

# THE ALPHABET OF WORDS IN THE DURHAM COLLECTAR AN EDITION WITH TWO NEW MANUSCRIPT WITNESSES

BY CHARLES D. WRIGHT AND STEPHEN PELLE

The Alphabet of Words (AW), a Latin alphabet text with an interlinear Old English gloss, occurs among the additions made to the Durham Collectar (D) by the priest Aldred in the tenth century. Previously thought to be extant only in D, and possibly by Aldred himself, AW also survives (without the OE gloss) in a Kassel manuscript (K) from the second half of the eighth century, as well as in a defective twelfth-century copy in Karlsruhe (Kr). Most of AW is also incorporated in a Latin treatise on the alphabet (“Audiuimus multos”: AM) compiled probably in the ninth century. AW belongs to the genre of “parenetic alphabet,” widely attested in Greek but also sporadically in Latin, including in a ninth-century Paris manuscript (P: BNF, lat. 2796) that shares lemmata and glosses with AW for the letters X, Y, and Z. We provide the first critical edition and translation of AW from D, K, and Kr, with variants from AM and P, together with a discussion of AW’s genre and relation to other alphabetical texts as well as a full commentary on the biblical, apocryphal, and patristic lore transmitted by AW’s lemmata and glosses on each letter.

## INTRODUCTION

The manuscript Durham, Cathedral Library, A. IV. 19 (s. ix/x; additions and gloss s. x<sup>2</sup>), more commonly known as the Durham Collectar or Durham Ritual, contains, in addition to the collects, capitula, rituals, and blessings that make up the main text of the volume, a number of additions of various kinds copied by multiple scribes.<sup>1</sup> Some of these additions were the work of the priest

---

We thank Lukas Dorfbauer, David Ganz, Thomas N. Hall, and the two anonymous readers for *Traditio* for their comments and suggestions.

<sup>1</sup> Karen Louise Jolly, *The Community of St. Cuthbert in the Late Tenth Century: The Chester-le-Street Additions to Durham Cathedral Library A.IV.19* (Columbus, 2012), 2. For an edition of the whole manuscript, see A. H. Thompson and U. Lindelöf, eds., *Rituale ecclesiae Dunelmensis: The Durham Collectar*, Publications of the Surtees Society 140 (London, 1927); see also T. J. Brown, ed., *The Durham Ritual: A Southern English Collectar of the Tenth Century with Northumbrian Additions*, Early English Manuscripts in Facsimile 16 (Copenhagen, 1969). The Collectar proper is edited separately by Alicia Corrêa, *The Durham Collectar*, Henry Bradshaw Society 107 (London, 1992). In the present article we make use of Jolly’s reedition of the additions to the manuscript at 230–359.

### Abbreviations:

AM Treatise “Audiuimus multos,” in Luigi Munzi, ed., *Littera legitera: Testi grammaticali latini dell’Alto Medioevo*, AION Sezione filologico-letteraria Quaderni, 11 (Naples, 2007), 55–81.

*Traditio* 72 (2017), 61–108

© Fordham University 2017

doi:10.1017/tdo.2017.12

Aldred, who also glossed this manuscript and the famed Lindisfarne Gospels in the Northumbrian dialect of Old English.<sup>2</sup> Among Aldred's additions, we find on fol. 88v of the manuscript a text that Karen Jolly, following T. J. Brown, calls an "alphabet of words" (and which we will correspondingly abbreviate *AW*).<sup>3</sup> The structure of the text is as follows: each letter of the alphabet is written in order in the left margin, next to which (in nearly all cases<sup>4</sup>) is placed a word or phrase beginning with that letter; the spiritual significance of this word or phrase is then explained. The letter P, for instance, is explained as follows: "Portauit, id est Christus crucem suam portauit."

*AW* as a whole might strike the modern reader as a medieval, moralizing version of the kind of mnemonic alphabets familiar from *Sesame Street* and countless children's books ("C is for 'cat'"), and the text does appear to have had some sort of educational purpose.<sup>5</sup> The kind of education it supports, however, seems not to

- 
- AW*     *The Alphabet of Words*  
*BCLL*   Michael Lapidge and Richard Sharpe, *A Bibliography of Celtic Latin Literature, 400–1200* (Dublin, 1985) [cited by no.]  
*CLA*     E. A. Lowe, *Codices Latini Antiquiores*, 11 vols. (Oxford, 1934–66); Supplement (1971); 2nd ed. of vol. 2 (1972) [cited by vol. and no.]  
*CPL*     Eligius Dekkers, *Clavis Patrum Latinorum*, 3rd ed. (Turnhout, 1995) [cited by no.]  
*CPPM*   Jan Machielsen, *Clavis Patristica Pseudepigraphorum Medii Aevi*, IA–B: *Homiletica* (Turnhout 1990); IIA: *Theologica, Exegetica*; IIB: *Ascetica, Monastica* (Turnhout, 1994) [cited by vol. and no.]  
*RBMA*   Friedrich Stegmüller, *Repertorium biblicum Medii Aevi*, 11 vols. (Madrid, 1950–80) [cited by no.]  
Stotz    Peter Stotz, *Handbuch zur lateinischen Sprache des Mittelalters*, 5 vols. (Munich, 1996–2004) [cited by vol. and section no.]

<sup>2</sup> On Aldred, see Jolly, *Community of St. Cuthbert*, 37–70. The Lindisfarne Gospels and their Old English gloss are edited, along with the West Saxon Gospels and Mercian/Northumbrian gloss to the Rushworth Gospels, in W. W. Skeat, *The Four Gospels in Anglo-Saxon, Northumbrian, and Old Mercian Versions* (Cambridge, 1871–77; repr., Darmstadt, 1970).

<sup>3</sup> Jolly, *Community of St. Cuthbert*, 355–58; Jolly, "The Process of Glossing and Glossing as Process: Scholarship and Education in Durham, Cathedral Library, MS A.iv.19," in *The Old English Gloss to the Lindisfarne Gospels: Language, Author and Context*, ed. Julia Fernández Cuesta and Sara M. Pons-Sanz, *Buchreihe der Anglia* 51 (Berlin, 2016), 362–75, at 375; Brown, *The Durham Ritual*, 51. W. J. Boyd ("Aldrediana XXV: Ritual Hebraica," *English Philological Studies* 14 [1975]: 1–57, at 51) calls the text "an alphabetical list of words relating to sin and salvation"; Sarah Larratt Keefe calls it an "Abecedarial Meditation on Sin and Redemption" (*Manuscripts of Durham, Ripon, and York, Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts in Microfiche Facsimile*, no. 14 [Tempe, AZ, 2007], 48); Helmut Gneuss and Michael Lapidge (*Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts* [Toronto, 2014], 183) refer to it as an "alphabet of names and words with religious interpretations." Though our MS **K** heads the work "Sermo de Adam," this title is simply based on the opening words and does not accurately convey its contents.

<sup>4</sup> For the special cases of X and Y, see the edition below.

<sup>5</sup> Jolly, *Community of St. Cuthbert*, 172, 197–99.

have been the very basic grammatical instruction in the sounds of the Latin alphabet that one might expect from the structure of *AW*, but rather the transmission of theological concepts and of biblical, or even apocryphal, lore. The A entry, for instance, refers to the popular idea that Adam's name was created from the first letter of four stars, each representing one of the cardinal directions, and the entry for R relies on knowledge of apocryphal angelological and demonological traditions. There has never been a systematic attempt to identify the sources or literary relations of *AW*, and it has sometimes been considered *sui generis*, perhaps even the work of Aldred himself.<sup>6</sup> Since the Durham Collectar was the only manuscript hitherto known to contain the text, this was not an altogether unreasonable suggestion. However, *AW* was actually in circulation on the Continent long before Aldred's lifetime. We can now identify one new complete manuscript of *AW* (**K**) dating to the second half of the eighth century as well a partial manuscript witness (**Kr**) dating to the twelfth century; moreover, a longer alphabetical treatise in a manuscript from the first quarter of the ninth century incorporates much of the text of *AW*, and a similar alphabet text in another manuscript from the early ninth century (**P**, edited in an appendix below) shares its explications of the letters X, Y, and Z with *AW*. We edit these new versions of *AW* below, in parallel with a transcription of the Durham manuscript's text. In addition, we provide the first full commentary on *AW*, as well as some discussion of the questions of the text's genre and literary relations.

#### *Manuscripts of AW*

**D** = Durham, Cathedral Library, A. IV. 19.

*AW* (glossed interlinearly in Old English) occurs among a group of additions made ca. 970 at Chester-le-Street to a collectar written in south England in the late ninth or early tenth century. *AW* is on fol. 88v in the last quire (XI, fols. 77–88), most of which (including *AW*) was written by Aldred.<sup>7</sup> This quire's other contents are: hymns; episcopal benedictions (in another hand); capitella and collects mainly for Prime and Vespers; the seven penitential psalms and incipits of special psalms for the Hours; collects for St. Cuthbert; a dedication and colophon; antiphons, versicles, and responsories for Advent; *notae iuris* (abbreviations for legal and other technical terms); a commonplace on the *octo pondera* from which Adam was created; two questions of the *Joca monachorum* type; *De dignitatibus*

<sup>6</sup> Thompson and Lindelöf, *Rituale*, xx. Jolly similarly suggests that “the poem [*sic*] is difficult to trace to a single source and is unique to Aldred, conceivably even an original composition,” though she also notes that “its overall tenor makes it likely another Irish-derived text” (*Community of St. Cuthbert*, 197).

<sup>7</sup> On Quire XI, see Jane Roberts, “Aldred: Glossator and Book Historian,” in *The Old English Gloss to the Lindisfarne Gospels*, ed. Julia Fernández Cuesta and Sara Pons-Sanz, 56–57. Roberts suggests that the outermost bifolium of this quire (fols. 77 and 88), which includes *AW*, “might have been supplementary.”

*Romanorum* (on the names of Roman imperial offices and of rulers in other ancient cultures); a list of the ecclesiastical grades; *Interpretatio nominis sacerdotum* (on sacred names, not just of priests); *Nomina locorum in quo apostoli requiescunt* (followed by *AW*); and a list of Ammonian sections of the gospels.<sup>8</sup>

*Editions:* A. H. Thompson and U. Lindelöf, eds., *Rituale ecclesiae Dunelmensis*, Surtees Society 140 (London, 1927) (complete transcription of the manuscript; see 197–99 for the text of *AW*); Jolly, *Community of St. Cuthbert* (edition of Chester-le-Street additions, see 355–58 for *AW*).

*Catalogue:* Helmut Gneuss and Michael Lapidge, *Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts: A Bibliographical Handlist of Manuscripts and Manuscript Fragments Written or Owned in England up to 1100* (Toronto, 2014), 182–83 (no. 223).

*Facsimile:* T. J. Brown, *The Durham Ritual: A Southern English Collectar of the Tenth Century with Northumbrian Additions: Durham Cathedral Library A. IV. 19*, Early English Manuscripts in Facsimile 16 (Copenhagen, 1969).

*Literature:* See Jolly, *Community of St. Cuthbert*; Gneuss and Lapidge, *Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts*.

**K** = Kassel, Universitätsbibliothek — Landesbibliothek und Murhardsche Bibliothek der Stadt Kassel, Theol. Qu. 10.

Written in the second half of the eighth century in central France, perhaps in the region of Bourges, the manuscript was at Fulda by the fifteenth century. It contains Isidore of Seville, *In libros ueteris ac noui Testamenti prooemia*, *CPL* no. 1192 (fols. 1r–16r), *De ortu et obitu patrum*, *CPL* no. 1191 (fols. 16r–39r), and *Allegoriae quaedam sacrae scripturae*, *CPL* no. 1190 (fols. 39r–58r); excerpts from the *Vitae Patrum* (fols. 58r–60r); Leo the Great, Letter to Flavianus, *CPL* no. 1656; fourteen homilies (fols. 67r–118r) including the anonymous “Remedia peccatorum,” *CPPM* 1A, no. 1095; an anonymous *Liber sententiarum tam de uetere quam de nouo [Testamento]* (fols. 73v–88r); *AW*, under the heading *Sermo de Adam* (fols. 94v–95r); sentences on the four evangelists (fol. 95v); Martin of Braga, *Sermo de correctione rusticorum*, *CPL* no. 1086 (fols. 118v–127v); Caesarius of Arles, *Sermones* 19 and 13, *CPL* no. 1008 and *CPPM* 1B, nos. 2164 and 1050 (fols. 128r–135r); an interpolated version of the *Apocalypse of Thomas*, *CPL* no. 796a (fols. 135r–138v); Caesarius of Arles, *Sermo* 158 (fols. 138v–141v); extracts from Defensor of Ligugé, *Liber scintillarum*, *CPL* no. 1302 (fols. 141v–143v); and a tract on the *Dies Aegyptiaci*. According to Barlow (cited below), as many as five scribes copied the manuscript; he assigns fols. 90–125, which includes *AW*, to his scribe D.

<sup>8</sup> For a detailed listing with editions of all of these texts, see Jolly, *Community of St. Cuthbert*, 280–359.

*Catalogue:* Konrad Wiedmann, *Manuscripta Theologica: Die Handschriften in Quarto*, Die Handschriften der Universitätsbibliothek Kassel — Landesbibliothek und Murhardsche Bibliothek der Stadt Kassel 1/2 (Wiesbaden, 2015), 20–22.

*Facsimile:* Accessible from the website of the Universitätsbibliothek Kassel: <http://orka.bibliothek.uni-kassel.de/viewer/fullscreen/1326713597631/273/>.

*Literature:* *CLA* 8, no. 1141; C. W. Barlow, ed., *Martinus Bracaraensis Opera omnia* (New Haven, 1950), 168–69; G. Morin, ed., *Caesarii Arelatensis opera*, CCL 103 (Turnhout, 1953), cxxi–cxxii; César Chaparro Gómez, ed., *De ortu et obitu patrum* (Paris, 1985), 61; Bischoff, “Panorama,” 241 n. 57; Bischoff, “Frühkarolingische Handschriften und ihre Heimat,” *Scriptorium* 22 (1968): 309; Rainer Kurz, *Die handschriftliche Überlieferung der Werke des heiligen Augustinus*, vol. 5/2: *Bundesrepublik Deutschland und Westberlin* (Vienna, 1979), 225–26; Klaus Gugel, *Welche erhaltenen mittelalterlichen Handschriften dürfen der Bibliothek des Klosters Fulda zugerechnet werden?*, 2 vols. (Frankfurt am Main, 1995–96), 1:24. The text of the Apocalypse of Thomas has recently been published by Charles D. Wright, “6 Ezra and The Apocalypse of Thomas: With a Previously Unedited ‘Interpolated’ Text of Thomas,” *Apocrypha* 26 (2015): 9–55.

**Kr** = Karlsruhe, Badische Landesbibliothek, Aug. perg. 191, fol. 151r.

According to Bischoff (*Katalog* 2:239, no. 3054), fols. 150v/151r are twelfth-century additions to a manuscript written in Alemannic minuscule in the upper Rhine (Lake Constance) region in the first third of the ninth century, which came to Reichenau by 822 (Holder dates fols. 117–52 to s. ix.). The additions comprise the mantic alphabet “A. uita presens,” *RBMA* no. 9379 (fols. 150v–151r); *AW*, also *RBMA* no. 9379 (defective copy, fol. 151r); and the opening words of an Adam Octipartite text (fol. 151r). These items were printed in full by Holder (433–34), but the mantic alphabet and *AW* have been neglected.

*Catalogue:* Alfred Holder, *Die Reichenauer Handschriften*, 1: *Die Pergamenthandschriften*, Die Handschriften der Landesbibliothek Karlsruhe 5 (Wiesbaden, 1910; repr., 1970), 432–34.

*Facsimile:* Accessible from the website of the *Carolingian Culture at Reichenau and St. Gall Project*: <http://www.stgallplan.org/stgallmss/viewItem.do?ark=p21198-zz0028n25g>.

*Literature:* Bernhard Bischoff, *Katalog der festländischen Handschriften des neunten Jahrhunderts*, 3 vols. (Wiesbaden, 1998–2014), 1:354 (no. 1690); cf. 2:237 (no. 3054, Clm 6330); idem, *Die südostdeutschen Schreibschulen und Bibliotheken in der Karolingerzeit*, vol. 1: *Die bayrischen Diözesen*, 3rd ed. (Wiesbaden, 1974), 145–46; idem, “Paläographische Fragen deutscher Denkmäler der Karolingerzeit,” in idem, *Mittelalterliche Studien: Ausgewählte Aufsätze zur Schriftkunde und Literaturgeschichte*, 3 vols. (Stuttgart, 1966–81), 3:90; idem, “Manuscripts in the Age of Charlemagne,” in *Manuscripts and Libraries in the Age of Charlemagne*, trans. M. Gorman (Cambridge, 1994), 36 n. 73; idem, “Die lateinischen Übersetzungen und Bearbeitungen aus den Oracula Sibyllina,” in *Mittelalterliche Studien* 1:155; idem, *Die Abtei Lorsch im Spiegel seiner Handschriften*, 2nd ed., Geschichtsblätter Kreis Bergstrasse, Sonderband 10 (Lorsch, 1989), 79 n. 106; Michael Gorman, “The Commentary on

Genesis in Autun 27,” *Recherches augustiniennes* 30 (1997): 169–277; repr. in Gorman, *Biblical Commentaries from the Early Middle Ages* (Florence, 2002), 323–433; idem, “Wigbod, Charlemagne’s Commentator: The ‘Quaestiuiculae super Evangelium,’” *Revue Bénédictine* 114 (2004): 5–74; Sara Passi, “Il commentario inedito ai Vangeli, attribuito a Wigbod,” *Studi Medievali* 43 (2002): 59–156. On Adam Octipartite, see Charles D. Wright, “*De plasmatione Adam*,” forthcoming in *The Embroidered Bible: Studies in Biblical Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha in Honour of Michael E. Stone*, ed. Lorenzo DiTommaso, Matthias Henze, and William Adler, *Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigrapha* (Leiden, 2017).

### *The Genre of AW*

The alphabetical text that is the subject of this article is difficult to place in terms of genre. *AW* only superficially resembles commonplace Hebrew and Greek alphabets in medieval manuscripts that provide the names of each letter, often with Latin equivalents and sometimes supplying brief moral explications of the letter names.<sup>9</sup> The relatively few scholars who have devoted any attention to *AW* (in its only previously identified form, that appearing in the Durham Collectar) have come to very different conclusions about its place in the landscape of early-medieval religious literature. Jolly, whose discussion in her 2012 monograph on the Durham Collectar is the fullest treatment of our text, refers to it several times as an “alphabet poem,” implicitly connecting the text with the abecedarian acrostic structure that characterizes a great number of early-medieval hymns and poetic texts.<sup>10</sup> Although this structure — likely deriving ultimately from abecedarian biblical texts like Psalm 118 and the book of Lamentations and reinforced by early Latin hymns like Sedulius’s *A solis ortus cardine* — was used by hymnodists and poets throughout medieval Europe, it seems to have achieved a particular vogue among Hiberno-Latin authors.<sup>11</sup> Contrary to Jolly’s choice of

<sup>9</sup> For a comprehensive overview of patristic and early-medieval lists of Hebrew and Greek letter names and their Latin equivalents, see Alan Griffiths, “A Family of Names: Rune-names and Ogam-names and Their Relation to Alphabet Letter-names,” 2 vols. (PhD diss., Leiden University, 2013), Volume 2, Tables, esp. 6, Table 2, “List of Texts with Examples of Interpretations of Greek and Latin Letter-names, and Some Alphabet Poems.” See also idem, “Some Curious Interpretations of Letter Names in Seven Greek Alphabets: Stretching the Bounds of a Tradition,” in *Limits to Learning: The Transfer of Encyclopaedic Knowledge in the Early Middle Ages*, ed. Concetta Giliberto and Loredana Teresi (Leuven, 2013), 109–22; and Kees Dekker, “Alphabets in Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts,” *ibid.*, 80–108, with reference to *AW* as an “abecedarian riddle” (83 n. 7).

<sup>10</sup> Jolly, *Community of St. Cuthbert*, 197–98, 215; so too Roberts, “Aldred: Glossator and Book Historian,” 57. The term “alphabet list,” used earlier by Jolly in her article “Prayers from the Field: Practical Protection and Demonic Defense in Anglo-Saxon England,” *Traditio* 61 (2006): 119 n. 76, is less problematic.

<sup>11</sup> See John Carey, *King of Mysteries: Early Irish Religious Writings* (Dublin, 1998), 29–30, 147 (in relation to “Altus prosator” and “Audite omnes amantes”); Andy Orchard, “Audite omnes amantes: A Hymn in Patrick’s Praise,” in *Saint Patrick, A.D. 493–1993*, ed. David N. Dumville (Woodbridge, Suffolk, 1993), 154–55; Andy Orchard, “The Verse-

terminology, *AW* is not a poem but rather a prose list of words and their spiritual significance organized according to the letters of the alphabet. Still, the overarching structure does invite comparison with Irish and Hiberno-Latin abecedarian texts (not all of which were poetic<sup>12</sup>), and the nature of some of the parallels identified in the commentary below are suggestive of Irish influence.

*AW* has also been placed in another, very different generic context, that of the so-called mantic alphabets, “divinatory devices that make use of the random consultation of books to obtain a letter that forms the key to future events.”<sup>13</sup> Naturally, such texts were also organized alphabetically, with the fortune presaged by each letter given immediately after the letter itself.<sup>14</sup> Max Förster suggested in a

---

Extracts in the *Collectanea*,” in *Collectanea Pseudo-Bedae*, ed. Martha Bayless and Michael Lapidge, *Scriptores Latini Hiberniae* 14 (Dublin, 1998), 90 (in relation to a Hiberno-Latin poem on the Day of Judgment); idem, *The Poetic Art of Aldhelm*, *Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England* 8 (Cambridge, 1994), 47; Michael Richter, *Bobbio in the Early Middle Ages: The Abiding Legacy of Columbanus* (Dublin, 2008), 65 (in relation to the “Versus de Bobuleno abbate”); Michael Lapidge, “A Seventh-Century Insular Latin Debate Poem on Divorce,” *Cambridge Medieval Celtic Studies* 10 (1985): 13; Tomás Ó Cathasaigh, “The Literature of Medieval Ireland to c. 800: St. Patrick to the Vikings,” in *The Cambridge History of Irish Literature*, vol. 1 (Cambridge, 2006), 12–13.

<sup>12</sup> Compare especially the abecedarian litany edited by Niels Krogh Rasmussen, “An Early ‘Ordo Missae’ with a ‘Litanía Abecedaria’ Addressed to Christ (Rome, Bibl. Vallicelliana, Cod. B. 141, XI. Cent.),” *Ephemerides Liturgicae* 98 (1984): 198–211 at 200: “A rchange-lorum eternitas / B onitas patriarcharum / ... / Z elus et corona martyrum.” Rasmussen (209–10) draws attention to several Irish “symptoms” in this litany. For examples of abecedarian structure in Irish prose composition, see Ann Dooley, “The Gospel of Nicodemus in Ireland,” in *The Medieval Gospel of Nicodemus: Texts, Intertexts, and Contexts in Western Europe*, ed. Zbigniew Izydorczyk (Tempe, AZ, 1997), 389–92. One wonders whether *AW* might be in some way related to the “alphabets” (*abgitir*) said to have been written by Irish saints, including Patrick, as manuals of instruction for their pupils. It is, however, difficult to tell whether such texts were actually organized according to the letters of the alphabet or, like the *Apgitir chrábaid* (“Alphabet of Piety”), were “alphabets” only in the figurative sense of providing basic and necessary instruction. See Martin McNamara and Maurice Sheehy, “Psalter Text and Psalter Study in the Early Irish Church (A.D. 600–1200),” *Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy Section C* 73 (1973): 206 n. 7; Brian Ó Cuív, “Irish Words for ‘Alphabet,’” *Ériu* 31 (1980): 104–5; Vernam Hull, “*Apgitir chrábaid*: The Alphabet of Piety,” *Celtica* 8 (1968): 44–89. The exact nature of Patrick’s “alphabets” has been a matter of debate. Various evidence and interpretations may be found in Gilbert Márkus, “What Were Patrick’s Alphabets?” *Cambrian Medieval Celtic Studies* 31 (1996): 1–15; Caoimhín Ó Dónaill, “A Poem in Praise of St. Patrick,” in *Teangeolaíocht na Gaeilge XIII*, ed. Ailbhe Ó Corráin and Malachy Ó Néill (Uppsala, 2014), 13–14 (where the alphabets are equated with “spiritual writing”); and Dominique Barbet-Massin, “Le rituel irlandais de consécration des églises au Moyen Âge: le témoignage des sources irlandaises et bretonnes,” *Annales de Bretagne et des pays de l’Ouest* 118 (2011): 7–39 (where it is argued that two Latin alphabets were written on the ground during an Irish rite of the consecration of churches).

<sup>13</sup> László Sándor Chardonnens, “Mantic Alphabets in Medieval Western Manuscripts and Early Printed Books,” *Modern Philology* 110 (2013): 340–66, at 342.

<sup>14</sup> For an example, see *ibid.*

1936 article on the topic that *AW* was an early mantic alphabet, but László Sándor Chardonens has recently refuted Förster's opinion, noting that the text has no divinatory function and that it lacks the introductory material typical of mantic alphabets, which gives directions on their use and "identif[ies] them as mantic devices."<sup>15</sup> Chardonens, does, however, consider texts like *AW* to be "the closest we get to an ancestor of the mantic alphabet," noting that "some of the responses in mantic alphabets ... are closely similar to those in the Durham alphabet and other parenetic acrostics," even if the latter texts do not assign to such responses a prognostic significance.<sup>16</sup> It seems to us a far leap to assert any kind of direct connection between mantic alphabets and texts, like *AW*, that simply use the letters of the alphabet as an organizing principle by which to transmit spiritual knowledge. Nevertheless, the Karlsruhe manuscript of *AW* (**Kr**) suggests that scribes and manuscript compilers recognized some degree of kinship between the two genres, since in this manuscript the mantic alphabet and *AW* are written in a single block.<sup>17</sup>

Chardonens's "parenetic acrostic" is perhaps the most apt term so far applied to *AW*, but "parenetic alphabet" would be more accurate still. Though not mentioned by Chardonens, there is a rich Greek tradition of parenetic alphabets, some thirty-six examples of which were catalogued by Dragutin Anastasijević in 1905.<sup>18</sup> Chardonens refers to just one medieval German example and one thirteenth-century Latin one. To our knowledge there has been no comprehensive discussion of parenetic alphabets in medieval Latin tradition. In addition to *AW*, we can add three other early Latin examples of the genre. The closest parallel in terms of genre for the parenetic alphabet in *AW* is a text in Paris, BNF, lat. 2796 (fols. 44–107, MS **P** below), fol. 69r, copied between 813 and 815. The text is edited in an Appendix below (105–8). In this text the short glosses on each letter consist mainly of biblical phrases. The connection with *AW* is not simply generic, however, but also partly textual, for, while the glosses on the letters A–U bear

<sup>15</sup> Max Förster, "Zwei kymrische Orakelalphabete für Psalterwahrsagung," *Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie* 20 (1936): 228–43, at 240 n. 6; Chardonens, "Mantic Alphabets," 345–46.

<sup>16</sup> Chardonens, "Mantic Alphabets," 346. See also László Sándor Chardonens, "The Old English Alphabet Prognostic as a Prototype for Mantic Alphabets," in *Secular Learning in Anglo-Saxon England: Exploring the Vernacular*, ed. idem and Bryan Carella, *Amsterdamer Beiträge zur älteren Germanistik* 69 (Amsterdam, 2012), 233–36, where it is suggested that *AW* and an unrelated Old English alphabetical text in London, British Library, Cotton Titus D. xxvi "served as prototypes for the mantic alphabets that emerged in the twelfth century."

<sup>17</sup> Transcribed by Holder, *Die Reichenauer Handschriften*, 1:433–34.

<sup>18</sup> Dragutin Anastasijević, *Die paränetischen Alphabete in der griechischen Literatur* (Munich, 1905). Of these, 32 are poems and 4 are prose texts. See also Rudolf Vetschera, "Zur griechischen Paränese," *Jahresberichte des k. k. deutschen Staatsgymnasiums in Smichow 1911 und 1912* (Smichow, 1912), 24–29 and 33.



no relation to those in *AW*, the glosses on the letters X, Y, and Z are drawn directly from *AW*, or at any rate from some common source.

Two consecutive similar lists of keywords for each letter of the alphabet are embedded within a dialogue text (including extensive parallels with the *Joca monachorum* genre) in the ninth-century Passau manuscript, Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek Clm 19410 (pp. 1–62, 67),<sup>19</sup> at p. 23:

Quo ordine inventae sunt litterae et quomodo? a Adam, b benedictio, c caelum, d deus, [no equivalents for e f g] h homo, i ignis, k kalendae, l luna, m maiestas, n nuntius, o oculus, p pius, q qualitas, r rex, s senex, t timor, u una, x xpistus, y ymnus, z zelus.

Iterum indica mihi de iisdem litteris! A pro alpha id est initium, b pro beato id est Ioseph, c pro caelestibus, d pro dono, e pro electis, f pro fine, g pro gloria, h pro honore regni, i pro instituto, k pro Karthagine,<sup>20</sup> l pro lege, m pro magis, n pro nomine, quod est super omne nomen, o pro ore dei, p pro pastore, q <pro> quae-  
rendo deo, r pro rege et principe, s pro scientia, t pro testibus, u pro vita, x pro xpisto, y pro ymno puerorum, z pro zona, quam cinxit Adam.<sup>21</sup>

These lists occur within a larger sequence of questions-and-answers on grammar that are introduced by the heading “Si vis contendere aut quaestionem quaeris in scripturis inchoamus ex capite † rationem.” The social context, therefore, as with the texts recently edited by Luigi Munzi (discussed below), is grammatical pedagogy for the clergy, but here the glosses are usually reduced to one keyword (always a single word in the first list; in the second there is an occasional brief phrase), with no spiritual elaboration and only four very brief literal explications (for *alpha*, *beatus*, *nomen*, and *zona*), all in the second list. *AW* differs from both these lists in offering a number of more allusive and even learned glosses (see Commentary below). Aside from the almost inevitable parallels “a Adam” (in the first list only) and “x xpistus/pro xpisto,” only the parallel “n pro nomine, quod est super omne nomen” in the second list in Clm 19410 may be indicative of some distant connection with *AW*. There are further parallels between the second list and the parenetic alphabet in Paris, BNF, lat. 2796, which shares the keywords *alpha*, *beatus*, *gloria*, *honor*, *magis*, and *Xpistus*. The fact that these parenetic alphabets all manage to come up with different keywords for K, a letter with limited possibilities, suggests that finding alternative keywords for the letters was part of the edification and diversion these texts

<sup>19</sup> Bischoff, *Katalog*, 2:271 (no. 3319). On the dialogue material in Clm 19410, see Charles D. Wright, *The Irish Tradition in Old English Literature*, Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England 6 (Cambridge, 1993), 63 and n. 80.

<sup>20</sup> The scribal correction recorded by Brunhölzl (see next note) in his apparatus, “k pit (?) kartigine” is likely for “k kaput kartigine.”

<sup>21</sup> Franz Brunhölzl, ed., *Studien zum geistigen Leben in Passau im achten und neunten Jahrhundert*, Abhandlungen der Marburger Gelehrten Gesellschaft 26 (Munich, 2000), 61–62.

apparently provided (at however elementary a level). Still, the family resemblance between these lists and *AW* is sufficient to regard them as examples of a common “parenetic alphabet” genre.<sup>22</sup> The lack of explanatory glosses for most of the keywords in the Clm 19410 lists does not necessarily mean that no such glosses were intended to be associated with them, since the unglossed keywords might represent a teacher’s cues to which students (or readers) would be expected to supply an appropriate gloss. To judge from *AW* and the parenetic alphabet in BNF, lat. 2796, however, the genre did seem to accommodate two fundamentally different ways to append keywords or phrases to letters. In *AW*, a distinct alphabetical lemma is always glossed with a syntactically separate clause, almost invariably introduced by “id est.” In BNF, lat. 2796, by contrast, the alphabetical lemma as a rule is not syntactically isolated but rather is simply the first word of a clause that itself constitutes the spiritual significance of the lemma and therefore is not glossed. The two exceptions, letters Y and Z, are two of the three drawn from *AW*. The entry for X (“Xps saluauit mundum per crucem, adsumpsit eum secum ad celum”) has apparently been transferred to X from the *AW* entry for S, where the lemma is *Saluator* and is again separated from the gloss by “id est.”

The reasons for the choice of some words and names (*Adam*, *Xpistus*) in these parenetic alphabets are obvious, and a few choices (for the letters K and X as well as to a lesser extent Y and Z) will have been constrained by the limited number of appropriate Latin words available (and indeed *ymen* in P is allegedly Greek; see the Commentary on Y). The choice of words for letters where many others were available may be essentially capricious, though some (such as *beatus*, *gloria*, *honor*, *saluator*) are obviously fundamental spiritual concepts in Christian-Latin tradition, while others (nouns such as *hamus* and *zizania*, verbs such as *gemit* and *fremuit*) invoke some concrete biblical or patristic imagery. The choice of *tenuit* for T, however, seems pedestrian, even though it is part of a larger phrase with spiritual significance (and echoing a biblical verse). The word *magis* for M in both Paris BNF, lat. 2796 and the second list Munich Clm 19410 likewise seems colorless and weakly motivated. We wonder, therefore, if the compilers’ familiarity with otherwise unrelated alphabetical traditions may have prompted certain word choices (as it were *faute de mieux*). In the tradition of musical *litterae significativae*, for example, T stands for the verb *tenete* (which indicates that the note thus

<sup>22</sup> It is very likely that more such parenetic alphabets occur in early-medieval monastic and scholastic miscellanies but perhaps have often not been itemized by cataloguers. In the *Catalogue général* of BNF manuscripts (3:92) the parenetic alphabet in lat. 2796 is not mentioned within a partial description of “Tableaux, notes et fragments de comput”; in Susan A. Keefe’s summary list of the contents of the manuscript (*A Catalogue of Works Pertaining to the Explanation of the Creed in Carolingian Manuscripts*, *Instrumenta patristica et mediaevalia* 63 [Turnhout, 2012], 313) our text is similarly hidden in the entry “fol. 68r–101v = computus and computistical matter.”

marked should be drawn out).<sup>23</sup> If so, perhaps the consecutive keywords *fremuit* and *guttur* were also prompted by the *litterae significativae*. In a letter by Notker Balbulus — the only medieval source that explains them — G also signifies *guttur* (indicating singing in the throat). Notker explains F as signifying (*cum*) *fragore seu frendore* (indicating a loud tone), but it has also been suggested that it means *fremitus*.<sup>24</sup> Another possible influence might be lists of *notae iuris*, and indeed in D just such a list, copied by Aldred, occurs in the same quire as *AW*.<sup>25</sup> While the *notae iuris* often involve abbreviations of more than a single letter, certain common words such as *magis* as well as *beatus*, *gloria*, *institutus*, *kalendas*, *lumen*, *lex*, and *omnipotens* did have standard *notae* that appear in alphabetically organized lists.

The closest analogues for the specific contents of *AW* occur in a group of early-medieval abecedarian treatises, several of which have been recently edited by Luigi Munzi, which were intended simultaneously to provide grammatical and spiritual instruction.<sup>26</sup> The most important of these for our purposes survives in Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat., lat. 6018 (s. ix, Italy).<sup>27</sup> For each letter of the alphabet, this untitled treatise (to which we will refer as *AM*, after its first words “Audiui-mus multos”) gives a mixture of grammatical and historical information alongside brief explanations of spiritual concepts that can be illustrated by the shape or formation of the letter or by Latin words starting with it. In the majority of cases, parts of these spiritual interpretations line up almost exactly with the interpretations given in the text below. The letter P section of *AM* (to which can be compared the P section of *AW* already quoted in the first paragraph of this article) runs as follows: “P muta est, sed quaeritur a nobis quare in psalmi nomine P littera opponitur: partem habet prophetae. Aliter: P, portavit Christus crucem

<sup>23</sup> Notker’s treatise on the *litterae* explains T by “Trahere vel tenere debere testatur” (Timothy J. McGee, *The Sound of Medieval Song: Ornamentation and Vocal Style according to the Treatises* [Oxford, 1998], 180); critical edition by Jacques Froger, “L’Épître de Notker sur les ‘lettres significatives,’” *Études grégoriennes* 5 (1962): 23–71, text at 69–70. See generally Michel Huglo, “Les recherches sur les *litterae significativae* au XXe siècle,” in *Sine musica nulla disciplina ... Studi in onore di Giulio Cattin*, ed. Franco Bernabei and Antonio Lovato (Padua, 2006), 163–74; Josef Kohlhäufel, “Die tironischen Noten im Codex Laon 239: Ein Beitrag zur Paläographie der *Litterae significativae*,” *Musicologica Austriaca* 14–15 (1996): 133–56.

<sup>24</sup> For *fremitus*, see Eugène Cardine, *Gregorian Semiology* (Sablé-sur-Sarthe, 1982), 224.

<sup>25</sup> On the *notae iuris*, see Theodor Mommsen, “Notarum laterculi,” in *Grammatici latini* 4 (Leipzig, 1864), 265–352. The list of *notae* in the additions to the Durham Collectar is edited in Jolly, *Community of St. Cuthbert* (n. 1 above), 329–38.

<sup>26</sup> Luigi Munzi, ed., *Littera legítima: Testi grammaticali latini dell’Alto Medioevo* (Naples, 2007).

<sup>27</sup> Bischoff, *Katalog* 3:455 (no. 6928), where the dates given are ix<sup>1</sup>, and ix<sup>3/4</sup> or ix<sup>4/4</sup>. For the contents, see A.-V. Gilles-Raynal et al., *Les manuscrits classiques latins de la Bibliothèque Vaticane* 3,2: *Fonds Vatican latin 2901–14740* (Paris, 2010), 591–95.

pro sanctis et peccatoribus” (P is a mute consonant, but we ask: why does the letter P appear in the word “psalm”? This is because it represents the role of a prophet. P [is also interpreted] in another manner: Christ carried [*portauit*] the cross for saints and sinners).<sup>28</sup> Most of the explanations for each letter in *AM* are significantly longer than those found in *AW*, but the two texts are clearly related in some way. Either the material that constitutes the alphabetical list in *AW* was excerpted from *AM* (or some other, closely related treatise intended for grammatical and spiritual edification), or *AW* was one of the sources of *AM*, which was further augmented by material taken from other sources or of the author’s own invention.

Several other early-medieval alphabet treatises sometimes give allegorical interpretations similar to those found in *AW*, but these are all less verbally close than the parallels in *AM*. Versions of one such treatise appear in two manuscripts — Leiden, Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit, B.P.L. 135, fols. 66–86 (s. ix<sup>1/4</sup> or ix<sup>2/4</sup>)<sup>29</sup> and Bern, Burgerbibliothek, Cod. 417 (s. ix<sup>1/3</sup> or <sup>2/3</sup>, Tours region)<sup>30</sup> — alongside copies of the so-called *Ars Sergilii*, an enigmatic Irish grammatical and orthographical work thought to have been composed by a student of Virgilius Maro Grammaticus in the late seventh century.<sup>31</sup> A related alphabet treatise survives in Karlsruhe, Badische Landesbibliothek, Aug. perg. 112 (s. ix<sup>1/4</sup>, Reichenau).<sup>32</sup> While these texts share with *AW* the association of A with Adam (and, in the case of the textual companions of the *Ars Sergilii*, of B with *bonus*),<sup>33</sup> their general strategy is to base the primary spiritual interpretation of each letter not on a word beginning with that letter, but on the shape of the letter and how it is formed while writing.<sup>34</sup> The significance of E in the Leiden text, for instance, is as follows: “E typum Trinitatis ostendit tribus virgultis”

<sup>28</sup> Munzi, *Littera legitera*, 66.

<sup>29</sup> First edited by Munzi, *Littera legitera*, 95–117. The text was edited again by Richard M. A. Marshall (“Studies on the ‘Ars Grammatici Sergi{li}i’ with an Edition,” *Journal of Medieval Latin* 20 [2010]: 227–30), who seems not to have known about Munzi’s earlier work. The nature of the text’s relationship with the *Ars Sergilii* has been a matter of debate, and it is very likely not by the same author as the *Ars*; see Marshall, “Studies,” 167 n. 1; Luigi Munzi, “La singolare *Ars Sergilii*: note in margine a un’edizione recente,” *Incontri di filologia classica* 13 (2013–14): 49–83, esp. 56–58. For the date, see Bischoff, *Katalog*, 2:44 (no. 2155).

<sup>30</sup> Edited from the Bern manuscript by Hermann Hagen in *Grammatici latini* 8 (Leipzig, 1870), 302–5. This version of the text also survives in other early-medieval manuscripts, about which see Munzi, “La singolare *Ars Sergilii*,” 56–57. For the date, see Bischoff, *Katalog*, 1:127 (no. 592).

<sup>31</sup> On the date and composition of the text, see Marshall, “Studies,” 170–84.

<sup>32</sup> Munzi, *Littera legitera*, 119–52; for the date, see Bischoff, *Katalog*, 2:344 (no. 1642).

<sup>33</sup> Munzi, *Littera legitera*, 101, 122; Hagen, *Grammatici latini* 8:302.

<sup>34</sup> Marshall, “Studies,” 169.

(E represents the Trinity by its three branches).<sup>35</sup> The only possible parallel for this kind of interpretation in the texts edited here is the entry for the letter Y in **P**, the shape of which, as we discuss in the Commentary below, was associated with the so-called *homo in bivio* tradition.

#### *Text-Critical Concerns and Editorial Procedure*

It is rarely useful to attempt to recover an authorial “original” in short, educational/encyclopedic texts like *AW*, which seem to have been especially prone to scribal intervention. The surviving manuscript versions, though clearly all witnesses of the same work, show a great deal of variation between them, not only in phrasing and orthography but also in the words meant to correspond to each letter, and no manuscript has a clear tendency to preserve the best reading. For instance, all three surviving manuscript witnesses for the letter X give different words or phrases: **K** “lex” (seemingly an error); **P** (= BNF, lat. 2796) “Christus” (= x̄ps); **D** “expulsi sunt” (likely the original reading). Meanwhile, for the letter N, **D** gives the apparently nonsensical “nemar” while both **K** and **Kr** preserve the better “nomen.”

While in some circumstances (like N) it may be possible to judge the probable originality of a given reading solely on the basis of the sense it makes in its context, in most cases there is no objective standard for declaring one manuscript variant preferable to another. If it could be proved that the closest analogue to *AW* — namely, *AM* — was indeed its source, one could perhaps argue in favor of whichever manuscript’s reading lined up more closely with the relevant section of *AM*. However, it is also possible, and perhaps more probable, that the arrow of dependence points in the opposite direction and that some version of *AW* was a source for *AM*. Indeed, the fact that many of *AM*’s correspondences with *AW* are introduced by words like “Aliter” or “Alibi” gives one the impression that *AM* is a composite text cobbled together from several parenetic alphabets, one of which was *AW*.<sup>36</sup> Furthermore, if “ymen,” preserved as the lemma for the letter Y in **P** only, is the original reading (see the Commentary below), *AM* could not be the source of *AW*, since *AM* agrees with **K** and **D** in giving the reading “finis.”

With no consistent way of determining original or better readings, stemmatic analysis of *AW* is impossible. For this reason, and because it is both feasible and useful to see simultaneously the texts of all the witnesses of this short (and apparently rare) work, we print the texts of all the surviving manuscript versions of *AW* in parallel columns below. For the letters A–P, the witnesses are **K**, **Kr**, and **D**; for Q–V, the witnesses are **K** and **D**; and for X–Z, the witnesses are **K**, **D**, and **P**

<sup>35</sup> Munzi, *Littera legitera*, 101.

<sup>36</sup> “Aliter” in C, D, I, K, P, V; “Alibi” in M; “Item” in X; see Munzi, *Littera legitera*, 63–67.

(only the last three letters of which line up with the other manuscripts of *AW*). Manuscript orthography is everywhere preserved, but punctuation and capitalization are editorial. The texts are not emended. Instead, obviously faulty readings are enclosed in daggers, lost text that can be reconstructed with confidence is given in angle brackets, and letters that are erroneously duplicated are printed in square brackets. The texts of **K**, **Kr**, and **P** are based on our own transcriptions; the text of **D** and its corresponding Old English gloss are based on Jolly's edition, checked against a facsimile of the manuscript. The edition has two apparatus: the first, keyed to the relevant letter, gives the corresponding sections in the treatise *AM*; the second, keyed to footnote numbers in the text, contains textual notes. The many linguistic and orthographical peculiarities of the texts are discussed in this apparatus. The Commentary that follows the text is keyed to the relevant letter.

## COLLATED TEXT

**K** = Kassel, Universitätsbibliothek, Theol. Qu. 10, fols. 94v–95r

**Kr** = Karlsruhe, Badische Landesbibliothek, Perg. Aug. 191, fol. 151r

**D** = Durham, Cathedral Library, A. IV. 19, fols. 88v<sup>a</sup>–88v<sup>b</sup>

## SERMO DE ADAM

A. Adam — prima littera, primus homo. De quattuor litteris nominatum est nomen eius.

A pro quid<sup>37</sup> ponitur? Id est Adam — prima litera, primus homo. De quattuor literis nominatum nomen ei.

*se f'ma mon*  
 <A.><sup>38</sup> Adam primus homo  
*aworht fro' drihtne of ðæm f'ma*  
 factus est a domino de prima  
*stæfe of f.ver stafum of*  
 litera, id est de .iiii. litteris, de  
*ðæm ...ad væs noma*  
 quibus nominatum est nomen  
*his*  
 eius.

B. Bonus, id est Abel, qui pietatem parentibus prestabat.

B. Bonum, id est Abel, qui pietatem prestauit parentibus.

*god sunv þ' is abel*  
 B. Bonus filius, id est Abel,  
*se ðe arfæstnisse gewvðe*  
 qui pietatem prestabat  
*ældrv' t acennendvm sinvm*  
 parentibus suis.

<sup>37</sup> pro quid] On *pro* + acc., see Stotz 9, §12.3.

<sup>38</sup> A] As Jolly says, the letter is no longer visible and may be obscured by a stain, but there seems little reason to doubt that it was there or at least that it was supposed to be.

C. Caecus, id est Adam seductus est ab Eua.	C. †Cetus, <sup>†39</sup> id est Adam seductus ab Eua.	<i>ablendad væs þ' is adam</i> C. Cæctatum est, id est Adam <i>besvicen væs fro' ewe</i> seductus est ab Eua. <i>gehæftad væs þ' is</i> D. Dampnatus est, id est <i>diwl in helle</i> diabolus in infernum. <i>eva wifmon ðio gegearvad væs</i> E. Eua mulier, que inducta <sup>41</sup> est super terram nata sine patre et matre. <i>ðrii'gv' gerv' 7 æc. ær. gecenned</i> .xxx. annis †atque <sup>†42</sup> nasceretur. <i>væðde t þ' is diwl</i> F. Fremuit id est †diabolus <sup>†43</sup> <i>ivdisc' ðon' giboren væs</i> iudaicus quando natus est <i>críst</i> Christus. <i>sviðe ge . fade þ' is diwl ðy læs</i> <i>nedunga</i> G. Gemuit, id est diabolus ne raperet Christus homines de guttore eius.
D. Damnatus est, id est diabolus in infernum.	D. id est damnatus diabo- lus <sup>40</sup> in infernum.	
E. Eua, id est {fol. 95r} mulier quae induta est treginta annis antequam nasceretur.	E. Eua mulier, que inducta <sup>41</sup> est super terram nata sine patre et matre.	
F. Fremuit, id est populus iudaicus quando Christus natus est.	F. Fremuit populus iudaicus quando natus est Christus.	
G. Gemuit, id est dia- bulus ne raperet Christus homines de guttore eius.	G. Gemuit diabolus cum Christus rapuit de gutture eius \hominem/.	

---

*Continued*

<sup>39</sup> cetus] This seems the most natural way to expand the MS abbreviation *cet'*, although one could perhaps make an argument for *cetera*. Either would represent an error for *cecus* or *cecatus*.

<sup>40</sup> diabolus] Both here and in the G entry the scribe uses an unusual abbreviation *diabb-* for forms of *diabolus*; it is uncertain how the scribe would spell out the full word.

<sup>41</sup> inducta] Probably originally a scribal variant of *induta*, with subsequent modification of the E entry by the Karlsruhe scribe or the scribe of his exemplar in order to make sense of the new word as a form of *induco*. On *-ct-* for *-t-*, see Stotz 7, §191.

<sup>42</sup> atque] *sic*, for *antequam* (as Kassel).

<sup>43</sup> diabolus] The idea of the devil being Jewish, or of Judaism being demonic, strikes the reader as exaggeratedly anti-Semitic even for a tenth-century Anglo-Saxon, and in fact the reading *populus* in the Kassel and Karlsruhe MSS reveals *diabolus* (and, as a result, its accompanying Old English gloss *diwl*) to be scribal errors. The reading in **D** has been contaminated from the following sentence, which also starts with a verb ending in *-emuit*.

<sup>44</sup> ra[ra]perit] *ra-* repeated after a line break. The *-erit* ending for the 3rd person singular imperfect subjunctive is due to the medieval Latin coalescence of *ĩ* and *ẽ*, especially in unstressed syllables; see Stotz 7, §14.

*Continued*

<b>K</b> = Kassel, Universitätsbibliothek, Theol. Qu. 10, fols. 94v–95r	<b>Kr</b> = Karlsruhe, Badische Landesbibliothek, Perg. Aug. 191, fol. 151r	<b>D</b> = Durham, Cathedral Library, A. IV. 19, fols. 88v <sup>a</sup> –88v <sup>b</sup>
H. †Humum, <sup>†45</sup> id est Christus quo tollitus <sup>46</sup> est inimicus de mundum. <sup>47</sup>	H. Hamum, id est Christus †captus in inimicum. <sup>†48</sup>	<i>ongel ... crist</i> H. Hamum, id est Christus, <i>f'ðon geledde ðone fio... of ðissv'</i> quia tulit inimicum ex hoc <i>middang'</i> mundo. <i>p' is</i> I. Imber, id est baptismum <i>godcvnd t word ...</i> diuinum siue scriptura. K. ... u ... n. uer' m. .t. m {88v <sup>b</sup> }
I. Imber, id est baptismum.	I. Imber, id est baptismus.	
K. Kalumnia, id est Iudaei calumniantes Christum.	K. Calumnia, id est Iudei calumniantes Christum.	
L. Lumen, id est lex diuina.	L. Lumen, id est lex diuina.	<i>leht p' is soð leht t</i> L. Lumen id est uerum lumen. <i>micil p' is cnæht</i> M. Magnus id est puer <i>se heah</i> excelsus. <i>onlesend p' is crist</i> N. Nemar, id est Christus <i>se hæl'</i> Iesus.
M. Magnus, id est deus pater omnipotens.	M. Magnum, id est deus pater.	
N. Nomen, id est Christus filius dei uiui altissimi.	N. Nomen, id est deus pater omnipotens.	

<sup>45</sup> humum] *sic*, for *hamum* (more correctly *hamus*). The apparent *a/u* confusion needed for the error to arise could in theory be indicative of an exemplar written in Merovingian, Visigothic, or Insular cursive minuscule script, but this evidence is too slim to allow any conclusions to be made.

<sup>46</sup> tollitus] On *tollitus* as an analogical past participle of *fero/tollo*, see Stotz 8, §§120.2, 121.

<sup>47</sup> de mundum] On *de* + acc., see Stotz 9, §12.2.

<sup>48</sup> captus in inimicum] One might perhaps attempt to make sense of this phrase as saying that Christ “the hook” was taken inside (*captus*) or eaten up by the enemy (*inimicum*, that is, the devil, hell, Death, etc.), thus allowing the enemy to himself be captured, but it seems more likely that the words are simply garbled.



O. Opifex, id est spiritus sanctus cum patre et filio.	O. Opifex, id est spiritus sanctus cum patre et filio.	<i>doere cræftig, þ' is gast</i> O. Opifex, id est spiritus <i>se halga</i> sanctus.
P. Portauit, id est Christus portauit crucem suam.	P. Portauit, id est Christus crucem suam. ( <i>Karlsruhe MS breaks off</i> )	<i>gebær þ' is crist</i> P. Portauit, id est Christus <i>hroda his gebær</i> crucem suam portauit.

**K** = Kassel, Universitätsbibliothek, Theol. Qu. 10, fols. 94v–95r

**D** = Durham, Cathedral Library, A. IV. 19, fols. 88v<sup>a</sup>–88v<sup>b</sup>

Q. Quassati sunt Iudaei, id est seducti sunt ab hereticis.	<i>acvoect woeron þ' is iudei besvicen woeron fro'</i> Q. Quassati sunt, id est Iudei seducti sunt ab <i>widirwordvm larw'</i> hereticis.
R. Raguhel: fortis, id est Satahel.	<i>noma þ' is strong þ' is satahel</i> R. Raguel, id est fortis, id est Satahel.
S. Saluator, id est Christus saluauit mundum per crucem suam.	<i>hælend þ' is crist hæł' se ðe gehælde</i> S. Saluator, id est Christus Jesus, qui saluauit <i>middang' ðerh rode</i> mundum per crucem.
T. Tenuit fortitudinem magnam, id est Christus adsumpsit mundum saecum ad caelus. <sup>49</sup>	<i>giheald strengo micel crist se ðe</i> T. Tenuit fortitudinem magnam Christus qui <i>gebær middang' ðerh rode</i> portauit mundum per crucem <sup>50</sup> ...
V. Vncti sunt oleo sancto, id est diuina misericordia.	<i>gesmirvad oele halgvm þ' is godcvnd..</i> V. Vnctus, id est oleo sancto, id est diuina ... miseri ...

<sup>49</sup> caelus] = *caelos*; see Stotz 7, §40.3.

<sup>50</sup> portauit mundum per crucem] The phrase does not give impossible sense, but the significantly different **K** reading *adsumpsit mundum saecum ad caelus* and the fact that the previous sentence in **D** also ends in *-auit mundum per crucem* leads one to believe that at least the words *mundum per crucem* are an erroneous doubling of part of the S entry.

K = Kassel, Universitätsbibliothek, Theol. Qu. 10, fols. 94v–95r	P = Paris, BNF, lat. 2796, fol. 69r (see Appendix below)	D = Durham, Cathedral Library, A. IV. 19, fols. 88v <sup>a</sup> –88v <sup>b</sup>
X. Lex expulserit <sup>51</sup> gentes ab infidelitate.	X. Christus <sup>52</sup> saluauit mundum per crucem, adsumpsit eum secum ad celum.	f <sup>r</sup> drifeno voeron þ <sup>r</sup> is hæðno X. Expulsi sunt, id est gentiles fro <sup>r</sup> vngeleaffvlnisse hiora ab infidelitate sua.
Y. Finis saeculi, id est dies iudicii.	Y. Ymen seculi, id est dies iudicii.	ende vorvldes þ <sup>r</sup> is dægi Y. Finis saeculi, id est dies domes iudicii.
Z. Zezania inter tritico, <sup>53</sup> id est peccatores in medio iustorum.	Z. Zizania in medio triticum, <sup>54</sup> id sunt peccatores in medio iustorum.	hata wydnung ... middv <sup>r</sup> hu. Z. Zezania in medio triticorum, þ <sup>r</sup> is synnfvll ... on middvm id est peccatores in medio soðfæstra iustorum.

Explicit.

*Apparatus 1: Correspondences in the Treatise Audiuius multos (Vat. lat. 6018, fols. 51r–54r, ed. Munzi, Littera legitima, 63–69)*

**A.:** ... catholici[s] sapientes ea <n> dem A littera <m> ... primam esse opinantur pro typo nominis primi hominis protoplausti, idest Adae.

**B.:** B, bonus filius, idest Habel iustus, qui pietate parentibus Deoque in offerendo munera optima prestabat.

**C.:** C, caecus a muliere, idest Adam qui seductus est ab Eva.

**D.:** Damnandus est, idest diabolus in inferno.

<sup>51</sup> lex expulserit] These words cause difficult syntax, and *lex*, hardly an appropriate word with which to begin the X entry, is probably a scribal error for the letter name *ecs* (but see Commentary). **D** preserves the better reading here.

<sup>52</sup> Christus] MS *xps*.

<sup>53</sup> inter tritico] On *inter* + abl., see Stotz 9, §18.4.

<sup>54</sup> triticum] Presumably an error for either *triticorum* or an error for (or orthographical variant of) *tritico*.

**E.:** E: Eva, ipsa est mulier quae facta fuerat de corpus Adae, quia costa de latere eius dextro fuit, quam Dominus ipso soporato tollit et edificavit eam in mulierem, quae nuncupata est Eva.

**F.:** F: Fremuit populus Iudaicus quando Christus natus est.

**G.:** <G>, gemuit Satan ne raperet Christus homines ex eius potestate.

**H.:** H, hamum idest Christus qui tollit inimicum ex mundo: sicut enim hamum a mari pisces auferit, ita salvator noster Iehsus Christus diabulo e mundo et ministros eius tollit.

**I.:** <I>, imber divinus, idest baptisma.

**K.:** K ... calomnium, idest Iudaeorum calomniantium Christo ...

**L.:** L ... in sensu lumen, idest lex divina.

**M.:** M, magnus, idest Deus pater.

**N.:** ... nomen <Christi>, idest filius Dei, quem nomen patris ... (*Munzi suspects a lacuna after patris*)

**O.:** O, opifex, artifex idest Spiritus Sanctus.

**P.:** P, portavit Christus crucem pro sanctis et peccatoribus.

**Q.:** Q, Quassati sunt Iudei seducti ab heretici[tis].

**R.:** R, Raguhel fortis, idest rebellis Deo, hoc est Satanahel. (*Munzi emends Satanahel to Nahalihel without comment.*)

**S.:** S ... Salvator Iehsus.

**T.:** T, tenuit fortitudinem, idest Christus, qui hominem ad caelum portavit.

**V.:** V, uncti sunt oleo sancto apostoli, spiritu sancto, misericordia divina.

**X.:** X: expulsi sunt gentes ab infidelitate reversi ad credulitatem.

**Y.:** Y fines saeculi, id<est> dies iudicii.

**Z.:** Zizania inter triticum, id est peccatores in medio iustorum.

#### TRANSLATION AND COMMENTARY

In the commentary on each letter, the keyword or phrase assigned to each letter is referred to as the “lemma,” and its explanation as the “gloss.” We provide English translations of all three versions of *AW* (except where more than one version can be translated identically) as well as of the corresponding extracts from *AM*. In keeping with the alphabetical spirit of the genre, where the Latin keywords for each letter can be translated without undue liberty into modern English words beginning with the same letter we have done so; where even with due liberty no such equivalent is available we give the Latin keyword followed by the non-alphabetical English translation in parens.

#### A.

- K:** Adam — the first letter, the first man. His name was named from four letters.  
**Kr:** A, for what does it stand? That is Adam — the first letter, the first man. His name was named for him from four letters.

- D: Adam the first man was made by the Lord from the first letter, that is, from four letters, from which his name was named.
- AM: It is the opinion of wise Catholic teachers that A is the first letter after the model of the name of the first man, the protoplast, that is, Adam.

That the name of Adam, the first man (Gen. 1:26–27, 2:7; 1 Cor. 15:45; cf. 1 Tim. 2:13), should begin with the first letter in all of the “three sacred languages” is obviously appropriate. In Alcuin’s *Disputatio Pippini cum Albino*, a riddle about Adam as the man who was never born but died once (indirectly answered as “earth”) is followed by a challenge to identify the first letter of his name, which is answered with “i.” (one, first): see Martha Bayless, “Alcuin’s *Disputatio Pippini* and the Early Medieval Riddle Tradition,” in *Humor, History and Politics in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages*, ed. Guy Halsall (Cambridge, 2002), 157–78, at 175 (nos. 102–3). Surprisingly, *AW* does not invoke the all but inevitable figural connection to Christ as the “last Adam” (1 Cor. 15:45) and as the “alpha and omega” (Apoc. 1:8, 21:6, and 22:13). The reverse idea, that the letter “A” received its name from the word Adam (among other A-words) is concisely stated in the pseudo-Isidorian (probably Irish) *Quaestiones de veteri et novo testamento*: “Dic mihi. Prima littera A, pro quo accepit nomen A? De angelis, de ante secula, de Adam, de anima” (CCL 108B, 198), and the Hiberno-Latin *Liber de numeris* similarly explains the letter A’s priority by means of sacred words and names (Adonai, Adam, and so on); see R. E. McNally, “Der irische Liber de numeris: Eine Quellenanalyse des pseudo-isidorischen Liber de numeris” (Ph.D. diss., University of Munich, 1957), 62–63, citing the *Questiones* as well as a tract *Ysidorus De interpretatione litterarum alphabeti*, ed. Hermann Hagen, *Anecdota Helvetica quae ad grammaticam Latinam spectant* (Leipzig, 1870), 302: “A vocalis est, tribus virgulis comparatur et tribus nominibus: *aleph* in ebraica, in greca *alfa*, in latina *a*: quia dicitur primus de nominibus hominum Adam, et in anima et in angelo” (see also Munzi, *Littera legitera*, 101). Compare a Hiberno-Latin poem on the letters of Hebrew and Greek alphabets: “Adam primus homo, doctrinam commonet aleph” (ed. Ludwig Traube, MGH, *Poetae Latini Aevi Carolini* 3 [Berlin, 1896], 698); and the Hiberno-Latin grammar *Ars Sergilii*: “Quare ex litteris prima (est) a? Quia primus de nominibus hominibus Adam, et anima quae dicta est ei et angelus qui portauit eam a fuit ante secula dum animae sunt creatae a Deo uiuo” (ed. Richard M. A. Marshall, “Studies on the ‘Ars Grammatici Sergi’ with an Edition,” *Journal of Medieval Latin* 20 [2010]: 167–231, at 227). The first of two mnemonic alphabets in the *Interrogationes* in Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek Clm 19410 quoted above (69) begins, “Quo ordine inventae sunt litterae et quomodo? a Adam, b benedictio, ...” etc. (ed. Brunhölzl [n. 21 above], 23). On this dialogue see also Charles D. Wright, *The Irish Tradition in Old English Literature*, Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England 6 (Cambridge, 1993), 63–69.

In **D** the “first letter” is more clearly identified as referring not just to “A” as the first letter of the alphabet as in **KKr** but to the first of four letters in Adam’s name as an acronym, though the constituent words are not identified. That the name Adam was an acronym of the Greek names for the four cardinal points (Anatole, Dysis, Arctus, Mesembria), sometimes understood as names of stars, was widespread, and there is an extensive scholarly literature on the origins and transmission of the motif. Most of the Latin testimonies are conveniently quoted by Christfried Böttrich, *Adam als Mikrokosmos: Eine Untersuchung zum slavischen Henochbuch*, Judentum und Umwelt 59 (Frankfurt am Main, 1995), 59–68. See also Émile Turdeanu, “Dieu créa l’homme de huit éléments et tira son nom des quatre coins du monde,” in *Apocryphes slaves et roumains de l’Ancien Testament*, Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigrapha 5 (Leiden, 1981), 404–35; D. Cerbelaud, “Le nom d’Adam et les points cardinaux: Recherches sur un thème patristique,” *Vigiliae Christianae* 38 (1984): 285–301; Sever J. Voicu, “Adamo, acrostico del mondo,” *Apocrypha* 18 (2007): 205–30; Paolo Marone, “L’acrostico ADAM e la ghematria nella letteratura cristiana antica e medievale,” *Rivista Biblica* 61 (2013): 225–46; J.-P. Pettorelli, “La vie latine d’Adam et Eve: Analyse de la tradition manuscrite,” *Apocrypha* 10 (1999): 195–296, at 242–58; A. Scafi, “Le premier homme comme microcosme et préfiguration du Christ: La mappemonde d’Ebstorf et le nom d’Adam,” in *Adam: Le premier homme*, Micrologus Library 45 (Florence, 2012) 183–98; Sever J. Voicu, “Gematria e acrostico di Adamo: Nuovi testimoni,” *Apocrypha* 25 (2014): 181–93.

The earliest attestation of the motif is *Sibylline Oracles* III.24–26 (trans. in James H. Charlesworth, *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, 2 vols. [Garden City, NY, 1983–85], 1:362), and the tradition was alluded to by pseudo-Cyprian (third century), *De duobus montibus Sina et Sion* 4 (CSEL 3/3,108). Augustine assured its popularity in the early Middle Ages by discussing it in his *In Iohannis euangelium tractatus* 9.14; 10.12 (CCL 36: 98, 108), and it is found in many early-medieval biblical commentaries. However, a more likely source for *AW* is the text *De plasmatione Adam*, in which the naming of Adam is elaborated in narrative form in combination with other motifs regarding Adam’s creation. Three recensions of this text have been edited with commentary by Wright, “*De plasmatione Adam*.”

## B.

- K/Kr:** *Bonus* (good), that is, Abel, who showed piety towards his parents.  
**D:** *Bonus* (good) son, that is, Abel, who showed piety towards his parents.  
**AM:** *Bonus* (good) son, that is, Abel the just, who showed piety towards his parents and God by offering the best gifts.

For the association of **B** with *bonus* cf. the *Ars Sergilii* (ed. Marshall, 227): “*B fuit ante secula ex nomine et opere, quia Deus bonus et opus eius bonum.*” Abel the good and the pious son of Adam and Eve was regularly contrasted with the evil

son Cain, who slew his brother (Gen. 4:6; cf. Jude 11), for example, in the *Regula S. Columbani* 8: “Abel pius bona elegit, Cain vero mala incoepit” (*Sancti Columbani opera*, ed. G. S. M. Walker, *Scriptores Latini Hiberniae* 2 [Dublin, 1957], 134). As John Hennig notes, the word *pius* “implies here the idea of obedience to the father and love for the brother” (“Abel’s Place in the Liturgy,” *Theological Studies* 7 [1946]: 126–41, at 132). See generally Hans Martin von Erffa, *Ikonologie der Genesis: Die christlichen Bildthemen aus dem Alten Testament und ihre Quellen*, vol. 1 (Munich, 1989), 346–51, with extensive bibliography. James L. Kugel, *Traditions of the Bible: A Guide to the Bible as It Was at the Start of the Common Era* (Cambridge, MA, 1998), 151–52, cites a variety of passages (such as 1 Jn. 3:12) showing that “Abel ... came to be thought of as fundamentally good, righteous, Cain’s diametrical opposite.”

The epithet *iustus* (only in *AM*) applied to Abel is biblical (Matt. 23:25); in the writings of Cyprian, for example, he is regularly called “Abel iustus” (Michael Andrew Fahey, *Cyprian and the Bible: A Study in Third-Century Exegesis* [Tübingen, 1971], 559), and the epithet found its way into the canon of the mass: “munera pueri tui iusti Abel” (Anton Hänggi and Irmgard Pahl, eds., *Præx Eucharistica: Textus e Variis Liturgiis Antiquioribus Selecti*, 3rd ed., *Spicilegium Friburgense* 12 [Fribourg, 1998], 435).

The further extension in *AM* specifying that Abel offered the “best” gifts to God reflects a standard qualitative understanding of his selection from the “firstlings” (“de primogenitis”) of his flock (Gen. 6:4). According to Heb. 11:4, by faith Abel offered a more valuable sacrifice (“plurimam hostiam”) than did Cain. On the quality of Abel’s selection in contradistinction to Cain’s as a traditional explanation for God’s acceptance only of Abel’s, see Johannes Bartholdy Glenthøj, *Cain and Abel in Syriac and Jewish Writers (4th–6th Centuries)*, CSCO, Subsidia 95 (Leuven, 1997), 91–92; Oliver F. Emerson, “Legends of Cain, Especially in Old and Middle English,” *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America* 21 (1906): 831–929, citing Alcuin, “Abel Deo optima et naturalia offerebat, Cain vero viliora et humana inventione excogitata, ut putatur” (*Interrogationes in Genesim* 15, PL 100, 518). The alternative explanations were that Abel offered animals, Cain only plants, or (as also in Alcuin) that Abel offered gifts of nature, Cain gifts of human invention.

The extension “who showed piety towards his parents” is unique in *AW* in deriving (ultimately if not directly) from a pagan source, the *De moribus* of pseudo-Seneca: “*Praestabis parentibus pietatem, cognatis dilectionem*” (*Publii Syri Sententiae*, ed. Eduard von Wölfflin [Leipzig, 1869], 96). First cited in the sixth century and widely disseminated in the Carolingian period, the *De moribus* in turn draws on a popular proverb cited by Quintillian, *Institutio oratoria*: “pro certis autem habemus primum quae sensibus percipiuntur, ut quae videmus, audimus, qualia sunt signa, deinde ea, <ad> quae communi opinione

consensum est ‘deos esse, *praestandam pietatem parentibus*’” (emphasis ours in both cases; ed. Ludwig Radermacher and Vinzenz Buchheit [Leipzig, 1965], 252). This particular sententia from pseudo-Seneca also occurs among extracts in Munich, BSB, Clm 19413, fol. 118v (Birger Munk Olsen, *La réception de la littérature classique au moyen âge (ixe–xiiie siècle)* [Copenhagen, 1995], 242). On the transmission of the *De moribus*, see Veronika von Büren, “La transmission du *De Moribus* du ps. Sénèque, de Winithar de S. Gall à Sedulius Scottus,” in *Ways of Approaching Knowledge in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages: Schools and Scholarship*, ed. Paulo Farmhouse Alberto and David Paniagua, *Studia classica et mediaevalia* 8 (Nordhausen, 2012), 206–44. von Büren (244) suggests that Sedulius Scottus and his milieu at Rheims played a central role in the dissemination of these sententiae, many of which (though not this one) Sedulius incorporated into his own *Collectaneum Miscellaneum*.

### C.

*AW:* *Caecus* (blind; D: *caecatum* [blinded]), that is, Adam was seduced by Eve.

*AM:* *Caecus* (blind) by a woman, that is, Adam who was seduced by Eve.

The adjective *caecus* and the verb *caeco* have both literal and metaphorical senses (as does Old English *ablendan*, which Aldred uses to translate *caecatum* in **D**). The image of Adam’s “blindness” as a result of Eve’s “seduction” is an ironic spiritualization of the biblical sequence Gen. 3:6–7, in which Eve gives the fruit of the Tree of Knowledge to Adam and immediately “the eyes of both of them were opened” (“et aperti sunt oculi amborum”). See Christiana Reemts, *Biblische Gestalten bei den Kirchenvätern: Adam* (Münster, 2007), 160–61, 174–75. Exegetes were mainly concerned to clarify that this verse does not imply that Adam and Eve were born blind, but sometimes they assert the spiritual “blindness” of Adam (and of his progeny) after the Fall. Origen does both at once:

Adam et videbat, et non videbat. Eva quoque, antequam aperirentur oculi eius, vidisse describitur: “Vidit,” inquit, “mulier lignum. ...” Deinde sequitur: “et aperti sunt oculi eorum” [Gen. 3:7]. Ergo caeci fuerant, nec videbant, quorum oculi postea sunt aperti; sed qui bene ante viderant, postquam mandatum Domini praetergressi sunt, coeperunt videre male et aspectum obedientiae subrepente delicto postea perdidit. (*Hom. 16 ad Lucam*, ed. Max Rauer, *Die Homilien zu Lukas in der Übersetzung des Hieronymus und die griechischen Reste der Homilien und des Lukas-Kommentars*, GCS 49 [Berlin, 1959], 98 = PL 26, 255)

In pseudo-Chrysostom’s *In Genesim sermo III*, Adam blames Eve for his fall, asking “Why have you blinded my eyes?” (PG 56, 534; *Clavis Patrum Graecorum*, ed. M. Geerard [Turnhout, 1983–98], no. 4562; cited by Glenthoj, *Cain and Abel in Syriac and Jewish Writers*, 149 n. 262). In Avitus’s biblical poem *De spiritalis historiae gestis* 2.267 one result of eating the fruit is that Adam becomes “completely blind” (*mage caecus*; MGH Auct. ant. 6/2, ed. R. Peiper [Berlin, 1883], 219). Augustine associated the man born blind in Jn. 9:1 with humanity, born

“blind” from Adam (*In Iohannis euangelium tractatus* 34.9; CCL 36, 315). For similar comments in early-medieval Latin exegesis, see Heiric of Auxerre, *Homiliae* 1, 27: “Caecus ergo iste a domino illuminatus, allegorice genus humanum designat quod modo ignorantiae caecitatem et tenebras patitur postquam in Adam supernae claritatis scientiam amisit” (CCM 116, 224); and two probably Hiberno-Latin commentaries, the *Commentarius in Iohannem* (CCL 108C, 119): “Caecus: Id, humanum genus. *A natiuitate*. Id, ab Adam quando dixit: *Aperientur oculi uestri*”; and pseudo-Jerome, *Expositio quattuor euangeliorum* (PL 30, 582A): “*Vidit hominem caecum a nativitate*, caecus humanum genus significat. *Neque hic peccavit neque parentes ejus*, ut intelligas hoc quod dixit neque peccavit: Adam primus creatus, ad videndum malum, clausos habuit oculos, cum transgressus fuit mandatum Dei: apertos oculos tenuit ad malum, et clausit ad bonum.”

1 Tim. 2:14 says that Adam was *not* “seduced,” meaning of course by the serpent, but that Eve was. Exegetes extrapolated from Gen. 3:6, which states simply that Eve gave the fruit to Adam, that she in turn “seduced” him, for example, pseudo-Bede, *De sex dierum creatione liber*: “Adam non fuit per serpentem seductus, sed per mulierem” (PL 93, 231B); on this commentary (properly titled *Explanatio sex dierum*), see Michael Gorman, “The Canon of Bede’s Works and the World of Ps. Bede,” *Revue bénédictine* 111 (2001): 399–445.

#### D.

*AW/AM*: Damned he was, that is, the devil in hell.

As unremarkable as this lemma and gloss may seem, the gloss does implicitly decide between hell and the air as the abode to which the devil was condemned between his expulsion from heaven and the Last Judgment. Both alternatives had scriptural and patristic authority, as summarized by Peter Dendle, *Satan Unbound: The Devil in Old English Narrative Literature* (Toronto, 2001), 66–73, 148–50 nn. 29–41, citing Jean Daniélou, *Théologie du Judéo-Christianisme, Histoire des doctrines Chrétiennes avant Nicée 1* (Tournai, 1958), 132–34, 149–59, 258–59. According to the Apocalypse, Satan was thrown down to the earth (12:9) or into the abyss (20:3), while 2 Pt. 2:4 says that the rebel angels were cast down “in tartarum.” Yet Eph. 2:1–2 speaks of the “ruler of the power of the air” (“*principem potestatis aeris*”) and Jude 6 of the rebels angels being condemned “under darkness” (“*sub caligine*”), which was often understood to be the lower atmosphere. Augustine set out the alternatives very clearly:

Propterea ad ista caliginosa, id est, ad hunc aërem, tanquam ad carcerem, damnatus est diabolus, de apparatu superiorum angelorum lapsus cum angelis suis; nam apostolus hoc de illo dicit: *secundum principem potestatis aëris huius, qui nunc operatur in filiis diffidentiae* [Eph. 2:2]. Et alius apostolus dicit: *si enim deus angelis peccantibus non pepercit, sed carceribus caliginis inferni retrudens, tradidit in iudicio puniendos servari* [2 Peter 2:4]; infernum hoc appellans, quod inferior pars mundi sit. (*Enarrationes in psalmos* 148.9; CCL 40, 2171)



Aldred's translation of *damnatus* by *gehæftad* alludes to the biblical "binding" of Satan (Apoc. 20:1–3); in the Old English *Beowulf* Grendel is termed *hellehæfta*, "captive of hell" (line 788a); cf. also *hellehæftling* in *Juliana* (line 246a) and *Andreas* (line 1342a; ed. G. P. Krapp and E. v. K. Dobbie, *The Anglo-Saxon Poetic Records*, 6 vols. [New York, 1936–42]).

## E.

- K/D:** Eve (that is) the woman who was clothed thirty years before she was born.  
**Kr:** Eve, the woman who was brought in upon the earth, born without father or mother.  
**AM:** Eve, this is the woman who was made from the body of Adam, because it was a rib from his right side that the Lord took while he was asleep and built it into a woman, who was called Eve.

"Eve" is the solution to an implied riddle of which the manuscripts preserve two different versions. In **KD**, she is the woman who was "clothed" (*induta*) for thirty years before (*ante*, **K**) she was born; in **Kr**, she is the woman "brought in" (*inducta*) upon the earth and born without father and mother. The latter version is a riddle whose answer is regularly "Adam," the man born without father or mother; see Archer Taylor, *English Riddles from Oral Tradition* (Berkeley, 1951), 236 (no. 667); cf. Stith Thompson, *Motif-Index of Folk-Literature*, 6 vols. (Bloomington, IN, 1955–58), motif H813: "Riddle: *who, having neither father nor mother, are dead?* (Adam and Eve.)" Eve, however, is normally said to have been born without a mother (her "father" being Adam). Thus the pseudo-Augustinian *Sermo ad fratres in eremo* 28 (CPPM 1A, no. 1155) distinguishes between Adam, who was born without a father and a mother, and Eve, who was born without a mother: "Novus enim erat homo quia quatuor modis generantur homines: aut sine matre, ut Eva; aut sine patre et matre, ut Adam; aut ex patre et matre, ut homines; aut sine patre ex matre tantum, ut Christus" (PL 40, 1285).

**Kr**, however, probably represents a secondary substitution for the first and more difficult version of the riddle in **KD**. We are aware of no analogue for this riddle, but (assuming *induta* is not a scribal error for or variant spelling of *inducta*) the logic seems to be as follows. Adam was created at the age of thirty, according to (for example) the *Laterculus Malalianus* 17, ed. Jane Stevenson, *The 'Laterculus Malalianus' and the School of Archbishop Theodore*, Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England 14 (Cambridge, 1995), 143 and 208; for other attestations see the commentary in J. E. Cross and Thomas D. Hill, *The Prose Solomon and Saturn and Adrian and Ritheus* (Toronto, 1982), 70–72. Adam's flesh therefore already "clothed" the rib from which Eve was subsequently created (Gen. 2:22). Based on Gen. 5:2 ("masculum et feminam creavit eos"), Eve was often said to have been created (as the rib) at the same time as Adam, as in Jubilees 3:8 and frequently in Ephraem the Syrian, with reference to Gen. 1:27; see James L. Kugel, *Traditions of the Bible*, 85–86. Thus, while Eve's creation

was usually said to have been only a matter of hours or days after Adam's, she had been "clothed" in flesh that was already thirty years old. **KD** do not explain the riddle this way, but *AM*, which omits the enigmatic comparisons that make it a riddle, does refer to her creation from a rib from Adam's right side, as if preserving only that part of the explanation.

Alternatively, "clothed" might be a metaphor alluding to the tradition of the "garments of glory" in which Adam and Eve were clad before the Fall (see Kugel, *Traditions of the Bible*, 114–19; Brian Murdoch, *The Fall of Man in the Early Middle High German Biblical Epic*, Göppinger Arbeiten zur Germanistik 58 [Göppingen, 1972], 106–18; Alexander Toepel, "When Did Adam Wear Garments of Light?" *Journal of Jewish Studies* 61 [2010]: 62–71). The motif was commonplace and appears prominently, for example, in the Middle-Irish *Saltair na Rann*: "After Eve had eaten secretly half of the apple of offence, her body changed — a wide penalty — her fair covering fell from her": trans. David Greene and Fergus Kelly, with commentary by Brian Murdoch, *The Irish Adam and Eve Story from Saltair na Rann*, 2 vols. (Dublin, 1976), 1:43 (lines 1293–96). On the sources and transmission of the motif, see Brian Murdoch's commentary (2:88–89).

## F.

- K:** Furied, that is, the Jewish people when Christ was born.  
**Kr/AM:** Furied: the Jewish people, when Christ was born.  
**D:** Furied: the Jewish devil, when Christ was born.

The impetus for the characterization of the Jews' response to the birth of Christ by the lemma *fremuit* is probably commentary on Ps. 2:1, "Quare fremuerunt gentes et populi meditati sunt inania?" Although the *gentes* are of course by biblical definition *not* the Jews, the *populi* of the psalm verse were identified with the "people of Israel" already in Acts 4:25–28 (**D**'s *diabulus*, which results in a curious allusion to a "Jewish devil," probably results from contamination from the following lemma and gloss: "Gemuit, id est diabulus ..."). The identifications are made explicitly by Isidore of Seville, though with reference to the Crucifixion rather than the Incarnation: "Sed quia eum Iudaei non agnoscentes, congregati sunt ad interficiendum eum, et universalem assensum in passione ejus praebuerunt, ita legitur: *Quare fremuerunt gentes, id est, Romani, et populi meditati sunt inania, hoc est, Iudaei*" (*De fide catholica contra Iudaeos* 1.19.1, PL 83, 477B–C), and by Bede, *Retractatio in Actus apostolorum* 4.25: "Gentes autem propter milites Romanorum, populos propter Iudaeos posuit, unde apte gentes fremuisse, populi autem inania aduersus dominum meditati esse dicuntur" (CCL 121, 124). Compare Augustine, *Enarrationes in Psalmos* 40.12 (CCL 38, 457), where we find the singular *fremuit* with the subject *populus* identified as the Jews: "Ciuitas enim illa in qua fremuit populus, tamquam leo rapiens et rugiens,

exclamans: *Crucifige, crucifige, eradicatis inde Iudaeis, christianos habet, a Iudaeo nullo inhabitatur.*” In the Utrecht Psalter illustration of Psalm 2, the two groups of soldiers at the Crucifixion are labelled “Gentes” and “Populi,” while buildings behind them are labelled “sancta ecclesia” (since the *gentes* were eventually converted) and “sinagoga,” which identifies the *populi* as the Jews, as Susan Gillingham has noted (*A Journey of Two Psalms: The Reception of Psalms 1 and 2 in Jewish and Christian Tradition* [Oxford, 2013], 168). The parallelism of the two halves of the psalm verse apparently facilitated a transfer of the agents and the actions, so that in *AW* it is the Jewish *populus* that is said to have “raged.” Psalm 2, moreover, was also associated with the Incarnation (since in verse 7 God says, “Filius meus es tu ego hodie genui te”) and Acts 4:27, which quotes Ps. 2:1, refers to Jesus as the “sanctum puerum” against whom the Gentiles and Jews assembled (see Michael Marissen, *Tainted Glory in Handel’s Messiah: The Unsettling History of the World’s Most Beloved Choral Work* [New Haven, 2014], 186, n. 15).

## G.

- K:** Groaned, that is, the devil lest Christ carry off men from his throat.  
**Kr:** Groaned: the devil, when Christ carried off man from his throat.  
**D:** Groaned, that is, the devil lest Christ carry off men from his mouth.  
**AM:** Groaned: Satan, lest Christ carry off men from his power.

Christ’s rescue of men from the “throat” of the devil is an allusion either specifically to the Harrowing of Hell, in which case the *homines* are the Old Testament patriarchs whom Christ rescued, or more generally to the Atonement, in which case the *homines* are Christians destined to be saved from damnation (**Kr**’s reading *hominem*, added in the margin, implies a more general allusion to humanity, whereas the plural *homines* in **KD** is open to either interpretation). Taking this item in isolation, the image of the devil’s *guttur* (**KKr**) or *os* (**D**) suggests the iconography of the hell-mouth, on which see Gary D. Schmidt, *The Iconography of the Mouth of Hell: Eighth-Century Britain to the Fifteenth Century* (Selinsgrove and London, 1995). According to Schmidt, that iconography did not develop until the ninth century in Anglo-Saxon period, but as Schmidt notes there were various literary analogues in the Bible that were developed by patristic writers. In the Old Testament hell (Sheol) is anthropomorphized as having a voracious mouth (*os*, Isa. 5:14). Patristic writers speak of hell or the devil as having a mouth or jaws (*fauces*) to swallow humanity (for example, Jerome, *Comm. in Osee* 3.13, PL 25, 937B, cit. Schmidt). Even prior to the emergence of hell-mouth iconography, there was an iconographic tradition in which Christ stabs the personified Hades either in the stomach or in the throat: Margaret English Frazer, “Hades Stabbed by the Cross of Christ,” *Metropolitan Museum Journal* 9 (1974): 153–61. Caesarius of Arles refers to the Harrowing using similar imagery, stating that Christ had regained prey from the devil’s jaws (*fauces*):

“in inferna descendit, ut praedam, quam diabolus rapuerat, disruptis eius faucibus et exulceratis inferni visceribus ad superna revocaret” (*Sermo* 26.3, CCL 103, 116). However, the lemma for the next letter H introduces the metaphor of Christ as a “hook,” which suggests that the devil here may be the sea-beast Leviathan or Behemoth (see Commentary below). The image of Christ as *hamus* alludes not to the Harrowing but to the Atonement.

That Satan “groaned” at the Harrowing of Hell is stated in a poem by John Scottus Eriugena: “Captiuam reuocans praedam raptoris ab ore/Abstulit: ille gemit confossus membra superbus/Vulneribus duris” (ed. Michael W. Herren, *Iohannis Scotti Eriugena Carmina*, *Scriptores Latini Hiberniae* 12 [Dublin, 1993], 90–93). Cf. Peter the Venerable: “Inde Satan victus gemit/Unde victor nos redemit” (*Carm.* 7.1.13; PL 189, 1017D). Further examples of the motif of the devil’s groaning are cited by Udo Wawrzyniak, *Philologische Untersuchungen zum “Rithmus in laude saluatoris” des Petrus Venerabilis: Edition und Kommentar*, *Lateinische Sprache und Literatur des Mittelalters* 22 (Frankfurt am Main, 1985), 85.

## H.

- K: Hook, that is, Christ by which the enemy was reeled in from the world.  
 Kr: Hook, that is, Christ taken inside (?) the enemy.  
 D: Hook, that is, Christ, because he reeled in the enemy from this world.  
 AM: Hook, that is, Christ who reeled in the enemy from the world: for just as a hook draws fish from the sea, so our Savior Jesus Christ reeled in the devil and his ministers from the world.

The metaphor of Christ as a “hook” that catches the devil is a classic image of the Atonement: Christ deceived the devil using the “bait” of his flesh or human body, concealing the “hook” of his divinity. By bringing about the death of Christ, a sinless man, the devil swallowed the bait and was caught and taken captive (in *AW*, reeled in from the world). This image assumes that the devil had no legitimate legal “rights” to fallen humanity and therefore that God had no need to conduct a transaction by paying a “ransom” with Christ’s death, an alternative image of the Atonement. See generally Gustav Aulén, *Christus Victor: An Historical Study of the Three Main Types of the Idea of the Atonement*, trans. A. G. Herbert (London, 1950), esp. 63–71. On the transmission of the image in the Middle Ages, see Johannes Zellinger, “Der geköderte Leviathan im Hortus Deliciarum der Herrad von Landsberg,” *Historisches Jahrbuch* 45 (1925): 161–77; James W. Marchand, “Leviathan and the Mousetrap in the *Niðrstignings saga*,” *Scandinavian Studies* 47 (1975): 328–38, esp. 333.

The most influential formulation for the Latin Middle Ages was that of Gregory the Great:

Quis nesciat quod in hamo esca ostenditur, aculeus occultatur? Esca enim prouocat, ut aculeus pungat. Dominus itaque noster ad humani generis redemptionem ueniens, uelut quemdam de se in nece diaboli hamum fecit. Assumpsit enim

corpus, ut in eo Behemoth iste quasi escam suam mortem carnis appeteret. Quam mortem dum in illo iniuste appetit, nos quos quasi iuste tenebat amisit. In hamo ergo eius incarnationis captus est, quia dum in illo appetit escam corporis, transfixus est. Ibi quippe inerat humanitas quae ad se deuoratorem duceret, ibi diuinitas quae perforaret, ibi aperta infirmitas quae prouocaret, ibi occulta uirtus quae raptoris faucem transfigeret. In hamo igitur captus est, quia inde interiit unde deuorauit. Et quidem Behemoth iste filium dei incarnatum nouerat, sed redemptionis nostrae ordinem nesciebat. Sciebat enim quod pro redemptione nostra incarnatus dei filius fuerat, sed omnino quod idem redemptor noster illum moriendo transfigeret nesciebat. (*Moralia in Iob* 33.7.14, CCL 143B, 1684–85; see also *Homiliae in Euangelia* 25.8, CCL 141, 213)

A concise summary is provided by Isidore of Seville, complementing the image of the “hook” (*hamus*) and “bait” (*esca*) by equating the “line” (*linea*) with Christ’s human genealogy:

Diabolus, dum in Christo carnem humanitatis inpetit quae patebat, quasi hamo diuinitatis eius captus est qui latebat. Est enim in Christo hamus diuinitas; esca autem caro; linea, genealogia quae ex Euangelio recitatur. Tenens uero hanc lineam Deus Pater est, de quo dicit apostolus: *Caput Christi Deus*. (*Sententiae* 1.14.14; CCL 111, 50)

## I.

K/Kr: *Imber* (rainstorm), that is, baptism.

D: *Imber* (rainstorm), that is, divine baptism or scripture.

AM: Divine *imber* (rainstorm), that is, baptism.

The image of baptism as a rainstorm (*imber*) evokes Christian typological interpretation of two Old Testament episodes: the deluge of rain (*pluvia*, *diluvium*) that caused Noah’s Flood in Genesis 7, and the great rain (*pluvia grandis*) obtained by the prayer of Elijah in 1 Kgs. 18:42–45. Already in 1 Pt. 3:20–21 the waters (*aquae*) through which the eight souls on the ark were saved are explicitly interpreted as a figure of baptism, and this became a standard typology, as concisely summarized by Jean Daniélou: “As sinful humanity in the time of Noe was destroyed by a judgment of God in the midst of the water, and one man was saved to be the first-born of a new human race, so in Baptism the old man is annihilated by means of the sacrament of water, and the man who comes out of the baptismal pool belongs to the new creation.” See *The Bible and the Liturgy* (Notre Dame, 1956), 70–85 (quotation at 77); and idem, *From Shadows to Reality: Studies in the Biblical Typology of the Fathers*, trans. W. Hibberd (Westminster, MD, 1960), 69–102. Though it does not occur in either biblical passage, the word *imber* denotes a downpour and is therefore appropriate to describe these heavy rains, and in commentary on the Noah’s flood or Elijah’s rain *imber* sometimes supplements *pluvia* or *diluvium*, for example in Maximus of Turin: “Quod quidem in figuram nostri factum esse cognoscimus, ut nos quoque horum quadraginta curriculo dierum ieiunantes spiritalem baptismatis pluuiam mereamur, ut et

totius mundi in fratribus nostris iam diu aridam terram caelestis desuper imber infundat, et longam gentilium siccitatem lauacri inundatio salutaris inroret” (*Collectio sermonum antiqua*, sermo 35.4, CCL 23, 138); “Etenim coelestis imber vitia peccatorum diluit. ... Sicut enim superveniente Eliae pluvia, omne pabulum terra produxit. ... Et sicut illic pluviarum fontes irrigaverunt orbem, ut vivificarentur herbarum mortificata jam semina: ita et fons baptismatis irrigat genus hominum, ut animarum mortificata corda vivificet” (*Sermo* 33, PL 17, 670B–C); also Peter Chrysologus: “quadraginta diebus et noctibus expiaturus terram caelestis imber effunditur, ut quia perire sibi mundus, quod factus fuerat, iam deflebat, gauderet tali baptismo se renatum” (*Sermo* 166.3, CCL 24B, 1020).

With D’s alternative gloss “scriptura” cf. Rupert of Deutz, *Commentaria in duodecim prophetas minores* 2.2 (PL 168, 92D): “Prophetica namque scriptura ipsa est imber temporaneus; quia sicut serotino imbre infusa coalescunt semina, ita haec promissionem Christi uenturi quae ad Abraham facta est, frequenti declamatione expectabilem faciebat. Porro euangelica uel apostolica scriptura imber serotinus est; quia, sicut serotino imbre fructus ad maturitatem perducentur, ita scriptura haec iam aduenisse Christum confirmat, de quo prophetae uaticinabantur. Igitur et uenient, inquit, nobis quasi imber temporaneus et serotinus, id est talis et taliter ueniet nobis, uel taliter nobis cum faciet, sicut utriusque scilicet Noui ac Veteris testamenti scripturae testificantur.”

## K.

K/Kr: Kalumny, that is, the Jews calumniating Christ.

AM: Kalumny, that is, of the Jews calumniating Christ.

Dag Norberg (*An Introduction to the Study of Medieval Latin Versification* [Washington, DC, 2004], 51) notes that K-strophes in abecedarian poems regularly begin with words in ka-, following grammatical teaching. Munzi (*Litera legitera*, 73) cites the Roman grammarian Diomedes who lists *Kalendae*, *kaput*, and *kalumniarum* as words in which the consonant k is written before the vowel “a.” In Roman law, calumny was punishable by having the letter K for *kalumniator* branded on the forehead (see Julio García Camiñas, *La lex remmia de calumniatoribus* [Santiago de Compostela, 1984], 91–112). The locus classicus is Cicero, *Pro Sexto Roscio* 57, ed. Andrew R. Dyck (Cambridge, 2010), 35: “that letter to which you (accusers) are so hostile that you hate the Kalends of every month” (see Dyck’s commentary and references at 123). That the Jews falsely accused or “calumniated” Christ is based on the Passion narratives in the gospels, in which the Jewish high priests Annas and Caiaphas bring charges of sedition against Jesus to Pilate, the Roman governor. At Jesus’s trial, a crowd of Jews, urged on by the chief priests and elders, chooses to have the murderer Barabbas pardoned rather than Jesus, demanding that Jesus be crucified (Matt. 27:15–23; Mk. 15:6–15; Lk. 23:17–23; Jn. 18:39–19:1–7, 15). On the history of extrapolation

from these scenes to the blanket condemnation of the Jews as “Christ killers,” see Jeremy Cohen, *Christ Killers: The Jews and the Passion from the Bible to the Big Screen* (Oxford, 2007). Augustine, notably, insisted that the Jews through their forebears were responsible for Christ’s death: “Occidistis Christum in parentibus vestris” (*Adversus Iudaeos* 8.11; PL 42, 60).

In addition to the Passion narratives, the gospels also include a number of scenes in which the Pharisees pose hostile questions to Jesus or make accusatorial comments about his actions or statements. An extension of the gloss in *AM* (see Munzi, *Litera legitera*, 65) refers specifically to the “false testimony” (the legal definition of calumny was false accusation motivated by malice) of the Jews responding to Jesus’s prophecy that he would destroy the temple and build another in three days in Mk. 14:57–59: “et quidam surgentes falsum testimonium ferebant adversus eum dicentes quoniam nos audivimus eum dicentem ego dissolvam templum hoc manufactum et per triduum aliud non manufactum aedificabo” (cf. Matt. 27:40, Jn. 2:19). The frequency with which the Jews were accused of “calumny” by Christian-Latin writers can be appreciated by searching “calumn\* + Iud\*e\* #iudex, #iudi\*” in the Library of Latin Texts database (<http://apps.brepolis.net/BrepolisPortal/default.aspx>). A perhaps fortuitously close verbal parallel for the phrasing in *AW* occurs in Augustine, *Sermo* 293.4 (PL 38, 1329–30), “calumniantes Iudaei Domino.”

## L.

K/Kr: Light, that is, the divine law.

D: Light, that is, the true light.

*AM*: Light according to the sense, that is, the divine law.

The image of the Law as a light or lamp is biblical: see Richard Bauckham, “Qumran and the Fourth Gospel,” in *The Scrolls and the Scriptures: Qumran Fifty Years After*, ed. Stanley E. Porter and Craig E. Evans (Sheffield, 1997), 267–80, at 276–78. The words *lex* and *lux* are equated in Prov. 6:23 (“quia mandatum lucerna est et lex lux”), and Wisd. 18:4 speaks of the “incorruptum legis lumen.” Cf. also Isa. 51:4 (“quia lex a me exiet et iudicium meum in lucem populorum requiescet”); Ps. 36:6 (“et educet sicut lumen iustitiam tuam et iudicium tuum sicut meridiem”). A patristic example is Caesarius of Arles, *Sermo* 76.3, “Et quia lex Dei non solum pluvia, sed et lumen est, secundum illud quod scriptum est, *Lucerna pedibus meis verbum tuum Domine* (Ps. 118:105)” (CCL 103, 318). But *lex* and *lumen* are just as often opposed, with *lex* standing for the Old Law and *lumen* for the gospel or revealed truth: “lex ergo quasi figura sit nobis, euangelium quasi lumen et signaculum veritatis” (Ambrose, *Explanatio super psalmos xii*, CSEL 64<sup>2</sup>, 303); “Lex enim iustitiam praedicat, ut fugiatur iniquitas: lumen ostendit, quod est veritas” (Ambrosiaster, *Comm. in Epistolam ad Corinthios secundam*, PL 17, 319A). The formulation in *AW*, however, is too compressed to

identify a precise source or tradition underlying its equation of *lex* and *lumen*. **D**'s change to *uerum lumen* presumably alludes to 1 Jn. 2:8, where the phrase refers to the *mandatum nouum* of loving one's brother.

### M.

K:	Mighty, that is, God the Father omnipotent.
Kr/AM:	Mighty, that is, God the Father.
D:	Mighty, that is, the exalted child.

The formulation of this Letter is probably corrupt due to entanglement with the wording of the Letter N. Taking the formulation of **KKr** as it stands, the equation of *deus pater* and *magnus* is too banal to document meaningfully. **Kr**'s faulty neuter *magnum*, however, may be a vestige of an original lemma *magnum nomen*, with *nomen* subsequently being wrongly displaced, on the assumption that it should be the lemma for N. The conjecture is supported by **Kr**'s conflation in the Letter N of the lemma *nomen* with the gloss *deus pater omnipotens* that properly belongs to the Letter M. The original reading, therefore, was probably "M. Magnum nomen, id est deus pater (omnipotens)." If so, the biblical sources are Ps. 75:2, "notus in Iudaea deus, in Israhel magnum nomen eius," and Jer. 10:6, "Non est similis tui Domine magnus tu et magnum nomen tuum in fortitudine." The pseudo-Hieronymian, probably Hiberno-Latin *Breuiarium in psalmos* (PL 26, 1009B) understands *Deus* in the psalm verse as the Father: "Notus enim in Iudaea Deus: in Israhel magnum nomen eius. Notus erat Deus, sed Dei via non erat nota in Iudaea. Quoniam ergo via Dei Patris non erat nota in Iudaeis" (on this commentary see Martin McNamara, *The Psalms in the Early Irish Church*, Journal for the Study of the Old Testament, Supplement Series 165 [Sheffield, 2000], 49).

**D**'s epithet *puer excelsus* is obviously more suitable to Christ than to God the Father, but *puer* obviously cannot have been the original lemma for N, which may have been replaced by *Nomen*; or perhaps originally *Nomen* was glossed by *puer excelsus*, in which case the repetition of the word *nomen* in the gloss of M and the lemma of N was the source of the scribal confusion. For Boyd's suggestion that the original lemma for N may have been **D**'s *Nemar* (the obscurity of which resulted in the scribal substitution of *Nomen*), see the Commentary on N below.

Christ as *puer* is of course biblical, designating not only Christ as a "child" but also his divine Sonship (see the *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* [Grand Rapids, 1964–76], s.v. παῖς). In Old Testament passages interpreted as prophecies of Christ, the word *puer* is sometimes an epithet, for example, Isa. 49:6, "Magnum tibi est vocari te puerum meum" (Vetus Latina reading). The *Breuiarium Gothicum* includes an antiphon for matins on the feast of St. Clement, "Ecce intelliget puer meus, excelsus erit et sublimis" (PL 86, 997D), a variant of Isa. 52:13 also found in the Mozarabic Antiphonary



(*Esaias*, ed. R. Gryson, *Vetus Latina* 12/2, fasc. 6 [1996], 1266). At a later date, Peter Lombard, commenting on Isa. 9:6, “Puer natus est nobis” (Vulgate *parvulus*; *puer* is the reading of the Christmas vigil introit), adds “Magnus est et excelsus puer iste” (PL 171, 383D).

The collocation of Jesus as *puer* with the adjective *excelsus* in *AW* may be due to Jerome’s explication of two Hebrew words meaning *excelsus*, both of which were associated with biblical verses naming or prefiguring Christ as “puer.” The first of these is the name “Aram” in the genealogy of Christ, which Jerome in his treatise on Hebrew names glossed “excelsus” (CCL 72, 61). Hrabanus Maurus in his commentary on Matthew associated this etymology with Matt. 12:18 (cf. Isa. 42:1):

Aram “electus” siue “excelsus” dicitur.

Et Propheta ex persona Patris ad Filium loquitur: *Ecce puer meus, electus meus; dedi spiritum meum super ipsum.*

The second is the word *bama*, meaning “excelsus” or better “excelsum” in Isa. 2:22 (“quiescite ergo ab homine cuius spiritus in naribus eius quia excelsus reputatus est ipse”). According to Jerome, the Jews tendentiously read *bamma*, meaning “in quo,” to obscure the prophecy of Christ:

Quod autem Christus excelsus sit uel altissimus, qui alio sermone apud Hebraeos appellatur HELION, in octogesimo sexto psalmo legimus: *Numquid Sion dicet homo quod homo natus sit in ea, et ipse fundauit eam altissimus* [Ps. 86:5], et in euangelio: *Et tu puer propheta altissimi uocaberis* [Lk. 1:76]. (*Commentaires de Jérôme sur le prophète Isaïe*, ed. Roger Gryson and Paul-Augustin Deproost, *Aus der Geschichte der lateinischen Bibel* 23 [Freiburg, 1993], 215–16; see B. Kedar-Kopfstein, “Divergent Hebrew Readings in Jerome’s Isaiah,” *Textus: Annual of the Hebrew University Bible Project* 4 (1964): 176–210, at 183)

## N.

K: Name, that is, Christ the son of the living most high God.

Kr: Name, that is, God the Father almighty.

D: Nemar (?), that is, Christ Jesus.

AM: Name (of Christ), that is, the son of God, whom the name of Father ...

W. J. P. Boyd, “Aldrediana XXV: *Ritual Hebraica*,” *English Philological Studies* 14 (1975): 1–58, at 51–55, following a suggestion by O. Ritter, understands D’s lemma *nemar* as “a rough translation of the Hebrew word ... *namer*, leopard or panther” (51). The interpretation of *namer* as Christ Boyd traces to the *Physiologus* tradition: “Sic et dominus noster Iesus Christus, uerus panther ... descendens de caelis eripuit nos de potestate diaboli et sociauit nos bonitati suae” (ed. F. J. Carmody, *Physiologus Latinus, versio B* [Paris, 1939], 40; cited by Boyd, “Aldrediana,” 55, with references to other bestiary texts). If so, then **KKrAM nomen** would be an understandable scribal effort to correct what must have appeared to be nonsense. Boyd, however, must assume that in glossing *nemar* with *onlesend* (“Redeemer”) instead of with *panðer*, Aldred was silently skipping over the literal meaning of

the lemma in favor of its allegorical meaning, even though that meaning is supplied in the gloss, its proper place. Moreover, the spelling *nemar* is apparently not attested elsewhere as a Latin transliteration of this Hebrew word (Boyd cites several other variant spellings at 51 n. 17). Two versions of *AW* interpret the lemma as the name Christ (**D**) or Christ Jesus (**Kr**), which suggests that *nomen* is in fact the original lemma (see commentary on **M**), as does the second alphabet text in Clm 19410, which has “n pro nomine, quod est super omne nomen” (above, 69). So does the sequence of letters **M**, **N**, **O**, whose lemmata all involve epithets for the three persons of the Trinity.

Either name, Christ or Jesus, or both, can suitably gloss the lemma *nomen*, though according to the biblical verse quoted partially in Clm 19410, Phil. 2:9–10, the name Jesus is the “name above every name” (“nomen super omne nomen ut in nomine Iesu omne genu flectat caelestium et terrestrium et infernorum”). The word *nomen* in reference to the deity can by itself denote divinity, as in the Irish Southampton Psalter, in which the word *nomen* is repeatedly glossed with forms of *diuinitas* (see, for example, glosses to Pss. 17:50, 19:2, 53:3; CCM 240, 42, 46, 138). Jesus was understood to mean *Saluator*, based on Matt. 1:21, “salvum faciet”; and in Old English the name Jesus was almost always rendered *Hælend* (“Savior”), as in Aldred’s translation here (see also the commentary below on the letter **S** lemma *Saluator*). See Damian Fleming, “Jesus, that is *hælend*: Hebrew Names and the Vernacular Savior in Anglo-Saxon England,” *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 112 (2013): 26–47. Forms of *onlysend*/*alysend* regularly translated *redemptor* or *liberator*. A hymnal from Durham does gloss *saluator* with both Old English words (Inge Milfull, *The Hymns of the Anglo-Saxon Church: A Study and Edition of the Durham Hymnal*, Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England 17 [Cambridge, 1997], 98.3), though *alysend* may have been prompted by the closely following participle *redemptis*. Since Aldred gives *hælend* as the direct equivalent for the personal name *Iesus* in the gloss, he may have chosen to use the near-synonym *onlesend* to render the inexplicable lemma *nemar* with another divine epithet. This seems more likely than accepting *nemar* as equivalent to Hebrew *namer*, which we should expect Aldred to have glossed literally as “panther.”

Instead of the personal name *Iesus*, the gloss in **K** extends the epithet *Christus* with the epithet “filius dei uiui altissimi.” In John 10:36 Christ calls himself “filius Dei,” and in Matt. 16:16 Peter confesses Christ as “tu es Christus Filius Dei vivi.” On the epithet “Son of God,” see Martin Hengel, *The Son of God: The Origin of Christology and the History of Jewish-Hellenistic Religion*, trans. John Bowden (Eugene, OR, 2007); Klaus Berger, “Zum traditionsgeschichtlichen Hintergrund christologischer Hoheitstitel,” *New Testament Studies* 17 (1971): 391–425. The expression “per nomen dei uiui omnipotentis” occurs already in a second- or third-century *defixio* from Carthage (see Jean-Marie Lassère, *Manuel d’épigraphie*

*romaine*, vol. 1 [Paris, 2005], 298), and in the oldest text of the apocryphal *Apocalypse of Thomas*, Christ identifies himself to Thomas by saying, “Ego sum filius Dei uiui omnipotentis” (E. Hauler, “Zu den neuen lateinischen Bruchstücken der Thomasapokalypse und eines apostolischen Sendschreibens im Codex Vind. Nr. 16,” *Wiener Studien* 30 [1908]: 308–40, at 312). The formula “In nomine sanctae trinitatis atque verae unitatis Dei vivi omnipotentis” occurs in an Anglo-Saxon charter of Berhtwulf, king of Mercia (840 × 848: S205 in *The Electronic Sawyer*, <http://www.esawyer.org.uk/charter/205.html>), and a similar invocation occurs in a Carolingian exorcism: “Adiuuro te etiam per invisibile et ineffabile nomen Christi Jesu, Filii Dei vivi omnipotentis” (ed. Karl Zeumer, *Formulae Merowingici et Karolini aevi*, MGH Leges 5 [Hanover, 1886], 621).

## O.

K/Kr: *Opifex* (maker), that is, the Holy Spirit with the Father and Son.

D: *Opifex* (maker), that is, the Holy Spirit.

AM: *Opifex* (maker), craftsman, that is, the Holy Spirit.

A likely ultimate source is 1 Cor. 12:11, *haec autem omnia operatur unus atque idem Spiritus*. Pseudo-Ambrose, *De trinitate*, characterized the Holy Spirit as *opifex* in the conception of Christ: “Ad viscera igitur sacrae Virginis, et suscipiendi inde carnem, et formandi illic hominem Spiritus sanctus opifex et sanctificator accessit” (PL 17, 524B). Augustine terms the Holy Spirit *opifex* in a different context, the action of the Spirit of God hovering over the waters in Gen. 1:2: “Ecce *In principio fecit Deus caelum et terram ... Spiritus Dei superferebatur super aquas*, et ipse opifex, nec a Patre et unigenito Verbo seiunctus” (*Sermo* 223A, ed. G. Morin, *Sancti Augustini Sermones post Maurinos reperti*, Miscellanea Agostiniana 1 [Rome, 1930], 13). While not very common, the epithet is also found, for example, in Beatus of Liébana, *Aduersus Elipandum* 1.40 (“ita Pater et Filius et Spiritus sanctus, opifex unius totius conditae creaturae, unius glomeratio caritatis, unius ambitus dilectionis coaeterna substantia” [CCM 59, 27]); and in Paschasius, *Sententiae catholicorum patrum* (PL 120, 1361B): “Quia in his omnibus unus est opifex Spiritus sanctus, unus et Christus, qui conceptus de Spiritu sancto ex Maria Virgine, unus et creator atque sanctificator corporis et sanguinis ipse Spiritus.” Like *AW*, both Beatus and Paschasius emphasize the unity of the Holy Spirit as *opifex* with the Father and the Son, and the epithet was also applied both to the Father and the Son.

## P.

K/D: *Portauit* (carried), that is, Christ carried his Cross.

Kr: *Portauit* (carried), that is, Christ his Cross.

AM: *Portauit* (carried), Christ his Cross for saints and sinners.

That Christ carried his own cross is asserted uniquely in John’s Passion narrative (19:17); the synoptics agree that the Roman soldiers made Simon of Cyrene carry

the cross behind Jesus (Matt. 27:32; Mk. 15:21; Lk. 23:26 *post Iesum*). The discrepancy was usually resolved on the literal level by assuming that Jesus carried the cross first, and then was relieved by Simon, or that Simon carried the cross as far as Golgotha, where Jesus took it up himself. See Jerome, *Commentariorum in Matheum libri iv* 4 (CCL 77, 269–70), and Augustine, *De consensu euangelistarum* 3.10.37 (CSEL 43, 321–22), both cited by Mark DelCogliano, “Gregory the Great on Simon of Cyrene: A Critique of Tradition,” *Annali di storia dell’esegesi* 28/1 (2011): 315–24, at 316 n. 14.

In the Vulgate Jn. 19:17 reads “baiulans sibi crucem,” but Vetus Latina variants include both *gestans* and (more frequently) *portans*, as in quotations by Augustine, whose paraphrases of the verse are sometimes formulated very similarly to *AW* (Jo. 9, 12, 5, “Portauit enim Dominus crucem suam”; s. 218, 2 “crucem suam ipse portauit”; see *Evangelium secundum Iohannem*, ed. P. H. Burton et al., Vetus Latina: Die Reste der altlateinischen Bibel 19 [Freiburg, 2013], ad loc.). Verbal parallels for the phrasing in *AW* can also be found elsewhere, but it is not distinctive enough to trace to a particular source.

## Q.

- K: *Quassati* (shaken) were the Jews, that is, they were seduced by heretics.  
 D: *Quassati* (shaken) they were, that is, the Jews were seduced by heretics.  
 AM: *Quassati* (shaken) were the Jews, seduced by heretics.

That the Jews were “shaken” or “bruised” (*quassati*) echoes interpretation of two gospel verses, each of which involves a quotation by Jesus of an Old Testament verse. The first, Lk. 20:18, follows Jesus’s quotation of Ps. 117:22 about the stone rejected by the builders that has become the cornerstone: “omnis qui ceciderit supra illum lapidem conquassabitur supra quem autem ceciderit comminuet illum” (the parallel verse Matt. 21:44 reads *confringitur*, though *conquassabitur* occurs as a variant). Augustine consistently identified those who were “shaken” by falling on this stone as the Jews: “iam ergo Iudaei illa offensione quassati sunt” (*Sermo* 91, PL 38, 567); “lapis erat jacens, offenderunt in eum Iudaei, et quassati sunt” (*Sermo* 92, PL 38, 573); *Enarrationes in Psalmos* 73.11, CCL 39, 1012 (“O Israel! quassatus es”) and 109.18, CCL 40, 1618. Munzi’s edition of *AM* gives the reading “quas satigunt” (*Littera legitera*, 66, 69), but the letter Munzi read as a *g* is clearly a majuscule *s*. See the facsimile of the manuscript at [http://digi.vatlib.it/view/MSS\\_Vat.lat.6018](http://digi.vatlib.it/view/MSS_Vat.lat.6018) (fol. 53r).

The second gospel verse is Matt. 12:20, a quotation of Isa. 42:2: “harundinem quassatam non confringet et linum fumigans non extinguet donec eiciat ad victoriam iudicium.” Jesus has just withdrawn from the Pharisees after healing the man with the withered hand on the sabbath, charging others whom he heals not to tell anyone, in fulfillment of Isa. 42:1–3. The “bruised” reed was interpreted as the Jews by, for example, pseudo-Cyprian: “alii uero Iudaei inridentes de harundine caput ei

quassabant, blasphemantes et dicentes: *ave rex Iudaeorum, ubi est pater tuus?*” (*De montibus Sina et Sion* 8, CSEL 3/3, 112); Epiphanius Latinus: “Ergo reliquit incredulos Iudaeos, ut veniret ad gentes peccatores, sicut ait sequenti evangelii: Harundinem quassatam non confringet et linum fumigantem non extinguet, quoadusque erigat victoriam ad iudicium” (*Sancti Epiphaniï episcopi Interpretatio Evangeliorum*, ed. Alvar Erickson, Acta Regiae Societatis Humaniorum Litterarum Lundensis 27 [Lund, 1939], 36); Gregory the Great: “Vnde et Iudaeorum regnum calamo comparatur, cum per prophetam apparense in ueritate carnis Domino dicitur: *Calamum quassatum non conteret et linum fumigans non exstinguet*. Quid enim calami nomine, nisi Iudaici populi temporale regnum denuntiat, nitens quidem exterius, sed interius uacuum? ... Incarnatus autem Dominus calamum quassatum non confregit ... non potestate iudicii percussit, sed cum patientiae longanimitate tolerauit” (*Moralia in Iob* 33.3.7, CCL 143B, 1675–76).

## R.

- K: Raguhel: strong, that is, Satahel.  
 D: Raguel, that is, strong, that is, Satahel.  
 AM: Raghuel, strong, that is, a rebel against God, that is, Satanahel.

The name Raguel occurs in lists of the names of archangels such as 1 Enoch 20:1–7 (trans. in J. H. Charlesworth, *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, 2 vols. [Garden City, NY, 1983–85], 1:23–24) and in various early-medieval litanies: see Karen Louise Jolly, “Prayers from the Field: Practical Protection and Demonic Defense in Anglo-Saxon England,” *Traditio* 61 (2006): 95–147, nn. 64, 92, 93, 106, 197; p. 142. Boyd (“Aldrediana,” 55) explains the meaning of the Hebrew name *r’u’el*: “The first element ... is *re’eh*, ‘fellow,’ ‘friend.’ The second element, ‘*el*, ‘god’ is frequently compounded in personal names.” According to Boyd, the gloss *fortis* is mistakenly based on the idiomatic use of the word ‘*el* in Gen. 31:29 and elsewhere in a Hebrew phrase that means “in the power of one’s hand.”

A better explanation, however, lies closer to hand. R. E. Kaske (without reference to *AW*) has noted “the frequent association of EL with strength,” citing Jerome, *Ep.* 25, “Primum dei nomen est el, quod Septuaginta ‘deum,’ Aquila ἐτυμολογίαν eius exprimens ἰσχυρόν, id est ‘fortem’ interpretatur” (CSEL 54, 218–19 = PL 22, 429; repeated by pseudo-Jerome, *De deo et nominibus eius*, PL 23, 1306–7); see Kaske, “*Beowulf* and the Book of Enoch,” *Speculum* 46 (1971): 421–31, at 426 n. 26. See also Isidore, *Etymologiae* 7.1.3 (ed. W. M. Lindsay, *Isidori Hispalensis Etymologiarum Libri XX*, 2 vols. [Oxford, 1911]): “Primum apud Hebraeos Dei nomen El dicitur; quod alii Deum, alii etymologiam eius exprimentes ἰσχυρός, id est fortem interpretati sunt, ideo quod nulla infirmitate opprimitur, sed fortis est et sufficiens ad omnia perpetranda.” As Lukas Dorfbauer points out to us, the “strong man” (*fortis*) of Matt. 12:29 and Mk. 3:27 was usually identified as the devil.

Boyd, moreover, seems to understand both Raguel and Satahel as angel names, whereas Satahel is almost certainly a variant of Satanahel (the form given by **R**, which explains *fortis* as a reference to being a “rebel against God”), a name for the devil. Satanahel/Satanael is named in 3 Enoch, 3 Baruch, and the *Questions of Bartholomew*. See Marcel Dando, “Satanaël,” *Cahiers d’Études Cathares* 30 (1979): 16–21; Charles D. Wright, “Apocryphal Lore and Insular Tradition in St Gall, Stiftsbibliothek MS 908,” in *Irland und die Christenheit: Bibelstudien und Mission*, ed. Próinséas Ní Chatháin and Michael Richter (Stuttgart, 1987), 124–45, at 138. An example in an early-medieval Latin source is the dialogue in St. Gall, Stiftsbibliothek 908: “Quis de thronum descendit? – Satanaël et Iudas inflex”; ed. François Ploton-Nicollet, “Ioca monachorum et pseudo Interpretatio sancti Augustini,” *Archives d’histoire doctrinale et littéraire du Moyen Âge* 74 (2007): 105–59, at 126. The *draco* of Ps. 73:14 is identified in the Irish Southampton Psalter as *Sathel* (CCM 240, 190), and *Sathiel* is given as another name for Satan in the Old English *Prose Solomon and Saturn Pater Noster Dialogue*, ed. Daniel Anlezark, *The Old English Dialogues of Solomon and Saturn*, Anglo-Saxon Texts 7 (Cambridge, 2009), 74. See Wright, *The Irish Tradition*, 255 and n. 147. In explicating the name Grendel in *Beowulf*, Kaske (“*Beowulf* and the Book of Enoch,” 426) has noted that a catalogue of fallen angels in 1 Enoch 6:7 includes sixteen whose names end in -el, and Thomas D. Hill has argued that Raguel in *AW* is more likely the name of a devil. See idem, “Raguel and Ragnel: Notes on the Literary Genealogy of a Devil,” *Names* 22 (1974): 145–49, at 148, citing Boniface’s condemnation of the heretic Adalbert, claiming that Adalbert had wrongly invoked the names of devils (including Raguel) as archangels: *Die Briefe des heiligen Bonifatius und Lullus*, ed. M. Tangl, MGH, Epistolae selectae I (Berlin, 1916), 117. Compare the shorter recension of the Hiberno-Latin *Reference Bible*: “Interrogatio: Dic: de quantos angelos scimus nomina? R.: Trium angelorum nomina scimus et legimus. Id est Gabriel, ... Michahel ... Raphahel. ... Amplius quicumque legerit, aposit[i]a esse non dubitatur. Solent aliqui[t] dicere Heuel, Salathiel, Raguel, sed haec <non> nomina angelorum sed demoniorum sunt” (ed. G. MacGinty, *Pauca problemsmata de enigmatibus ex tomis canonicis: Praefatio et libri de Pentateucho Moysi*, CCM 173, 219).

## S.

- K: Savior, that is, Christ saved the world through his Cross.  
 D: Savior, that is, Christ Jesus, who saved the world through his Cross.  
 AM: Savior, Jesus.

*Saluator* was the standard Latin translation of the name Jesus, based on Matt. 1:21, as Jerome explained: “Aethimologiam ergo nominis eius euangelista signauit dicens: *Vocabis nomen eius: Saluator, quia ipse saluum faciet populum suum*” (*Commentariorum in Matheum libri ix*, CCL 77, 11). See commentary on N above.

The statement that Christ “saved the world through his cross” is less commonplace than one might expect, and it is striking that the close verbal parallels are all poetic (for *salvavit mundum*, see Otto Schumann, *Lateinisches Hexameter-Lexikon: Dichterisches Formelgut von Ennius bis zum Archipoeta*, Teil 5: S. –Z., MGH, Hilfsmittel 4–5 [Munich, 1982], 22). The closest parallels are in Hiberno-Latin hymns. Compare the hymn *Sancte uenite*: “Mundum salvavit / Per crucem et sanguinem” (*The Bangor Antiphony*, ed. F. E. Warren, 2 vols., HBS 9–10 [London, 1895], 2:10) and *In te Christe credentium*: “Christus crucem ascenderat / Christus mundum saluauerat” (*The Irish Liber Hymnorum*, ed. J. H. Bernard and R. Atkinson, 2 vols., HBS 13–14 [London, 1898], 1:85; in this hymn the pluperfect is used for the perfect). Compare also verses of uncertain authorship quoted by both Aldhelm and Cruindmel in their treatises on metrics:

Ponitur loco primo dactilus ita: / In cruce confixus mundum Christus salvavit, / loco secundo ita: / Christus filius aeterni salvavit mundum. (Aldhelm, *De metris et enigmatibus ac pedum regulis*, ed. R. Ehwald, MGH Auct. ant. 15 [Berlin, 1919], 84)

In uersu tredecim syllabarum species quot sunt? Quinque, quippe in eo dactylus inter spondeos admissus quinque locis inuertitur. Primo loco in hoc uersu

in cruce confixus mundum Christus saluauit,

loco secundo ita

Christus filius aeterni saluauit mundum. (*Cruindmeli sive Fulcharii Ars metrica*, ed. J. Heumer [Vienna, 1883], 31)

Compare also Hrabanus Maurus, “Qui cruce saluauit mundum, dans regna beatis.” (*In honorem sanctae crucis* I.B3, l. 35; CCM 100, 44)

## T.

K: Took hold of great courage, that is, Christ took up the world with him to the heavens.

D: Took hold of great courage, Christ who carried the world through his Cross.

AM: Took hold of courage, that is, Christ, who carried man to heaven.

The phrase *fortitudinem magnam* may echo Ex. 33:11, in which Moses refers to God as the one who led his people out of Egypt with great power (*in fortitudine magna* = 2 Kgs. 17:36). The gloss explicates the lemma in relation to the Ascension, when Christ carried humanity into heaven in his own human body (singular *hominem* refers to Christ’s own human body as well as to human nature collectively). For convenient surveys of Ascension theology with special reference to Anglo-Saxon texts, see Brian Ó Broin, “Rex Christus Ascendens: The Christological Cult of the Ascension in Anglo-Saxon England” (Ph.D. diss., University of Illinois, 2002); Johanna Kramer, *Between Heaven and Earth: Liminality and the Ascension of Christ in Anglo-Saxon Literature* (Manchester, 2014). Thus Leo

the Great characterized the feast of the Ascension as “that day on which our poor human nature was carried up in Christ above all the hosts of heaven, above all the ranks of angels, beyond the highest heavenly powers to the very throne of God the Father” (*Tractatus* 74.1, CCL 138A, 455–56; trans. Thomas C. Oden and Christopher A. Hall, *Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture: Mark* [Downers Grove, IL, 1995], 254). As Ambrose stated, “non unus homo, sed totus in omnium redemptore mundus intrabat” (*De fide* 4.1.7, CSEL 78, 160; cit. Kramer, *Between Heaven and Earth*, 43). The doctrine *totus Christus* asserted that human believers as “members” of Christ could not be separated from him, as Augustine assured his congregation (“sic et nos cum illo ibi iam sumus, quamvis nondum in corpore nostro sit quod promittitur nobis”; *Sermo* 263 [= *Sermo Mai* 98], PLS 2, 494; cit. Kramer, *Between Heaven and Earth*, 51). D’s reference to the Cross (which may reflect conflation with a gloss to the letter X like that preserved in P, where the wording is very similar) shifts the soteriological significance of the lemma from the Ascension to the Crucifixion.

#### V.

- K: *Uncti sunt* (they were anointed) with holy oil, that is, with divine mercy.  
 D: *Unctus* (anointed), that is, with holy oil, that is, with divine mer[cy].  
 AM: *Uncti sunt* (anointed were) the apostles with holy oil by the Holy Spirit, with divine mercy.

The gloss is based on a wordplay on Greek ἔλεος, “mercy,” and ἐλαίον, “olive tree.” The patristic background and diffusion in early-medieval Gaul has been traced very thoroughly by Philippe Bernard in his edition of the *Epistolae de ordine sacrae oblationis et de diversis charismatibus ecclesiae* wrongly attributed to Germanus of Paris (CCM 187, 135–46). In this text *oleum* is identified with Greek *eleo*, glossed as *misericordia* in Latin: “Specialiter autem oleum <eleo> grece, latine autem misericordia dicitur; et per oleum sancti Spiritus gratia designatur” (2.2a, CCM 187, 356). According to Bernard, the earliest attestation of this etymology is in Clement of Alexandria. In Christian-Latin it is found in Gregory the Great, *Homiliae in Euangelia* 1.20.13 (CCL 141, 165) and three early-medieval sources cited by Bernard, to which we can add Albericus of Monte Cassino, *Sermo in S. Scholasticam* (PL 66, 945C [CPPM IB, no. 4207]). The term *oleum misericordiae* occurs more frequently in patristic writers, though not explicitly as an etymology (for example, Ambrose, *In Ps. 118* 14.7, CSEL 62<sup>2</sup>, 301–2; Caesarius of Arles, *Sermo* 128, CCL 103, 527). The “oil of mercy” also features prominently in two widely disseminated apocryphal texts that relate how Seth went to Paradise to find it: the *Vita Latina Adae et Evae* 36:2, 40:1, ed. Jean-Pierre Pettorelli and Jean-Daniel Kaestli, *Corpus Christianorum Series Apocryphorum* 18 (Turnhout, 2012), 368–69, 376–77, and the *Euangelium Nicodemi* 19.1, ed. H. C. Kim, *The Gospel of Nicodemus* (Toronto, 1973), 38. On the motif in these apocryphal narratives, see Esther Casier Quinn, *The Quest of Seth for the Oil of Life*



(Chicago, 1962), esp. 24–27. Later examples of the etymology are noted by Paul Tombeur, “La symbolique de l’huile et du vin dans la tradition occidentale,” in *Olio e vino nell’alto Medioevo*, Settimane di Studio della Fondazione Centro Italiano di Studi sull’Alto Medioevo 54 (Spoleto, 2007), 711–52, at 738–41.

**KD** do not specify who was anointed with holy oil, but *AM* identifies the apostles. In the Bible, the apostles anoint the sick with oil (Mark 6:13, Jas. 5:14) but are not themselves anointed. Since the word “Christ” means “anointed,” all Christians are spiritually anointed, as Jerome explained: “iuxta litteram, omni generi electo, regali et sacerdotali — quod proprie ad christianos refertur, qui uncti sunt oleo spiritali de quo scriptum est: *Vnxit te deus, deus tuus, oleo laetitiae prae participibus tuis* [Ps. 44:8]” (*Commentarii in Hiezechielem* 13.44, CCL 75, 669). By the same token, as the Hiberno-Latin *Liber questionum in euangeliis* explains, “Apostoli susceperunt Christum et ideo oleo Spiritus Sancti uncti sunt” (25.8, CCL 108 F, 390–91).

## X.

- K:** Law expelled (?) the nations from infidelity.  
**P:** *Xps* (Christ) saved the world through the Cross, he took it up with him to heaven.  
**D:** Expelled they were, that is, the nations from their infidelity.  
**AM:** Expelled were the nations from infidelity, returning to belief.

The manuscripts present two very different alternatives for both lemma and gloss. In **DAM** the lemma *expulsi sunt* is based not on the letter x as a grapheme but on its pronunciation, which *AM* specifies as “ecs” (in Roman grammarians it is usually *ex* or *eex* or *ix*; see Arthur Ernes Gordon, *The Letter Names of the Latin Alphabet* [Berkeley, 1973], 2, 20, 30, 43 and *passim*). As Norberg notes (*An Introduction to the Study of Medieval Latin Versification*, 51), X-strophes in abecedarian poems “sometimes begin with words *eXultantes, eXul, eXcelsa, eXtolle*.” **K**’s *Lex* cannot be the lemma for **X** and is presumably a scribal error for the letter name *ex*, unless it is influenced by the association of the Roman numeral **X** with the letter x and the Decalogue, as in the seventh-century *Versus cuiusdam Scotti de alphabeto*: “per me [scil. X] saepe patet numerus de lege sacratus” (CCL 133A, 739). In addition, **K** is lacking the “id est” separating lemma and gloss, and the first part of the gloss repeats part of the gloss from the letter S. The gloss in **KDAM** refers to the conversion of the Gentiles, which was understood both historically and eschatologically. As commonplace as this theme was, the wording here, that the *gentes* were “expelled” or driven from their lack of faith, is idiosyncratic.

The alternative lemma *xps* for *Christus* in **P** (paralleled in **D**’s lemma for the letter T) is the only one that relies on an abbreviation, for which see Ludwig Traube, *Nomina Sacra: Versuch einer Geschichte der christlichen Kürzung*, Quellen und Untersuchungen zur lateinischen Philologie des Mittelalters 2 (Munich, 1903), 156–60;

W. M. Lindsay, *Notae Latinae: An Account of Abbreviation in Latin Mss. of the Early Minuscule Period (c. 700–850)* (Cambridge, 1915), 402–6.

As Ambrose stated, “non unus homo, sed totus in omnium redemptore mundus intrabat [scil. into heaven]” (cited above, commentary on T). Although there is sporadic evidence for a conception of universal salvation in the early-medieval West (see Thomas D. Hill, “Universal Salvation and Its Literary Context in Piers Plowman B.18,” *The Yearbook of Langland Studies* 5 [1991]: 65–76; Derek Pearsall, “The Idea of Universal Salvation in Piers Plowman B and C,” *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 39 [2009]: 257–81), in the **P** gloss that Christ “saved the world through the cross [and] took it up with him to heaven” the word *mundus* should be taken as synecdoche (that is, that part of humanity that Christ’s Crucifixion and Ascension ultimately does save). Indeed the glosses to the following two letters imply an eschatological separation of the saved and the damned.

## Y.

- KD:** End of the world, that is, the Day of Judgment.  
**P:** *Ymen* ([forking] path) of the world, that is, the Day of Judgment.  
**AM:** End of the world, that (is), the Day of Judgment.

This is the only letter in *AW* with a lemma that begins with a different letter (*finis*, in **KDAM**). In early-medieval abecedarian poems, however, a Y-strophe may begin with a word in *f-*, a phenomenon that Norberg (*An Introduction to the Study of Medieval Latin Versification*, 51) suggests may derive from the spelling *fydes*. However, the name of the letter Y actually started with F in certain medieval literary traditions. A twelfth-century English alphabet in London, British Library, Stowe 57, for example, gives the name of the letter Y as “fix,” a name also found in a thirteenth-century Old French alphabet poem (see Fred C. Robinson, “Syntactical Glosses in Latin Manuscripts of Anglo-Saxon Provenance,” *Speculum* 48 [1973]: 443–75, at 450 and 451 n. 32; E. S. Sheldon, “The Origin of the English Names of the Letters of the Alphabet,” *Studies and Notes in Philology and Literature* 1 [1892]: 66–87, at 78–82). The name of the letter in the English alphabet in Stowe 57 is likely a borrowing from Anglo-Norman, and the text is much too late to have had any direct relationship to *AW*, but it is possible that the name “fix” reflects an older tradition by which F was connected to Y by the two letters’ positions at the beginning of the Latin and Greek words for “son,” *filius* and *υἱός* (that is, *YIOΣ*) respectively. The fact that “fix” is a common spelling variant of Old French *filz*, “son,” has been cited in support of this hypothesis, and corroborating evidence may be found in names for the letter Y in several Romance dialects (see Sheldon, “The Origin,” 79–81, where a possible [if distant] connection to the word *finis* is also discussed).

The other alphabet of words in **P**, which overlaps with *AW* only in the last three letters, does preserve a Y-lemma for Y: *ymen*. It is therefore possible that *ymen*, which is untranslated, represents the original reading of *AW*, and was preserved in the lost manuscript of *AW* used by the compiler of **P** for the letters X Y Z. In that case *finis* in the surviving manuscripts of *AW* would be a substitute by a reviser who was baffled by *ymen* but familiar with the convention of using words in f- for Y-strophes in abecedarian poems. Alternatively, *ymen* might be an ingenious substitute for an original *finis* by a reviser who was not familiar with these abecedarian or letter-naming conventions for the letter Y.

At first blush the Greek word *ymen*, meaning “membrane, hymen,” hardly seems relevant to the gloss. There was, however, an alternative meaning (or homonym) attested in glosses on Jerome’s prologue to the book of Genesis. Explicating the word *prologus*, Haymo of Auxerre’s commentary on Genesis gives the following sequence of equivalences: “*Praefatio* Latine, *prologus* vel *prooemium* Graece dicitur, id est *breuiatio*. *Ymen* Graece, Latine dicitur *via*” (PL 131, 51C). The sequence is closely paralleled in a set of glosses on the biblical prologues of Jerome that seems to depend on Haymo: “Prologus, id est *prelocutio* sive *prefatio*. ... *Idem* et *proemium* sive *proimium*. *Imen* siquidem dicunt *Greci* *viam*. *Pro*, *ponitur* ante, vel *pro*, *pre* ... *Unde* dicitur *proemium* sive *proimium*, *previatio*” (John J. Contreni, “The Biblical Glosses of Haimo of Auxerre and John Scottus Eriugena,” *Speculum* 51 [1976]: 411–34, at 417). According to Contreni, Haymo’s biblical glosses derive largely from the “Leiden Family” of glosses, which ultimately reflect the exegesis of the School of Canterbury under Theodore (see Michael Lapidge, “The School of Theodore and Hadrian,” *Anglo-Saxon England* 15 [1986]: 45–72; repr. with additional notes in Lapidge, *Anglo-Latin Literature 600–899* [London and Rio Grande, 1996], 141–69 and 502–3; and J. D. Pfeifer, “Early Anglo-Saxon Glossaries and the School of Canterbury,” *Anglo-Saxon England* 16 [1987]: 17–44). However, while Haymo’s commentary preserves the word *ymen*, the gloss attributed to Haymo which Contreni cites as a parallel for the gloss on the prologues of Jerome does not. There seems to be no such Greek word (the Greek word for “way” being *ὁδός*).

The combination of the letter Y with a lemma meaning “way” implicitly alludes to the tradition of the symbolic “Pythagorean Y,” representing the two ways of virtue and vice open to each human being. Ausonius’s alphabet poem “De litteris monosyllabis Graecis et Latinis” states for the letter Y, “Pythagorae bivium ramis pateo ambiguis” (ed. R. Peiper, *Decimi Magni Ausonii Burdigalensis opuscula* [Leipzig, 1886], 166). The *homo in bivio* tradition, which goes back as far as Hesiod, was readily assimilated by Christian writers to the spiritual tradition of the “two ways” and to the opposition between the broad and narrow gates and ways of Matt. 7:13–14. While Lactantius (*Divinae Institutiones* 6.3.1–6, CSEL 19, 485–87) contrasted the Pythagorean and Christian formulations of the two

ways precisely in terms of the eschatological focus of the latter, most Christian writers simply conflated them. See Carlo Pascal, “Il bivio della vita e la «Littera Pythagoræ»,” in *Miscellanea Ceriani: Raccolta di Scritti originali per onorare la memoria di Mr. Antonio Maria Ceriani* (Milan, 1910), 57–67; Wolfgang Harms, *Homo Viator in Bivio: Studien zur Bildlichkeit des Weges* (Munich, 1970), 158–86; Margherita Guarducci, “Dal gioco letterale alla crittografia mistica,” in eadem, *Scritti scelti sulla religione Greca e Romana e sul Cristianesimo* (Leiden, 1983), 407–44. According to Isidore of Seville, “Y litteram Pythagoras Samius ad exemplum vitae humanae primus formavit; virgula subterior primam aetatem significat, incertam quippe et quae adhuc se nec vitiis nec virtutibus dedit. Bivium autem, quod superest, ab adolescentia incipit: cuius dextra pars ardua est sed ad beatam vitam tendens: sinistra facilior sed ad labem interitumque deducens” (*Etymologiae* 1.3.7, ed. Lindsay). **P** stresses the Christian eschatological dimension of the Pythagorean Y by equating it with the end of the world and Judgment Day, when the eternal consequences of the temporal choice of “ways” are realized.

## Z.

- K/AM: *Zizania* (tares) among the wheat, that is, sinners in the middle of the just.
- P/D: *Zizania* (tares) in the middle of the wheat, they are (that is) sinners in the middle of the just.

The lemma derives from the Parable of the Wheat and Tares in Matt. 13:24–30 and 36–43. An enemy oversows tares in the middle of a man’s wheat (“superseminavit zizania in medio tritici”). The man tells his servants to wait until the harvest and then tells the reapers, “colligite primum zizania et alligate ea fasciculos ad comburendum triticum autem congregare in horreum meum.” The gloss in *AW* reflects Jesus’s own explanation in verses 37–43: the good seed (and implicitly the wheat that grows from it) are the *fili regni* sown by the *filius hominis*; the tares are the *fili nequam* sown by the devil. The harvest is the *consummatio saeculi*, the reapers the *angeli* who separate *eos qui faciunt iniquitatem* and cast them into the fiery furnace. (Aldred elsewhere shows his understanding of the traditional exegesis by glossing Matt. 13:39 *messem* as “hrīpe .i. to domes dæg”; see W. J. P. Boyd, *Aldred’s Marginalia: Explanatory Comments on the Lindisfarne Gospels* [Exeter, 1975], 34 with Boyd’s commentary). In the gloss to *AW* the phrase *in medio* echoes the phrasing of the lemma but may also be influenced by Jesus’s explanation of the Parable of the Fishing Net in the same chapter of Matthew (13:49): “et separabunt malos de medio iustorum.” The phrase *de medio iustorum* is used with reference to the tares and wheat by, for example, Augustine: “messores autem angeli sunt: separant malos de medio iustorum, sicut zizania a tritico; frumentum recondent in horreo, paleam autem comburent igni inextinguibili” (*Enarrationes in Psalmos* 128.7, CCL 40, 1885). Patristic and

medieval commentary often merely paraphrases Jesus's own explanation of the parable, though alternatives are sometimes offered (notably the equation of the tares with heresy rather than or in addition to Jesus's equation with "wicked sons"). See Stephen J. Wailes, *Medieval Allegories of Jesus' Parables* (Berkeley, 1987), 103–8.

*University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign and University of Toronto*

**Keywords:** Aldred, *The Alphabet of Words*, Durham Collectar, grammar, literacy, and education, parenetic alphabets

APPENDIX: ANOTHER PARENETIC ALPHABET IN PARIS, BNF, LAT. 2796, PT. 1  
(FOLS. 44–107), FOL. 69R.

The manuscript was written possibly in northern France in the early ninth century (813 × 815). See Bischoff, *Katalog*, 3:82 (no. 4232). Bischoff (*Manuscripts and Libraries in the Age of Charlemagne*, trans. Gorman, 108 n. 75) characterizes the manuscript as "an interesting assortment of texts, predominantly computistical; within longer exegetical and legal texts, grammatical, liturgical, and medical material was also included." Bischoff refers to Deslisle's view that it was a schoolbook with notes by a student named Salahardus but considers it more likely to be a teacher's book.

*Catalogue:* *Catalogue général des manuscrits latins de la Bibliothèque Nationale*, 7 vols. (Paris 1939–88), 3:90–95; Charles Samaran and Robert Marichal, *Catalogue des manuscrits en écriture latine portant des indications de date, de lieu ou de copiste*, 7 vols. (Paris 1959–84), 2:129.

*Literature:* Hubert Mordek, *Bibliotheca capitularium regum Francorum manuscripta: Überlieferung und Traditionszusammenhang der fränkischen Herrscherklasse*, MGH, Hilfsmittel 15 (Munich, 1995), 430–32; Arno Borst, *Schriften zur Komputistik im Frankenreich von 721 bis 818*, 3 vols., MGH, Quellen zur Geistesgeschichte des Mittelalters 21 (Hanover, 2006), 1:266–67; Susan A. Keefe, *Catalogue*, 313; eadem, ed., *Explanationes symboli aevi Carolini*, CCM 254 (Turnhout, 2012), xiv; Raymond Kottje and Thomas A. Ziegler, *Verzeichnis der Handschriften mit den Werken des Hrabanus Maurus*, MGH, Hilfsmittel 27 (Hanover, 2012), 156.

This alternative parenetic alphabet has different glosses than *AW* for the letters A–U, but then the entries for Y–Z overlap with *AW*, while X appears to have been transferred from *AW*'s entries for S and T. The glosses are mainly from the Bible, but some conflate two biblical phrases, and others conflate a

biblical phrase with a non-biblical one. For the non-biblical glosses there are some partial verbal parallels elsewhere, but we have not been able to identify any specific non-biblical sources. Comments are printed immediately below each gloss.

A. Alfa et .ω. inicium et finis.

Rev. 21:6.

B. Beati et laudabilis.

Cf. the heading to the Anonymous Life of Gregory, “Liber beati et laudabilis uiri Gregorii Papae,” in *The Earliest Life of Gregory the Great*, ed. Bertram Colgrave (Cambridge, 1968), 72; *Anonymi Glosa Psalmorum ex traditione seniorum* 31:1: “Beatus, ut supra diximus, immortalis, laudabilis, gloriosus siue bene uadens,” ed. H. Boese, *Vetus Latina: Aus der Geschichte der lateinischen Bibel* 22 and 25 (Beuron, 1992–94), 1:132.

C. Centies mille legionis.

Compare the *Ars Sergilii* (ed. Marshall, 277): “C aduerbium numeri (fecit), ut (centum) centies.” The reference to “legions” perhaps alludes to the hymn “Te centies mille legionum angeli” attributed to Beatus of Liébana (Dieter Schaller and Ewald Könsgen, *Initia carminum Latinorum saeculo undecimo antiquorum*, Suppl. [Göttingen, 2005], no. 16048; cf. José Castro Sánchez, ed., *Hymnodia hispanica*, CCL 167 [Turnhout, 2010], 211–14, 808).

D. Defensor Deus omnipotens.

Cf. Jth. 6:13 (“Deus caeli defensor eorum est”).

E. Eripe me de manu peccatoris.

Ps. 70:4.

F. Frequenter inuoco trinitatem.

The phrase suggests the “lorica” genre of prayer, which always begins with an invocation of the Trinity. Compare a charm in the Old English *Lacnunga* 31: “inuoco sanctam trinitatem”: ed. Günther Leonhardi, *Bibliothek der angelsächsischen Prosa* 6 (Hamburg, 1905), 133.

G. Gloria Deo in hoc ego sperabo.

Ps. 26:3 (“in hoc ego sperabo”).

H. Honor sanctorum psallite regi nostro.

Ps. 46:7 (“psallite regi nostro”).

I. In uirtute magna et brachio excelso.

Bar. 2:11.

## K. Kataractarum caeli Domino.

Cf. Gen. 7:11 (“cataractae caeli”).

## L. Litterarum lux quę legunt in Domino.

The phrase “litterarum lux” is not uncommon, but we have not found an example in a similar context.

## M. Magis ac magis confitebor Domino.

Ps. 108:30 (“confitebor Domino”).

## N. Nisi solus Dominus sine querella.

Cf. Lk. 19:18 (“nemo bonus nisi solus deus”); Lk. 1:6 and 1 Thess. 2:10 (“sine querella”). The word “Nemo” has perhaps dropped out, as Lukas Dorfbauer suggests to us.

## O. Omnipotens sempiternus &lt;in&gt; secula.

Cf. a private prayer in the Book of Nunnaminster: “Omnipotens sempiternus Deus,” ed. Walter de Gray Birch, *An Ancient Manuscript of the Eighth or Ninth Century* (London, 1889), 61.

## P. † p̄ ī- teñ- † est in omnibus omnia.

The lemma for P is uncertain as we do not know how to resolve the initial abbreviations. Perhaps (as both Martin Camargo and Luigi Munzi suggest to us) *potens* was intended, though the abbreviation as written cannot be so expanded; cf. “potens est [*scil.* Deus] in omnibus,” Martin of Braga, *Sententiae patrum Aegyptiorum* 30, ed. Barlow, 38, and cf. 1 Cor. 15:28 (“ut sit deus omnibus in omnia”). In the lists in Clm 19410 (quoted above, p. 69), the lemmata for P are *pastor* and *pius*.

## Q. Qui regis † uiuet†, uiuamus in gloria.

The first half of this sentence may be a corruption of the liturgical phrase “qui uiuis et regis”; the phrase “uiuamus in gloria” occurs in a hymn (*Analecta hymnica Medii Aevi*, 55 vols. [Leipzig, 1886–1922], 8:171).

## R. Redemptor meus deus in uniuersa terra.

Job 19:25 (“redemptor meus”); Ps. 46:3 (“Magnus deus in uniuersa terra”).

## S. Super me manus dextera tua.

Ps 38:4 (“et descendit super me manus tua”).

T. Tibi honor imperius [*sic*].

1 Tim. 6:16 (“honor et imperium”). Cf. “tibi honor et imperium per cuncta saecula”: Sanctus trope, ed. Gunilla Iversen, *Tropes du Sanctus: Tropes de l'ordinaire de la messe*, Corpus troporum 7 (Stockholm, 1990), 96.

U. Una uoce clamamus a`d` Dominum.

The phrase “una uoce” is very common in the liturgy (Johannes Quasten, *Musik und Gesang in den Kulturen der heidnischen Antike und christlichen Frühzeit* [Münster, 1930], 66–72), and the phrase “clamamus ad Dominum” occurs in Augustine and Cassiodorus. We find no parallel for this combination of the two phrases, but cf. “una uoce clamamus” (D. P. de Puniet, “Formulaire grec de l’Épiphonie dans une traduction latine ancienne,” *Revue bénédictine* 29 [1912]: 29–46, at 33).

X. Xps saluauit mundum per crucem, adsumpsit eum secum ad cælum.

See Commentary on the letters S and T in *AW*.

Y. Ymen seculi, id est dies iudicii.

See Commentary on the letter Y in *AW*.

Z. z Zizania in medio triticum, id sunt peccatores in medio iustorum.

See Commentary on the letter Z in *AW*.