

---

*Anglo-Saxon Texts 7*

---

**THE OLD ENGLISH  
DIALOGUES OF SOLOMON  
AND SATURN**

*Edited and translated by  
Daniel Anlezark*

---

## Anglo-Saxon Texts

7

### THE OLD ENGLISH DIALOGUES OF SOLOMON AND SATURN

The dialogues of Solomon and Saturn, found in MSS Corpus Christi College Cambridge 422 and 41, are two of the most complex Old English texts to survive. The first two dialogues, in verse and prose, present the pagan god Saturn in human form interrogating King Solomon about the mysterious powers of the Pater Noster, while in a second poem the two discuss in enigmatic terms a range of topics, from the power of books to the limits of free will.

This new edition – the first full one to appear for some 150 years – presents a parallel text and translation, accompanied by notes and commentary. The volume also includes a full introduction, examining the evidence pointing to the influence of Irish continental learning on the dialogues' style and content; arguing that the circle which produced the dialogues was located at Glastonbury in the early tenth century, and included the young Dunstan, future archbishop of Canterbury; and locating the texts in the context of the learned riddling tradition, and philosophical debates current in the ninth and tenth centuries.

DR DANIEL ANLEZARK teaches in the Department of English at the University of Sydney.

## Anglo-Saxon Texts

ISSN 1463–6948

### *Editorial Board*

MICHAEL LAPIDGE  
GABRIELLA CORONA  
MECHTHILD GRETSCH  
RICHARD MARSDEN  
ANDY ORCHARD

*Anglo-Saxon Texts* is a series of scholarly editions (with parallel translations) of important texts from Anglo-Saxon England, whether written in Latin or in Old English. The series aims to offer critical texts with suitable apparatus and accurate modern English translations, together with informative general introductions and full historical and literary commentaries.

1. *Wulfstan's Canon Law Collection*  
edited by J. E. Cross (†) and Andrew Hamer
2. *The Old English Poem Judgement Day II: a Critical Edition with Editions of De die iudicii and the Hatton 113 Homily þe domes dæge*  
edited by Graham D. Caie
3. *Historia de Sancto Cuthberto: A History of Saint Cuthbert and a Record of his Patrimony*  
edited by Ted Johnson South
4. *Excerptiones de Prisciano: The Source for Ælfric's Latin-Old English Grammar*  
edited by David W. Porter
5. *Aelfric's Life of Saint Basil the Great: Background and Context*  
edited by Gabriella Corona
6. *Aelfric's De Temporibus Anni*  
edited with a translation by Martin Blake

THE OLD ENGLISH DIALOGUES  
OF SOLOMON AND SATURN

Edited with a translation by

*DANIEL ANLEZARK*

D. S. BREWER

© Daniel Anlezark 2009

*All rights reserved.* Except as permitted under current legislation no part of this work may be photocopied, stored in a retrieval system, published, performed in public, adapted, broadcast, transmitted, recorded or reproduced in any form or by any means, without the prior permission of the copyright owner

First published 2009  
D. S. Brewer, Cambridge

ISBN 978 1 84384 203 3

D. S. Brewer is an imprint of Boydell & Brewer Ltd  
PO Box 9, Woodbridge, Suffolk IP12 3DF, UK  
and of Boydell & Brewer Inc,  
668 Mt Hope Avenue, Rochester, NY 14620, USA  
website: [www.boydellandbrewer.com](http://www.boydellandbrewer.com)

A CIP catalogue record for this book is available  
from the British Library

This publication is printed on acid-free paper

The publisher has no responsibility for the continued existence or accuracy of URLs for external or third-party internet websites referred to in this book, and does not guarantee that any content on such websites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.

Typeset by Word and Page, Chester

Printed in Great Britain by  
CPI Antony Rowe, Chippenham and Eastbourne

# Contents

Preface	vii
Acknowledgements	x
Abbreviations	xi
<b>Introduction</b>	
1. The Manuscripts	1
2. Language and Metre	6
3. Genre, Context and Sources	12
4. Structure and Relationships	41
5. Date and Authorship	49
<b>The Dialogues of Solomon and Saturn: Texts and Translation</b>	
Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 41	
<i>Solomon and Saturn I</i>	60
Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 422	
<i>Solomon and Saturn I</i>	64
<i>Solomon and Saturn Prose Pater Noster Dialogue</i>	72
<i>Solomon and Saturn Poetic Fragment</i>	78
<i>Solomon and Saturn II</i>	78
Apparatus Criticus	96
Commentary	99
Glossary	139
Bibliography	153
Index	165



## Preface

The dialogues of Solomon and Saturn edited here are among the most unusual texts which survive from the Anglo-Saxon period, either in Latin or Old English. The two poems, *Solomon and Saturn I* (*SolSatI*) and *Solomon and Saturn II* (*SolSatII*), and the *Prose Pater Noster Dialogue* (*SolSatPNPr*), evidently emerged from a common scholarly milieu which has left an imprint on their diction and style, with a shared interest in obscure and enigmatic expression, revealing a fascination with the relationship between the laws of nature and the nature of life. The three texts also present a common understanding of the spiritual life, a quotidian struggle with an apocalyptic dimension, a war against the devil and his angels to be consummated at Doomsday. It is difficult to determine how many authors are at work, or the degree to which authorship overlaps, though I believe *SolSatII* was written first. If the other texts were not by the same author, then it is clear that whoever came later followed where a master had led. The three texts are found in two manuscripts. The first part of *SolSatI* is found in Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 41 (B), of the mid-eleventh century, while all three texts (with a poetic fragment, *SolSatFrag*), are found in Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 422 (A), of the mid-tenth century. A separate trivia dialogue presenting Solomon and Saturn as interlocutors is found in Cotton Vitellius A. xv, of the mid-twelfth century; this is not edited here because it does not appear to have emerged from the same close circle which produced the other three texts, and has recently been edited.<sup>1</sup> The survival of four separate dialogues between Solomon and Saturn (one partially in two versions), extant in manuscripts from across two centuries, might suggest a literary phenomenon in late Anglo-Saxon England. This richness, however, may depend on the accidents of survival, and it is difficult to believe such difficult texts ever had wide appeal. Indeed, the texts in both A and B have survived on the margins of more highly valued works – A as flyleaves for a missal, in B in the margins of the Old English Bede.

There have been five independent editions of some or all of the Solomonic dialogues found in A and B. The Ælfric Society published John Mitchell Kemble's *The Dialogue of Salomon and Saturnus with an Historical Introduction* in 1848, placing the dialogues among the first Old English texts (arranged in the order of A) to be edited according to the newly developing principles of philology.<sup>2</sup> The

<sup>1</sup> See Cross and Hill, *Prose Solomon and Saturn*.

<sup>2</sup> See O'Keeffe, 'Editing and the Material Text', p. 149 n. 9. Kemble's edition of Solomon and Saturn was first published as the Society's issue no. 13 in 1847; the three parts of the *Anglo-Saxon Dialogues of Salomon and Saturn* were issued in 1845, 1847, 1848. Kemble had earlier (around 1844) printed the work privately, *Salomon and Saturn*.

## Preface

edition was the product of fifteen years of research into a range of esoteric dialogues, beside which the Old English texts were published. Kemble's misleading translation of all three dialogues into modern English is the only complete one ever made.<sup>3</sup> Kemble's treatment of the Old English texts, with random emendation and idiosyncratic orthography, has long since made his text redundant. However, his interpretative framework has proved more enduring: 'I assign a Northern origin to one portion of the story, while I admit the admixture of an Oriental element. I propose to show that this Northern portion is an echo from the days of German heathenism, and to restore Saturnus or Marcolfus *the God* to his place in the pagan Pantheon of our ancestors.'<sup>4</sup> Elements of this paradigm have endured, though more recent scholarship has revealed no close influence of obscure Oriental legend, while the search for Germanic paganism in the texts has proved a dead end.<sup>5</sup> Christian Grein's edition ten years after Kemble's was later revised by Bruno Assmann, whose 1898 edition of the poems appeared in Richard Wülker's revision of the *Bibliothek der angelsächsischen Poesie*, providing a more accurate text, though in keeping with the practice of the time emending more often than is now considered acceptable.<sup>6</sup> Robert Menner published his edition in 1941, providing the poems with full apparatus, commentary and glossary, but relegating *SolSatPNPr* (text only) to an appendix.<sup>7</sup> Breaking with the previous practice of treating A as a base text, Menner printed separate, facing texts of *SolSatI*. In his 1942 edition of the poems (produced in co-operation with Menner) for the Anglo-Saxon Poetic Records, Elliott van Kirk Dobbie resumed the practice of treating A as the base text for *SolSatI*.<sup>8</sup> Gilda Cilluffo's 1981 edition (with Italian translation) of *SolSatPNPr* represents the only edition dedicated solely to this text.<sup>9</sup>

The history of editions of the dialogues since the late nineteenth century has served to uncouple the poems from the prose, so that the anthology of dialogues which appears in A has become almost invisible to scholars and students of Old English. The perception has been created of three independent texts, or of a poetic dialogue of two parts, with the prose remaining hidden.<sup>10</sup> This edition is designed to present these texts to a modern audience in a way similar to A's mode of delivering them to its tenth-century readers; the hope is that this will lead to further discussion of the texts themselves, their relationship to each other and their recep-

<sup>3</sup> Shippey, *Wisdom and Learning*, includes the Old English text of *SolSatII*, with facing-page translation into modern English. Wild, *Salomon und Saturn*, translates the poems into German; Faerber, *Salomon et Saturne*, presents the Old English texts of all four dialogues, with French translation.

<sup>4</sup> Kemble, *Dialogues*, pp. 6–7; see O'Keeffe, 'Editing and the Material Text', p. 170.

<sup>5</sup> See E. G. Stanley, *Imagining the Anglo-Saxon Past. 'The Search for Anglo-Saxon-Paganism' and 'Anglo-Saxon Trial by Jury'* (Cambridge, 2000).

<sup>6</sup> C. W. M. Grein, ed., *Bibliothek der angelsächsischen Poesie*, 4 vols (Goettingen, 1857–64); Assmann, *Die Handschrift von Exeter*, pp. 58–82.

<sup>7</sup> Menner, *PD*.

<sup>8</sup> Dobbie, *ASPR VI*, pp. 38–48, 164–70.

<sup>9</sup> Cilluffo, *Salomone e Saturno*; I thank Patrizia Lendinara for providing me with a copy of this edition. See also Cilluffo, 'Il dialogo'.

<sup>10</sup> O'Neill, 'Date, Provenance', p. 140.

## Preface

tion in Anglo-Saxon England. My work as editor has been made easier in the latter stages of this project by the Parker-Web project.<sup>11</sup> This project and others like it are changing the role of the editor of early medieval texts. The edition no longer serves the purpose of making materially available texts otherwise difficult to access. However, the fact that manuscripts can be seen at high resolution on a desktop does not make them ‘accessible’ to all readers. As editor I have tried to interpret what is now easily visible to the reader; in the Introduction and Commentary, I discuss some of the texts’ linguistic features, and a range of sources and analogues which locate them in a literary and intellectual moment of origin. The case of B is different from A, but similarly the editor no longer need be anxious over the fact that extracting one text from many in the margins will cause confusion. This edition attempts to bridge, rather than erase, the gap between the twenty-first-century reader and the tenth- and eleventh-century scribes.<sup>12</sup> I have included both texts of *SolSatI*, whose varying texts demand separate editions.<sup>13</sup> B’s text is printed first for reasons only of narrative logic, to cater for readers who would like to begin reading *SolSatI* at line 1. A’s texts are presented in their manuscript order, though I have separated them, giving them titles and independent lineation. Editors have created five different systems of lineation for the poems, and three for the prose; mine hopefully simplifies and clarifies these.<sup>14</sup> The major break with the past is treating the problematic nine lines of verse on A, p. 13, as a fragment (*SolSatFrag*). I agree with Vincenti and Menner that these lines originally concluded *SolSatII*; however, this edition is designed to facilitate, rather than confuse, discussion, and the manuscript order has been retained.

In the Introduction I offer a discussion of the literary milieu which I believe produced these dialogues, breaking with a scholarly tradition which has found them to be magical, superstitious and deliberately obscure. Work over the past four decades has gradually undermined a consensus dating from Kemble’s study and edition, and the great scholars whose names are found throughout my notes have shown that the author(s) were well read in the kinds of works generally known to have been available to the Anglo-Saxons. It is now well accepted that many of the idiosyncrasies of style and intellectual interest reflect the strong influence of Hiberno-Latin literature, symptomatic of a close contact between the circle which produced these texts and the world of Irish learning. I have developed this discussion, and left behind any interest in Solomon as master magician, which has been more the product of wishful thinking than of a close reading of the texts. I hope that I have not erred too far in another direction.

<sup>11</sup> <http://parkerweb.stanford.edu/>; the project aims to have all the Parker Library’s medieval manuscripts freely available on the World Wide Web by the end of 2009; facsimiles of the dialogues in both manuscripts are included in Robinson and Stanley, *Old English Verse Texts*, no. 12.

<sup>12</sup> See O’Keeffe, ‘Editing and the Material Text’, pp. 150–1.

<sup>13</sup> O’Keeffe, *Visible Song*, p. 66.

<sup>14</sup> This edition agrees with Menner, *PD*, for *SolSatI* and Shippey, *Wisdom and Learning*, for *SolSatII* (as far as 327).

## Acknowledgements

A number of debts have been incurred in the preparation of this edition. Work on it began when I was Lecturer in English at Trinity College Dublin, continued while I held a post at the University of Durham, and has been completed at the University of Sydney. Colleagues in all three universities (and countries) have supported and encouraged this project in various ways. I would like to thank the Fellows of Corpus Christi College Cambridge for granting me access to the manuscripts of the Parker Library, and to Ms Gill Cannell for her ready assistance. Financial support for the preparation of this edition was given by the University of Sydney in the form of a School of Letters, Art and Media Writing Fellowship in Semester 1 of 2007. Publication of this edition has been helped by a generous grant from the Australian Academy of the Humanities. Various elements of the edition have appeared as conference papers over the past few years, and their presentation here has benefited greatly from the comments of colleagues. I especially would like to thank Tom Hill for his encouragement of the project, and Robert Carver for help with some awkward passages of Latin. Other debts of gratitude are acknowledged in the notes.

## Abbreviations

Full details of frequently cited references may be found in the bibliography.

acc.	accusative
adj.	adjective
adv.	adverb
ASPR	Anglo-Saxon Poetic Records
B-T	J. Bosworth and T. N. Toller, ed., <i>An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary</i> (Oxford, 1882–98); <i>Supplement</i> by T. N. Toller (Oxford, 1921); reissued with revised and enlarged addenda by A. Campbell (Oxford, 1972).
BL	British Library
CCCC	Corpus Christi College Cambridge
CCCM	Corpus Christianorum Continuatio Mediaevalis
CSSL	Corpus Christianorum Series Latina
<i>CollPsBedae</i>	<i>Collectanea Pseudo-Bedae</i>
CSEL	Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum
dat.	dativ
<i>DOE</i>	<i>Dictionary of Old English: A to G Online</i> , ed. A. Cameron, A. C. Amos, A. diP. Healey, <i>et al.</i> (Toronto, 2007).
EETS	Early English Text Society
fem.	feminine
gen.	genitive
masc.	masculine
MGH	Monumenta Germaniae Historica
neut.	neuter
nom.	nominative
OE	Old English
os	Original Series
<i>PD</i>	<i>The Poetical Dialogues of Solomon and Saturn</i> , ed. R. J. Menner (New York and London, 1941).
pl.	plural
PL	Patrologia Latina, ed. J.-P. Migne, 221 vols (Paris, 1844–64).
sg.	singular
<i>SolSatI</i>	<i>Solomon and Saturn I</i>
<i>SolSatII</i>	<i>Solomon and Saturn II</i>
<i>SolSatFrag</i>	<i>Solomon and Saturn Poetic Fragment</i>
<i>SolSatPNPr</i>	<i>Solomon and Saturn Pater Noster Prose</i>
<i>SolSatPr</i>	<i>Solomon and Saturn Prose</i>
ss	Supplementary Series

*In memory of my father*

Sige hie onsendað soðfæstra gehwam,  
hælo hyðe, ðam ðe hie lufað.

*Solomon and Saturn II*, lines 67–8

# Introduction

## 1

### The Manuscripts

The Old English dialogues of Solomon and Saturn edited here survive in two manuscripts. Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 422, Part A (A) contains a dialogue between Solomon and Saturn on the Pater Noster in verse (*SolSatI*) and prose (*SolSatPNPr*), followed by a poetical dialogue on a range of subjects (*SolSatII*); at the head of p. 13 is a fragment of verse (*SolSatFrag*). Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 41 (B) contains the first 95 lines of *SolSatI*. In A *SolSatI* begins on the badly damaged and mostly unreadable p. 1, continuing to p. 6, line 12, where without change of manuscript format, the dialogue continues in prose; this proceeds as far as the bottom of p. 12, where it terminates abruptly owing to the loss of a leaf. On the top of p. 13 (recto of the last leaf of the first quire) are seven lines of text in verse (nine edited lines), which are clearly the conclusion of a dialogue, though whether these were originally designed to conclude *SolSatI* or *SolSatII* has proved a subject of debate. Following these lines on p. 13 a second verse dialogue begins, continuing to p. 26, where it ends incomplete. In B the first part of *SolSatI* (as far as line 94a) is found written in the margins of pp. 196–8 of the Old English translation of Bede's *Historia Ecclesiastica*.

#### *A (CCCC 422; Part A)*

CCCC 422 (Ker, no. 70; Gneuss nos. 110, 111) is comprised of two distinct parts.<sup>1</sup> The larger of these is Part B, a missal; its calendar dates this part to *c.*1060.<sup>2</sup> The two quires containing the dialogues making up Part A are in a unique hand, and apparently were used by a medieval binder as flyleaves for the missal.<sup>3</sup> These leaves are now bound together at the front of CCCC 422, and their Parkerian pagination, pp. 1–26, points to rearrangement in the sixteenth century. The leaves of Part A are difficult to read in places, owing to rubbing and the application of reagents. Page 1, which was long an outside page, is barely legible, though Page's examination of the leaf under ultraviolet light has confirmed that those parts of the text which

<sup>1</sup> Ker, *Catalogue*; Gneuss, *Handlist*; James, *Catalogue*, II, pp. 315–22.

<sup>2</sup> Ker, *Catalogue*, no. 70; Part B (pp. 27–586) is mainly in a round hand, the table of years on fols 44–5 is for 1061–98. Pages 571–86 are a quire of later date (s. xii); see T. Graham, 'The Old English Liturgical Directions in Corpus Christi College Cambridge MS 422', *Anglia* 111 (1993), 439–46.

<sup>3</sup> See Ker, *Catalogue*, p. xliii.

## Introduction

can be seen substantially agree with B.<sup>4</sup> A number of pages have been lost: a leaf is missing after p. 12 (at *seofode*, *SolSatPNPr* 120); the text on p. 14 has been erased, and a Latin form of excommunication written in the upper half during the twelfth century;<sup>5</sup> a leaf is missing after p. 18 (at *reafað*, *SolSatII* 130a); a leaf is missing after p. 22 (at *neahtes*, *SolSatII* 220); the text ends imperfectly on p. 26 (at *him to middes*, *SolSatII* 327).<sup>6</sup> The quires of Part A are arranged as follows:<sup>7</sup> fols 13, paginated on rectos 1–26. Collation: 1<sup>8</sup> wants 7 after p. 12, 2<sup>8</sup> wants 3 after p. 18, and 6 after p. 22 (presumably conjugate leaves of a bifolium).<sup>8</sup> The manuscript measures 190 x 130 mm, with a written space of c. 160 x 95 mm; there are 23 long lines to a page (24 lines on pp. 7–13; p. 2 has 22 lines).<sup>9</sup> The hair is outside all sheets, with ruling on hair sides, on more than one leaf at a time.

The scribe uses two grades of punctuation: an inverted triangle of points, and a simple medial point. The punctuation technique varies across the texts. Triangles are never combined in *SolSatI* or *SolSatPNPr*, though multiple triangles are found in *SolSatFrag* and *SolSatII*. In *SolSatI* the triangle appears three times (38b, 160b, 165b) – two of these are in the last ten lines of the poem; *SolSatI* 38b is the only instance of the inverted triangle being used to mark the end of a speech in this poem. In *SolSatPNPr* the use of the triangle to mark speeches and syntactic units is standard, and it is used frequently as a syntactic mark within Solomon's long speeches. In *SolSatII* the inverted triangle (sometimes multiplex) is used almost exclusively to mark the end of speeches, but also at 202 and 223 before capitals. Two other instances of multiple triangles are found in the first few lines of *SolSatIII*: after 4b, two triangles with virgule are written before the first use of the name *Saloman* (justified to the left margin); at the end of line 11 before the name *Saulus* (coincidentally in the left margin, and accidentally (perhaps) treated as the name of a speaker). In *SolSatII* before a new speaker the triangles are generally followed by a (variable) number of virgules. Virgules appear in combination with a single triangle in *SolSatPNPr* (three times on p. 7; once on p. 8), and once after two triangles at the end of *SolSatFrag*; virgules are never used in *SolSatI*.<sup>10</sup> The use of the medial point is more conventional, marking individual letters, numerals and runes, or terminating a row of capitals or a line of writing. In *SolSatPNPr* the

<sup>4</sup> O'Keeffe, *Visible Song*, pp. 67–8; Page, 'A Note on the Text', pp. 36–9; Menner, *PD*, pp. 2 n. 5, 80–1, 105.

<sup>5</sup> See Ker, *Catalogue*, p. 120; the erasure of the Old English text and the writing of the formula on p. 14 (the last page of Quire 1) suggests that at the time this page was more obviously placed for such reuse; an alphabetical pen trial in upper margin of manuscript A, p. 15 (s. xi med.?), would seem to corroborate this; the formula is edited by Liebermann, *Gezette*, I, p. 435.

<sup>6</sup> See Dobbie, *ASPR VI*, p. lv; Vincenti, *Die altenglischen Dialoge*, pp. 71, 75; pp. i–xv, 1–51, of Vincenti's study were also published as his Munich inaugural dissertation, *Drei altenglischen Dialoge*; the second part of Vincenti's edition, with text, never appeared.

<sup>7</sup> Ker, *Catalogue*, p. 120.

<sup>8</sup> O'Keeffe, *Visible Song*, p. 68 n. 62; Menner, *PD*, pp. 1–2.

<sup>9</sup> On p. 13 the capitals (*SolSatI* 1) take up two lines; cf. O'Keeffe, *Visible Song*, p. 68 n. 63.

<sup>10</sup> O'Keeffe, *Visible Song*, p. 74 n. 76; in addition to its use to end speeches and before the names of the contestants, the triangle occurs in *SolSatII* at: 25b (before a small capital 'W'); 202b (before a small capital 'H'); 223b (before a small capital 'ð' in the margin); 1a (at the end of a row of capitals).

## 1. The Manuscripts

medial point is used infrequently, and sometimes appears before capitals. The rare use of points makes the two ‘grammatical’ uses in *SolSatII* surprising; at 47b to separate an independent clause from a subordinate clause and at 141a before a small capital in a series.<sup>11</sup>

In all texts the Tironian ‘et’ is used throughout, though in *SolSatPNPr* ‘Ond’ is written out after inverted triangles. All the texts mark the abbreviation of a final nasal with horizontal mark over the penultimate letter, and all abbreviate *donne* as *don*. There is an almost exclusive preference for ‘ð’ over ‘þ’, with the latter found only twice (*SolSatPNPr* 20, 50); *ðæt* is never abbreviated. There is a difference in the way *SolSatI* and *SolSatPNPr* abbreviate ‘Pater Noster’. In *SolSatI* ‘Pater’ is abbreviated as ‘paṯ’ (39b, 167a), while ‘noster’ is not abbreviated. In *SolSatPNPr* ‘Pater Noster’ is found: written out in full at 2; abbreviated as in *SolSatI* once, at 20; abbreviated as ‘paṯ n̄r’ (i.e. with abbreviation marks) in all other cases (9, 11, 13, etc).<sup>12</sup> *SolSatI* begins with a large capital ‘S’ (approximately three lines high) written in the left margin, followed by a line of capitals one line high. This arrangement matches the scribe’s treatment of the opening line of *SolSatII* (p. 13, line 8). After this opening, however, scribal practice is not consistent. In *SolSatI* and *SolSatPNPr* the names are treated similarly, and begin with initial capitals. In both, if a name happens to appear at the beginning of a line of writing, the scribe writes a capital ‘S’ in the margin (in *SolSatPNPr* this practice is extended to other capitals); however, in *SolSatII* the rubrics (‘SALOMON CWÆÐ’, etc.) are all justified into the left margin, often at the cost of space. Katherine O’Brien O’Keeffe suggests the shift is the scribe’s invention in *SolSatII*, rather than reflecting a difference of practice in his exemplar, though the evidence could support either conclusion.<sup>13</sup> In *SolSatI* the medial point is used to separate independent clauses, whether or not a small capital follows.<sup>14</sup> The hair-facing-flesh arrangement of the sheets, the ruling of more than one leaf at a time and the use of the same ink as the main text for writing initials all suggest practices from the first half of the tenth century.<sup>15</sup> The consistent accenting of prepositional *on* (found throughout) and the marking of a major pause with a triangle of dots are two practices characteristic of Hand 3 of the Parker Chronicle (dated c.955). The hand was dated by Ker to s. x med.; David Dumville classifies the script of A as English Square Minuscule Phase II, which he would date ‘in principle to the 930s’.<sup>16</sup> Gneuss (no. 110) suggests variously s. x<sup>1</sup>, x<sup>2/4</sup> or x med. The copying of A is datable to the period c.930 x 950.

The Sherborne usage of the missal (CCCC 422, Part B) provides limited evidence for the provenance of Part A, made at least a century earlier.<sup>17</sup> Sherborne

<sup>11</sup> O’Keeffe, *Visible Song*, p. 71.

<sup>12</sup> The raw data might suggest a difference in an immediate or remote exemplar, though the two examples found in *SolSatI* may not present a statistically reliable comparison.

<sup>13</sup> O’Keeffe, *Visible Song*, pp. 71–2, n. 71.

<sup>14</sup> O’Keeffe, *Visible Song*, pp. 74 n. 77.

<sup>15</sup> See Ker, *Catalogue*, pp. xxv, xxvi and xxxvii–xxxviii, p. 120; O’Neill, ‘Date, Provenance’, p. 139.

<sup>16</sup> Ker, *Catalogue*, nos. 180 (1) and 264; D. N. Dumville, ‘English Square Minuscule Script: The Mid-Century Phases’, *Anglo-Saxon England* 23 (1994), 133–64, at pp. 143–4 and 158–9.

<sup>17</sup> Budny, *Manuscript Art at Corpus*, I, p. 647.

## Introduction

was an ancient West Saxon diocese, with Aldhelm of Malmesbury serving as its first bishop (c.705), and Hereman its last (1058–78).<sup>18</sup> Charter evidence points to a surge in administrative activity towards the middle of the tenth century (close to the date of A), especially under Bishop Alfred. In the 890s Sherborne was given to Alfred's advisor the Welsh bishop Asser, who held it until 909, when it was divided. It is difficult to say how active the scriptorium was at this time, though some evidence of activity (and poetic composition) before Asser's election might be found in the metrical preface added by his predecessor, Bishop Wulfsgige, to Gregory's *Dialogi*.<sup>19</sup> In 1058 the diocese of Sherborne united with Ramsbury, and the production of the missal could be associated with this merger. The enlarged diocese of Sherborne was itself suppressed in 1075, when the bishop moved to Old Sarum. At some time between its production, c.1060, and the sixteenth century, CCC 422 found its way to Darley in Derbyshire, where it was known as 'the rede boke of darleye in peake in darbyshire' and was held there in 'reverence'.<sup>20</sup> How CCC 422 came to Darley is a mystery; however, the book presents evidence of association with another centre in the twelfth century. As Ker noted, the two parts were together at an early date, as the twelfth-century form of excommunication on p. 14 is in the same hand as an addition on p. 49.<sup>21</sup> The text of the excommunication added on p. 14 differs from that on p. 310 of CCC 422's missal. However, the same formula as is found on A, p. 14, is found on p. 329 of CCC 146 (Ker, *Catalogue*, no. 37, pp. 50–1, s. xi inc.). CCC 146 was probably written in the Old Minster at Winchester, but texts, including the excommunication formula, were subsequently added at Worcester at the end of the eleventh and beginning of the twelfth century. It is possible that the same excommunication formula was added to both CCC 422, Part A, and CCC 146 at Worcester at around the same time. If so, CCC 422 made its way to Worcester at a time when this centre was collecting manuscripts from across England (and after Sherborne had lost its bishop). The missal may also have acquired its flyleaves at Worcester, though the awkward copying of the excommunication formula (on the last page of A, Quire 1) suggests they were already a part of the book.<sup>22</sup>

<sup>18</sup> 'Houses of Benedictine Monks: The Abbey of Sherborne', in Page, *Victoria History of Dorset*, II, pp. 62–70.

<sup>19</sup> See Ker, *Catalogue* no. 182.

<sup>20</sup> See James, *Catalogue*, p. 315. The missal is exceptional among Anglo-Saxon books, in that it is known to have spent the later Middle Ages in a parish, apparently passing during the Reformation period into the custody of a parishioner, 'Margaret Rollesley widow' (scribbled on pp. 130–1 in a mid-sixteenth-century hand); see E. Duffy, *The Stripping of the Altars: Traditional Religion in England 1400–1580* (New Haven and London, 1992), pp. 490–4. It was given to Archbishop Parker by 'Richard Wendesley esquier' (p. 586), and bequeathed to Corpus Christi College by Archbishop Parker in 1575.

<sup>21</sup> Liebermann, *Gesetze*, I, pp. 435–6.

<sup>22</sup> See M. Swan, 'Mobile Libraries: Old English Manuscript Production in Worcester and the West Midlands, 1090–1215', in *Essays in Manuscript Geography: Vernacular Manuscripts of the English West Midlands from the Conquest to the Sixteenth Century*, ed. W. Scase (Turnhout, 2007), pp. 29–42, at 39.

## 1. *The Manuscripts*

### *B (CCCC 41)*

B (Ker, no. 32; Gneuss no. 39) is also comprised of two parts, though the parts represent stages of writing, rather than the creation of a composite manuscript through binding. Part 1 is the Old English translation of Bede's *Historia Ecclesiastica*, occupying the main writing space. Part 2 is a collection of Latin and Old English texts distributed throughout the margins (ruled for the purpose), apparently with little system. *SolSatl* occupies the margins of pp. 196–8. The manuscript dates from s. xi<sup>1</sup>; the *Historia* is written in two hands, beginning respectively at p. 1 and p. 207 (quire 14, leaf 1), the marginal texts are from later in the same period. B has 244 leaves (fols iii+244+iii), paginated (i–vi), 1–488 (489–94).<sup>23</sup> The collation is as follows: pp. 1–488: 1<sup>8</sup>, 2<sup>6</sup>, 3–12<sup>8</sup>, 13<sup>8</sup> + 1 leaf after 5 (pp. 199–200), 14–30<sup>8</sup>, 31<sup>6</sup> wants 6, probably blank after p. 488; 4 and 5 in quire 9, and 3 and 6 in quire 16 are half-sheets. The manuscript measures c.347 x 214 mm, the written space of the *Historia* 293–250 x 145–135 mm. This space is ruled with 25 long lines (27 and 28 lines on pp. 157–98, 201–6), with single bounding lines. The marginal texts are mostly in one hand – the Old English texts (Ker, *Catalogue*, Articles 2–18) probably all in the same hand, unusually angular, of s. xi<sup>1</sup> or xi med; all are written in brown ink. Solomon's name is given visual prominence, even though, as O'Keeffe notes, the writing of the poem in the margins 'made capitals somewhat of a luxury'.<sup>24</sup> The name *Saturnus* which begins the text at the top left corner of p. 196 is given a capital 'S' roughly twice the height of the minuscule letters, followed by a small capital 'A', with the remaining letters minuscules; all other instances of the name have a small capital and minuscules. *Salomon* (following 20b), however, in addition to its large initial, has the next four letters in small capitals, with an abbreviation mark over the 'M'. The next time the name is written (following 38b), this 'M' is written like a rune; in the third instance (following 62b), it is written in a mixture of capitals and oversized minuscules.<sup>25</sup> The pointing of B is markedly different to A, certainly because of B's later date.<sup>26</sup> B uses the medial point almost exclusively, as a rule to mark statements, usually independent clauses, with approximately half occurring before capitals.<sup>27</sup>

The provenance of the manuscript is unknown, and none of its scripts points to the well-documented centres of the time.<sup>28</sup> The book was given to Exeter by Bishop Leofric (d. 1072), according to a donation inscription (p. 488).<sup>29</sup> Any claim of the book to display status in its decoration was cancelled by the inclusion of the

<sup>23</sup> Ker, *Catalogue*, p. 45; B was rebound in 1953; the previous binding was s. xviii.

<sup>24</sup> O'Keeffe, *Visible Song*, p. 72.

<sup>25</sup> O'Keeffe, *Visible Song*, p. 72 n. 74.

<sup>26</sup> O'Keeffe, *Visible Song*, p. 75.

<sup>27</sup> O'Keeffe, *Visible Song*, p. 75 n. 79, points out that the scribe's other work suggests that he simply copied the punctuation before him.

<sup>28</sup> Budny, *Manuscript Art at Corpus*, I, pp. 507–11.

<sup>29</sup> See E. Treharne, 'Producing a Library in Late Anglo-Saxon England: Exeter, 1050–1072', *Review of English Studies* 214 (2003), 155–72.

marginal texts, which impart the character of a ‘commonplace book’.<sup>30</sup> The texts are too many to be listed here.<sup>31</sup> These fall into three general categories: texts, mostly prayers in Latin, related to the liturgical cycle (including entries from the Old English martyrology corresponding to the Christmas Octave); homilies, all in Old English, which are also (sometimes loosely) related to the liturgical cycle;<sup>32</sup> charms in Old English and Latin. The relationship between these texts and *SolSatI* is not easily defined, though the presence of the SATOR formula (p. 329), an acrostic incantation based on the letters PATERNOSTER, might suggest the compiler included the fragment of the poem as a ‘charm’.<sup>33</sup> The content and style of the homilies (and other texts) indicate a debt to Hiberno-Latin religious literature.<sup>34</sup> While their arrangement is puzzling, the missal texts copied are perhaps not as random as sometimes assumed, and better thought of as prayers *from* the Mass (and office), rather than *for* liturgical use: this book would have been useless on an altar. B’s marginalia would have been read by someone literate in English and liturgical Latin, which intersect in *SolSatI*.

## 2

### Language and Metre

Copying errors in all three texts of A show that it is not an autograph; B cannot be. Neither text is free of the characteristic errors of copying: B skips words (e.g. at *SolSatI* 62a, *neah*, and 64a, *leaf*), while A is missing line 67, and has ‘s’ for ‘f’ at line 41b. In addition to possibly inherited errors, the scribe of A writes and corrects a dittography at *SolSatII* 72a.<sup>35</sup> The two partial texts of *SolSatI* invite discussion of their relationship to a hypothetical authorial original. However, the relationship

<sup>30</sup> Budny, *Manuscript Art at Corpus*, I, p. 506.

<sup>31</sup> O’Keeffe, *Visible Song*, pp. 69–70, suggests the resulting parallel configuration of texts on any given page is ‘probably fortuitous’, and the fact that the East Saxons’ return to devil worship is framed by Solomon’s account of the power of the letters of the Pater Noster over devils is ‘a splendid graphic accident’ (p. 69). See *The Old English Version of Bede’s Ecclesiastical History*, ed. T. Miller, 2 vols, 4 pts., EETS os 95–6, 110–11 (repr. London, 1959–63), I, p. 250.

<sup>32</sup> Ker, *Catalogue*, no. 32, articles 9, 11–13, 16–18; these are: pp. 254–80 (a version of Vercelli Homily IV); pp. 280–7, on the Assumption; pp. 287–95, the Apocalypse of St Thomas; pp. 295–301, from the Gospel of Nicodemus; pp. 402–17, homily on St Michael; pp. 484–8, a Passion homily; see Scragg, *Vercelli Homilies*; W. H. Hulme, ‘The Old English Gospel of Nicodemus’, *Modern Philology* 1 (1903–4), 579–614; Tristram, *Vier altenglische Predigten*; Grant, *Homilies*.

<sup>33</sup> O’Keeffe, *Visible Song*, pp. 69–70; see Grant, *Loricis*, p. 18; E. J. Sharpe, ‘The Old English Runic Paternoster’, in *Symbols of Power*, ed. H. R. E. Davidson (Cambridge, 1977), pp. 41–60, at 162–5, 59; K. Aland, ‘Der Rotas-Sator-Rebus. Seine Diskussion in der Korrespondenz Franz Cumont-Hans Lietzmann und in der Zeit danach’, in *Corona Gratiarum: Miscellanea Patristica, Historica et Liturgica Eligio Dekkers oblata*, 2 vols (Bruges, 1975), II, pp. 285–343.

<sup>34</sup> See K. Jolley, ‘On the Margins of Orthodoxy: Devotional Formulas and Protective Prayers in Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 41’, in *Signs on the Edge: Space, Text and Margins in Medieval Manuscripts*, ed. S. L. Keefer and R. H. Bremmer (Leuven, 2007), pp. 135–83.

<sup>35</sup> See O’Keeffe, *Visible Song*, p. 61 n. 45.