seneca's De clementia and Letters were approved of by Christian writers, along with much of the rest of his moral work. De clementia is a moral treatise [12]. The 124 Epistles, addressed to his friend Lucilius, also form moral essays, clearly intended for publication, and full of "moralizing tone and informal anecdotal style" [13]. They form the bulk of his work recorded in mediaeval catalogues [14].

Editions:

Sénèque, De la clémence, ed.François Préchac, Paris, 1925.

De clementia
Royal 15.C.ii..........s.xi ex., or.Salisbury, prov. Salisbury, 275 x 182mm. Also contains the epistles of Seneca to St.Paul, an epitaph for Seneca, 20 letters from Seneca to Lucilius, De paupertate, aphorisms drawn from Seneca, De remediis fortuitorum, De beneficiis, the Moralis Philosophia of Guillaume de Conches, and the Liber Petri Alfuni.
Epistolae

Royal 15.C.ii.............(see De clementia above).
STATIUS
(c.A.D.40-c.96) Statius' Achilleis was unfinished at his
death, with only just over one book completed, but the
Thebais took twelve years to complete. In the Middle Ages
his work was used as a school text [15], but there is also
evidence for it in monastic catalogues [16].

Editions:

(Weubner edition vol.II, fasc.1) P.Papini Stati
(Weubner edition vol.II, fasc.2) P.Papini Stati
Thebais, ed.O.Muller & A.Klotz, Leipzig, 1908

Achilleis

Thebais
C.St.John's 87 (D.12) ....s.xi, or.unknown, prov. Dover
Priory, 256 x 166mm. Also contains
Glosses on Priscian, and Commentum
super Sophisticos elenchos. There
is a list of vestments on the
flyleaf.
Royal 15.C.x..............s.x ex., or.continental, prov.
Rochester, 294 x 238mm. Also
contains a Life of Statius.
VITRUVIUS
(c. 50 - 26 B.C.) This is the only surviving work of Vitruvius Pollio. It was very influential during the Renaissance, but it is strange to find two early copies of it like this. There is no evidence for it in mediaeval library catalogues [17].

Edition:

_Uitruuii de architectura libri decem_, ed. V. Rose, Leipzig, 1899.

De Architectura
Cleo. D. i ................. s. xi, or. unknown, prov. St. Augustine's, Canterbury, quarto.
Also Flavius Vegetius, De re militari and Junius Solinus Polyhistor.

Harley 3859 ................ s. xi/xii, or. unknown, prov. unknown.
Also Flavius Vegetius, De re militari, Macrobius, Saturnalia, Inuectiuæ Sallustii in Ciceronem, Nennius' History of the Britons, Augustine, Ad cauendum haereses, Junius Solinus Polyhistor and AEthicus, Cosmographia.
Notes to Appendix I:
1. See note on p. 25 of Introduction.
10. Epistles of Boniface, 114 (MGH, Epistolae Selectae Tom. I).
16. Manitius, Handschriften, p. 128. A. Klotz thinks a York exemplar of Statius was an ancestor of B. N. Par. Lat. 8051 (Philologus 63 (N. F. 17) (1904), pp. 157-60), and Alcuin was certainly familiar with Statius' work (Alcuin: The Bishops, Kings, and Saints of York, ed. P. Godman).
17. Manitius, Handschriften, p. 82.
Appendix II: The use of marginal k in Insular MSS.

The appearance of marginal k is noted in several of our MSS studied above, amongst others. They do not seem to be among the idle scribbles with which a bored reader decorates the margin: rather they serve a purpose, but what precisely the purpose is, or whether indeed their meaning is consistent, is in doubt. They appear almost exclusively in the left margin, are clearly formed and contemporary with the text. They can be divided into three kinds, as follows:

1. Indications of lemmata. In this case, they are put beside the line where the lemma begins in the text, even when a new line is not taken for the start of the lemma. An example of this is in Würzburg, Univ.Bibl.M.P.Th.f.149a (Gregory, Moralia) (see Vol.II, pp.97-98), where they are placed in the left margin along with ..., at the beginning of the lemmata, each following line being marked only with .... This MS is in Anglo-Saxon minuscule of s.viii\(^2\), of Northumbrian type but probably written on the continent. The lemmata are in uncial, with large clear capitals, unilluminated.

2. Indications of colour-washed initials in the text. Again, the k appears in the left margin, against the line containing the initial. This appears in Bodl.708 (Gregory, Cura pastoralis) (see Vol.II, pp.14-16), f.84v, 1.2, but the
k does not appear anywhere else in that section, although there are other colour-washed initials. The origin of this MS is unknown: it is English, s.xi, and its provenance is Exeter.

3. Indications to the rubricator. These signalled that an initial letter was required at that point. They appear at the opening of paragraphs in Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 448 (Isidore, Synonyma), s.x, from either Glastonbury or Winchester (see Vol. II, pp. 198-199); B.L. Harley 110 (Isidore, Synonyma), Anglo-Saxon, s.x ex.: in this MS, at one point where the k missing, the rubric has been omitted (see Vol. II, p. 202). M.R. James points them out also in Cambridge, Trinity College 0.2.31 and 0.1.18 (see Vol. II, p. 198), without seeming to see their purpose. The latter MS is Augustine, Enchiridion, s.x, for which James hypothesizes a Glastonbury origin.

In general, then, the initials seem to be placed against the text by the scribe or his contemporary in order to indicate to a later rubricator or decorator where initials should be filled in or washed with colour. What the k actually stands for is unclear. Where the sign specifically means that a rubric should be inserted, there is an association with Glastonbury Abbey which should be taken into consideration. T.H. Habinek has observed a sign transcribed as k in a papyrus fragment of Cicero, Verr. 2.2
(P. Iand. 90, mid 1st cent. A.D.?) [1], and suggests that it stands for kaput, and indicates a new subject. In the papyrus it appears in the middle of the line, not in the margin.

Notes:
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<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>226, 287, 291, 295</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>153, 158</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>225, 184, 282</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>219, 80 n.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>268, 276, 292</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>220</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>191</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>222</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>221</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>260, 261, 266</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>215, 220</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>162, 168-169, 170</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>282</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>299</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>201, 204-205, 215</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>311</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157</td>
<td>113, 121-122, 125-192, 5, 19-21, 32-79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165</td>
<td>196</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
<td>219</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
<td>113, 122-123, 125-192</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173</td>
<td>227, 189, 196-197, 200-246</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179</td>
<td>80 n.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Shrewsbury, Shropshire Record Office:**
- Vol. II: 277, 299

**Vatican Library:**
- Reg.Lat.1560 - Vol. I: 43

**Verona, Chapter Library:**
- XLII (40) - Vol. II: 28

**Windsor, St. George's Chapel:**
- 5 - Vol. II: 172, 179, 182

**Worcester Cathedral Library:**
- F.163 - Vol. II: 23
- Q.21 - Vol. II: 162, 169-170
- Add.3 - Vol. II: 5, 21-24, 32-79
- Add.5 - Vol. II: 282
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Würzburg Universitätsbibliothek:
M. p. th. q. 2 - Vol. II: 299.

Zürich, Zentralbibliothek:
Rh. 92 - Vol. II: 181.
# Index Nominum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vol. I</th>
<th>Vol. II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alfred, King</td>
<td>4, 21</td>
<td>2, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambrose, St.</td>
<td>2, 15, 19, 20, 21, 111, 213, 215, 217, 224</td>
<td>297, 309-316, 319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arnulf of Boeriis</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augustine, St., of Canterbury</td>
<td>3, 19</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augustine, St., of Hippo</td>
<td>2, 12, 14, 19, 20, 21, 22, 24, 36, 110-227</td>
<td>166, 167, 184, 196, 249, 282, 289, 297, 302-303, 309, 311, 313, 315, 320, 328, 331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augustus - Vol. II: 152</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ausonius</td>
<td>13, 17, 37</td>
<td>317-318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bath Abbey</td>
<td>198, 293</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battle Abbey</td>
<td>320</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bede</td>
<td>6, 14, 21, 36, 215</td>
<td>Vol. II: 3 nn. 1 + 3, 4, 81, 90, 152, 188, 298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedict Biscop</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedict, St.</td>
<td>1-2, 7</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildwas Abbey</td>
<td>298</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burton-upon-Trent Abbey</td>
<td>203</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bury St. Edmund's Abbey</td>
<td>4, 8, 105, 114, 210, 225-226</td>
<td>Vol. II: 173, 174, 300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury</td>
<td>3, 4, 9, 20, 115, 202, 213, 218, 224, 225</td>
<td>Vol. II: 81, 184, 197, 255, 295, 298, 300, 311, 313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christ Church</td>
<td>8, 194, 195, 199, 206, 208, 213, 225</td>
<td>Vol. II: 11, 15, 82, 156, 158, 159, 173, 179, 182, 193, 282, 297, 316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassiodorus Senator</td>
<td>1, 111</td>
<td>287, 289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chichester</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cicero</td>
<td>13-14, 15, 151</td>
<td>Vol. II: 166, 258, 313, 319-321, 331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluny</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cnut, King</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyneheard, Bp. of Winchester</td>
<td>324</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dover Priory</td>
<td>327</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunstan</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham Cathedral</td>
<td>8, 9, 196, 208-209, 218, 224, 225</td>
<td>Vol. II: 170, 175, 184, 297, 298, 299, 311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eadwine</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ely Cathedral</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethelwold of Winchester</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Iona Abbey - Vol.I: 5.


Lindisfarne Abbey - Vol.I: 3.


Peterborough - Vol.II: 177, 292.


Whitby, Synod of - Vol.I: 3.
Windsor, St. George's Chapel - Vol.II: 178, 179.

York Minster - Vol.II: 324.