

390. Oxford, Bodleian Library,
Junius 85 and 86 (5196–97)
Homilies, “Visio Pauli”
[Ker 336/[337], Gneuss 642/[643]]

HISTORY: This small pair of manuscripts contain what appears to be a fragmentary OE homiletic compilation in the process of creation. The separation into two volumes is post-medieval: the foliation proceeds continuously, with ff. 1–35 bound in Junius 85, ff. 36–81 bound in Junius 86, and the contents proceed across the volumes without a break.

The handwriting is dated by Ker (*Cat.*, p. 409) to the middle of the 11c. The evidence of linguistic forms suggests a Kentish origin (see Healey 1978: 31–40), although, contra Madan et al. (1937: 983), a Kentish provenance is not hinted at by a scribble on f. 43v, ‘teobald(us) ade de | richebor’, in what Ker considers a hand of 12/13c, since the town of Richborough in Kent was not so named before the 16c (as clarified by Chadbon 1993: 33–34). Healey (1978: 17–18) has suggested a possible provenance of St Augustine’s, Canterbury, but the evidence for this is very tentative, in the form of two possibly relevant references in a 15c Canterbury catalog. The collection bears other clear signs of use but without clues that localize place. Another name occurs on the inside margin of f. 20v, now unreadable within the binding, but read by Ker (*Cat.*, p. 411) as ‘odo de moteroil’, which Chadbon (1993: 34) suggests may be a French place-name. There are further Latin notes, including the incipit for a hymn for St Denis (‘gaude prole grecias gloriēt(ur) gaulia patre dyonisio exultet’ [*sic*]) written upside down in the lower margin of ff. 20v and 21r and in the inner margin of f. 21r, in a hand dated by Ker (*Cat.*, pp. 410–11) to the 12/13c. Probably the same hand occurs in the upper margin of f. 36v, which is now in Junius 86, suggesting that the material was still together in a single manuscript at that time. Other inserted scribbles in Latin occur at ff. 24r, 24v, and 44v.

A misidentifying title, ‘Pars psalt(er)ii g(re)ci’, is written at the head of f. 1r in Junius 85 in a hand considered by Ker as possibly 13c (*Cat.*, p. 411). Healey (1978: 17–18) assumes the material was once bound with a Greek

psalter and identifies this with a possible example from St. Augustine, Canterbury. Presumably influenced by this heading is the different erroneous title ‘Pars Psalterii Saxonici’ at the head of f. 2r in Junius 85 and legible under strike-through at the head of f. 36r at the beginning of Junius 86, both in the same 17c hand (as dated by Ker, *Cat.*, p. 411). The repeated heading demonstrates that the manuscripts were bound separately by this time. Dating the division into two parts is possible on account of Francis Junius’s transcript of part of item 6 preserved in MS Oxford, Bodleian Library, Junius 45, ff. 9r–11v. Here Junius transcribes and partly edits much of the first half of item 6 (Fadda 1), taking material from ff. 29v–35v, i.e. only that part of the homily now in Junius 85. Junius’s transcript ends with a note that the remainder is lacking. The transcript is titled twice, on ff. 9r and 10r, and in both titles Junius records that he is transcribing from a MS lent to him by Isaac Voss. Presumably, Junius borrowed only Junius 85, not the pair of manuscripts. Voss’s pressmark ‘C. 29.’ is recorded on the top right of f. 1r in Junius 85 and ‘F. 29.’ is on the first paper flyleaf of Junius 86. Subsequently the pair of manuscripts passed from Voss to Francis Junius (1591–1677), who was his uncle, whose account of their contents is contained in a sixteen-line note on f. 1r, where he corrects the earlier headings by observing that, rather than a psalter, the collection contains homilies which he accurately characterizes as ‘materiam | tractans pœnitentialem’.

The pair of manuscripts went from Junius to the Bodleian Library, which acquired them in 1678 with Junius’s other manuscripts. They are described in the Summary Catalogue as 5196 and 5197, as is reflected by the stickers ‘S.C. 5196’ and ‘S.C. 5197’ at the top left of each inside cover. The current Bodleian classmarks, ‘MS. Junius 85’ and ‘MS. Junius 86’, are written twice on each inside cover in pencil. ‘MS. | JUNIUS | 86’ is embossed on the spine of the second volume. Later marks include a small pencilled ‘JW’(?) at the foot of f. 81v and ‘[R]H 16.7.55’ and ‘RH. 14.7.55’ at the end of the two volumes, written in black ink at the foot of the inside endboards, presumably reflecting Bodleian inspections.

[Note: At the back of the manuscript Napier (1887) reported seeing a binding leaf that contained parts of chapters 14 and 16 of the OE translation of Boethius, “Consolations of Philosophy”; it was detached from the manuscript about 1886 and was mislaid before the publication of Sedgfield’s *Boethius* in 1899. The leaf is reported as missing in Madan’s catalogue of 1937 and upon recent inquiry at the Bodleian it was reported as still missing. It is no. 337 in Ker, *Cat.* and no. 643 in Gneuss’s *Handlist*. Ker dates it “s. x¹” and Gneuss “prob. s. x¹ or xi med.” Kiernan (2005) uses new technologies to recreate the format of the leaf that Napier published, showing that it had improbably small script, improbably ragged line lengths, and

an excess of subscript letters. The improbabilities lead Kiernan to suggest that the fragment may have been a fake.]

CODICOLOGICAL DESCRIPTION: Junius 85: i + 1 + 34 + i, foliated [i], 1–35, [ii]. Ff. [i] and [ii] are unfoliated paper flyleaves of the date of binding, f. 1 is a 12c parchment flyleaf. Junius 86: ff. ii + 46 + i, foliated [iii-iv], 36–81 [v]. Ff. [iii-iv] and [v] are unfoliated paper flyleaves of date of binding (17c).

This is a strikingly small pair of Old English manuscripts. Leaves in Junius 85 measure approx. 155–160 × 105–120 mm. while those in Junius 86 measure approx. 150–155 × 100 mm. The parchment is of distinctly inferior quality, with a sewn-up rip on f. 16, and many holes, as on ff. 17, 24, 34, and with insufficient parchment to make a full rectangular page at a number of places (e.g. ff. 16, 30, 34, 81, which all lack the lower outer corner). In all of these cases there is no text missing but rather the scribes worked around the failings in the parchment, which were presumably there from the start. The parchment is often discolored and now bears some water damage, e.g. at ff. 25–26. So far as can be seen, leaves are generally arranged HFHF.

At the lower right of each recto is an ink foliation that takes account of the opening parchment flyleaf and begins with '2' on the first OE page. This foliation has frequently been touched up, sometimes over an incorrect or unclear number, as at '4' which is apparently written over another number. This is the foliation followed by Ker and Healey and used throughout here. An earlier foliation on the upper right rectos ignores the opening parchment flyleaf and begins '1' on f. 2r. The numbers 1–3 (on ff. 2r–4r) are in ink in a neat small hand; this foliation is continued very faintly throughout.

The material in this collection was apparently accumulated over time and never standardized into a unified visual look. This is particularly apparent in the varying space of the writing grid and the number of lines per page. Lineation is made throughout by incising with drypoint and there appears to be a double bounding line on both left and right of the writing block whenever this is visible. The number of lines and the space of the writing grid vary considerably throughout and will be described here in detail. To facilitate understanding the assembling of the manuscript, this information will also be related to the quiring (for further details on which see under collation below), to the scribal hands (on which see further below), and to the contents (keyed to the listing below).

Quires I and III (ff. 2, 12–17) contain item 1 (just the ending), item 2a and 2b (with text missing between parts and now adapted to incorporate item 3), and item 4 (partly written over an erasure, fragmentary at end). F.

2 is lineated from the recto for 17 lines creating a written grid of 110 × 87 mm., but the writing does not straightforwardly follow this; the 14 lines of text on f. 2r ignore the lineation but occupy the available grid, while the 20 lines of text on f. 2v follow the lineation at first but break the grid by continuing for a further three lines in the lower margin. Ff. 12–16 are ruled for 19 lines per page within a lineated grid of approx. 135 × 80 mm. F. 17 has two sequences of rulings partly visible: pricking is visible (in the outside margins) for 19 lines, matching ff. 12–16, and this lineation is mostly visible, but this format has been superseded by a slightly more spacious lineation of 17 lines occupying the same written grid, on which the text has been written.

[**Note:** Healey (1978: 8) and Chadbon (1993: 49) consider that Scribe A wrote f. 2v and ff. 12r–16v, although f. 2v is virtually impossible to attribute because it has been so heavily touched up by a reviser. Healey and Ker both see a switch to Scribe B on f. 17rv, apparently for the final lines of item 2b as well as item 4, while Chadbon (1993: 50) is uncertain of the hand. The handwriting is inconsistent enough throughout and obscured enough by the occasional touching-up hand that attribution is uncertain.]

Quire II (ff. 3–11, which was inserted between quires I and III) contains item 3 (fragmentary at beginning, perhaps just for the missing leaf, and fragmentary at end, although now adapted to flow into item 2b); ff. 3–11 are ruled for 16 lines of text per page within a written area of 135 × 85 mm. Text generally follows lineation except that there are remnants of a lower line of text visible on ff. 3r, 4r, 4v, and two such lines at f. 5v (these traces do not now constitute part of the main text as this has been touched up), while at f. 11r the writing misses the lineation, having 15 lines on the page, and f. 11v has 15 lines of writing within the grid of 16 and then a further line inserted at the foot and marked with a decorative insertion mark.

[**Note:** Healey and Chadbon see all the text here as the work of a single scribe, their Scribe B. While it is probably true that it is written by a single scribe, it is difficult to be sure that this is the same hand that writes other parts of the manuscript.]

Quire IV contains item 5: this quire is clearly a distinct unit, different in size from the rest, consisting of ff. 18–24, lacking a final leaf, and containing a single complete text followed by blank space; ff. 18–24 have a written grid for 20 lines (ff. 18r–v, 19r) or 19 lines (ff. 19v, 20r–24r) within a written space of some 145 × 100 mm. The text block was once wider and apparently some outer text was lost from the rectos in an early trimming and so the last letters of each line were erased and written again in the inner margin, apparently by the main hand (as suggested by Ker, *Cat.* 410, see further, Wilcox 2009).

[**Note:** Healey and Chadbon see this as the work of a single scribe, their Scribe B. This indeed seems to be all one scribe, whose work may or may not appear elsewhere in the manuscript.]

Quire V (ff. 25–32) contains the opening of item 6; all ruled for 19 lines with a written grid of approx. 128 × 85 mm., all by Scribe A.

Quire VI (ff. 33–35) contains the continuation of item 6; ff. 33 and 35 are ruled for 19 lines with a written grid of approx. 130 × 85 mm., in harmony with Quire V; f. 34 is ruled for 16 lines, with a written grid of approx. 127 × 78 mm., with 15 lines written on both sides plus an additional half a line entered at the bottom of 34v. There is a clear switch in scribe at f. 35r/4.

Quire VII (in Junius 86, ff. 36–41) contains the continuation and conclusion of item 6 (with no apparent gaps) and opening of item 7; all ruled for 16 lines of text creating a written grid of approx. 122 × 83 mm. On all the pages the text runs over for an extended line at the bottom marked off with a colored decorated line extender (picking up on the idea from f. 34v). Scribes unclear.

Quire VIII (ff. 42–52, which incorporates an added leaf) contains the continuation of item 7 (with no apparent gaps); ff. 42r–48r have 13 lines of ruled text within a written grid of 122 × 80 mm. plus the extended lower line, still with the same line extender, in a somewhat bigger hand; ff. 48v–51r have 14 lines plus extended line of text within the same space, in slightly smaller script; ff. 51v–52v go back to 13 lines plus extended line within the same space, with the shift in lineation within the quire happening both times between recto and verso.

Quire IX (ff. 53–61, which incorporates an added leaf) contains the continuation of item 7 (no apparent gaps until fragmentary at end, lacking a line or two of the conclusion); all have 14 lines of text (clearly ruled) within a written grid of 128 × 83 mm. and no extended line, except for a short line extender at the foot of f. 58r.

[**Note:** Healey and Chadbon think quires VIII and IX are all by Scribe B, but this is unclear. There is probably a shift in hand from f. 41v to f. 42r, but it is not certain that this is the earlier scribe.]

Quire X (ff. 62–71) contains the opening of item 8; ff. 62r–63r have 15 lines (clearly ruled) with a writing area of 132 × 83 mm.; ff. 63v–69v have 14 lines within the same space; ff. 70r–71v have 15 lines with the same space.

Quire XI (ff. 72–81, with two leaves added) contains the continuation and conclusion of item 8; ff. 72r–75r have 15 lines within a written area of 132 × 83 mm.; ff. 75v–77r have 14 lines within the same space; ff. 77v–78v have 15 lines with the same space. Ff. 77r–78v have an extended further part line. F. 79r has the same number of lines (15 plus extender) but in a smaller

area (presumably because the parchment is substantially shorter) i.e. occupying a space of 118 × 85 mm. without the extender line. Ff. 79v–80v have 15 lines but no extender, within a written grid 122 × 80 mm. Lineation is not visible on all of f. 81, which contains the last 11 lines of text on the recto and ends with blank space.

[Note: Healey sees this all as her Scribe B. Ff. 62r–81r is indeed probably the work of a single scribe, who may be the same as the scribe of ff. 42r–61v.]

The different scribes in these manuscripts are difficult to distinguish, in part because the ink has often faded and in many places been touched up, in part because of the different aspect of the hand as the size of the written grid varies, and in part because there seems to be a high toleration for varying appearance even in passages perhaps written by a single scribe. Ker (*Cat.*, 411) observes that “The writing varies in appearance,” but goes on to suggest that ff. 2v, 12r–16v, 25r–34r/4 appear to be in a different hand from the rest. Healey (1978: 6–8) suggests that there appear to be two distinct major scribes, while a third hand has retouched in black ink throughout, and especially at f. 2rv. Chadbon (1993: 48) also sees two distinct major hands, with a third hand providing some material in the middle.

Healey suggests that Scribe A wrote ff. 2v/1–20, 12r/1–16v/19, 25r/1–35r/4, plus, perhaps, the additions on ff. 3r–6r, while Scribe B wrote ff. 17r/1–17v/17, 3r/1–11v/16, 18r/1–24r/12, 42r/1–81r/11, although, she concedes, it is possible that passages here ascribed to Scribe B could be the work of more than one scribe. Healey declines to identify the scribe for f. 2r, f. 35r/4–35v/19 or for ff. 36r/1–41v/17, which probably represent the work of one or two further scribes. Chadbon (1993: 42–50) suggests that Scribe A wrote ff. 2v/1–20, 12r/1–16v/19, 25r/1–33v, that Scribe B wrote ff. 3r/1–11v/16, 18r/1–24r/12, 42r/1–81r/11, and probably f. 34rv. He suggests that a further hand, Scribe C, wrote ff. 35r/4–41v/17. He sees f. 2r as possibly Hand B, the reviser of ff. 2v–6r as probably a different hand again, and uncertainty about the hand of f. 17r/5–17v/17 (i.e. item 4). Healey’s suggestion that some of what she attributes to Scribe B may be written by more scribes seems correct. The number and stint of the scribes matters for understanding how this manuscript was put together. The shift between scribes in item 2 within a quire between ff. 16v and 17r suggests that Scribe B took over the work of Scribe A in some kind of collaboration. The shift in scribes within items 6 and 7 indicates that multiple scribes worked on a single item, and, in the case of item 6, this apparently involved a multiplicity of scribes. Scribe A’s corrections and additions to item 3 on ff. 3r–6r (if these are by Scribe A) shows that scribe taking on an editorial and organizing role, which may also be implied by his absorption of Quire II, already written by Scribe B, within

his Quire I and III. Scribe B was actively involved in reorganizing material for the present form of the collection if he was the one who corrected item 5 in Quire IV by inserting a few syllables at the front of each line on every recto to compensate for the cropping. If Healey's identifications are correct, then Scribe B also wrote out the whole second half of the collection, from f. 42r onwards, although this might be the work of another scribe.

Corrections and touchings-up are in evidence throughout the manuscripts, generally by a distinct hand using a blacker ink. Ogawa (1994) shows that this retouching is not always reliable and suggests that it is the work of a 17c corrector associated with Junius. Ogawa's case for dating this touching-up is not entirely convincing, resting on the presence of mirror writing on part of the paper flyleaf, f. [iii], at the front of Junius 86. Ogawa suggests that this mirror impression of text from part of f. 36r came about somehow when the paper flyleaf was inserted at the time of the 17c binding (although there is now an intervening further paper flyleaf) and that the impression was made because the page was freshly retouched at this time. There are, though, other reasons which could have created the small patch of mirror impression writing, such as moisture on this part of the page, which might better account for why only one small part of the page received the impression. In such a case, the retouching could have occurred any time from the first organization of the collection in the 11c up until the 17c. It was present by the time of Wanley's description (1705: 44–45), as demonstrated by Ogawa (1994: 9).

There is some use of display capitals and some coloring of initials and the notae but, like most aspects of this collection, there is little uniformity. The only distinct rubric is for item 5 on f. 18r/1, which was probably written in red in rustic capitals, although the colored ink has now faded and been redrawn closely by the retoucher (?) in black. The opening initial is enlarged, slightly decorated, and written in red which has now largely faded. The first line is written in majuscules (for the most part) in regular black ink and then the text resumes in the normal manner. This is a standard opening decorative format common to many 11c Ælfric manuscripts. The opening of items 7 and 8 are somewhat similar in decorative effect, albeit lacking a rubric and with less use of capitals. Each of these items begins at the top of a new page with an enlarged and slightly decorated red-colored initial ('G' at f. 40v/1, 'H' at f. 62r/1) followed by a brief use of majuscules. All three of these openings are considered by Healey to be the work of a single hand, her Scribe B. The opening of items 2 and 6, on f. 2v and f. 25r, are the work of a different scribe (Healey's Scribe A) and have a somewhat different visual effect. Each item again starts at the top of a page with an enlarged and

decorated initial (here an M and a G) which are more elaborately decorated than the opening of items 5, 7, and 8 and are in a colored ink that has faded to black. The text then continues in a regular script without majuscules. Items 1 and 3 both lack their openings, while item 4 is not presented with any decorative flourish, but simply continues from item 2b.

Other decoration throughout the manuscript consists in providing capital letters and tironian notes with a decorative touch of color. Such decoration has faded to oblivion if it was once present on f. 2r-v, but was apparently lacking from ff. 3r-11v (where a few capitals are somewhat enlarged), is present in black on ff. 12r-17v, present in faded red or black on ff. 18r-24r, present in black or occasionally red on ff. 25r-70r, and appears to have been lacking from ff. 70v-81r. It is hard to be certain whether the variations here may result from different amounts of fading. It is striking that there is some consistency here across the work of multiple scribes, as in ff. 25r-70r, along with some variation during the stint of a single scribe, as between f. 70r and 70v.

An interesting decorative touch comes with the extended lines. On numerous occasions the scribes add an additional half a line or so beneath the standard written grid and in such cases there are decorative brackets in ink marking the added line. F. 11v, which has the first such line extender, has a fairly elaborate abstract example in black ink (this is within the stint that Healey attributes to Scribe A). The examples on ff. 18-24 are not the same since these result from the main scribe's providing material that has gone missing from right-hand sides of the rectos presumably due to cropping. The next line extender, on f. 34v, is an elaborate drawing of a bird sprouting decorative leaves from its mouth drawn in black ink (within another stint attributed by Healey to Scribe A). There is then a consistent series of such line extenders throughout ff. 36r-52v where the decorative squiggly pair of black lines have been filled in with red (thus providing a consistent decorative flourish within pages apparently written by multiple scribes, delimited to quires VI and VII). F. 77r provides another example in the form of a bird, clearly matching the one at f. 34v, if slightly less elaborate, even though the writing here is attributed by Healey to Scribe B. A double squiggly line, like those on ff. 36r-52v but without the red color, recurs at ff. 77v-79r (in the stint of Scribe B, according to Healey). The pattern of the line extenders is not consistent, then, like so much else, but it seems to provide a little flourish of decorative interest across various components of the collection.

All in all, the visual pattern of these two manuscripts presents a distinct experience for different sections, often inconsistently miscellaneous (as in the number of lines per page), but with some features that recur across the

whole collection, as with the recurring line extender brackets and, to a contestable extent, the recurring scribes. Healey (1978: 16) suggests that the collection “represents the formative stages” of an anthology: “Its value lies precisely in its unfinished state; since the editorial touch is conspicuously apparent, it lays bare the process by which finished collections, like the Vercelli Book, could evolve.”

Perhaps the most conspicuous sign of such a process of accumulation lies in the evidence that the manuscripts are made up from a distinct series of booklets, as suggested by Robinson (1978). This is most clear-cut for Quire IV (ff. 18–24), which contains a single homily by Ælfric (item 5) that starts with a rubric at the top of the recto of the first folio of the quire and ends with considerable blank space on the last surviving folio, with the likelihood that the following folio was excised because it was blank. The quire has significantly different written dimensions from other material in the manuscripts, as is particularly obvious in the additional width of the writing. Apparently this booklet was cropped down at such an early stage that the original scribe was able to systematically recopy text lost to the cropping from the right-hand side of the rectos in the inner margin. Such early cropping hints that the unit had but a brief independent existence, although a little added discoloration on the outer leaves, ff. 18r and 24v, and damage from fluids not seen for the most part inside this quire, may result from early circulation unbound. The only thing connecting the creation of this quire with the collection in which it now resides is the possible recurrence of this scribe’s handwriting elsewhere in the collection. Otherwise this quire is connected only insofar as the contents, a sermon on Lent, fit well with the thematics of the collection and perhaps with its temporal sequence of Lenten homilies.

The first three quires (ff. 2–17) form a unit in a different way and the evidence is more equivocal. The texts here both begin and end imperfectly, demonstrating that this was once part of a larger sequence. An earlier arrangement has been visibly disrupted with the placing of Quire II and its text of the *Visio Sancti Pauli* (item 3) within the context of Quires I and III and the homily on the Address of the Soul to the Body (item 2). The fragmentary nature of item 1 shows that a substantial homily (Napier 49/Blickling 9/Vercelli 10) at the least, and perhaps more, has been lost from the beginning of this sequence. Nevertheless, f. 2 has been heavily soiled, with the text on both f. 2r and 2v only legible because it has been retouched by a later scribe, with the suggestion that this leaf served as the outside wrapper for a unit that at some stage circulated independently without a protecting binding. The fragmentary end of item 1 was perhaps simply sacrificed at

this stage to serve as the outer wrapper until it was restored by the attention of the retoucher. At the end of the sequence, item 4 is distinct in content as a sequence of charms within a collection otherwise full of homilies and, as such, it may have been added to originally blank space at what would be the end of the sequence. Since the charms end in mid-flow, there is clearly now some loss here and the codicological evidence hints at the loss of just one more folio: while Quire III has now been significantly disrupted, one additional lost leaf at the beginning and end would make this a quire of eight gathered around the stitching between ff. 14 and 15. The fact that these charms were apparently copied over an erased text on f. 17v is more puzzling but might indicate that at this end, too, an item was sacrificed on a page (or on this page and the subsequent lost folio?) that was subsequently reused. Healey considers that her Scribe B wrote both item 3 on the inserted Quire II and item 4, the charms at the end of Quire III, and takes over for the end of item 2 on Quire III otherwise written by Scribe A. This would suggest that the reorganization of material here was the work of Scribe B, who absorbed the *Visio Sancti Pauli* and added the charms. This independent unit is associated with the rest of the collection in view of the recurrence of both scribes, the approximately similar size (although notice the variation in number of lines and written space), and also the somewhat but not very similar line extender on f. 11v and on f. 34v and f. 77r (although notice that the one at f. 11v is fairly different). In other words, while this unit probably had a distinct life as a separate unit, it may also have provided the aesthetic kernel for the collection as it now stands.

Quires V–IX, ff. 25–61, appear to constitute another distinct unit, although here the pattern, which was disrupted by the subsequent division into two books, includes some palaeographical and codicological oddities. The opening of Quire V starts a new homily (item 6 on f. 25r/1) and the contents appear to proceed continuously without any gaps to the end of Quire IX, which ends just shy of the end of a homily (item 7 on f. 61v/14). At least three different hands and perhaps more are in evidence within this sequence, including in Healey's analysis both Scribe A and Scribe B, with no obvious rationale for the alternations. The make-up of Quire VI is quite odd as a gathering of just three leaves incorporating multiple changes in scribes. This is the point where the early modern binder divided the collection, and the short quire would make most sense if material were here missing, but instead item 6 appears to proceed without gaps. After that both Quires VIII and IX incorporate an added leaf. This would make most sense if the organizing scribe wanted to finish copying item 7 at the end of Quire IX. This constraint on copying space might also explain the inclusion of an

added line at f. 34v, throughout Quires VII and VIII (ff. 36–52), and on f. 58r. Paradoxically, though, although the completion of item 7 was almost certainly within grasp with the addition of just a line or two at f. 61v, the scribe did not finally do so but allowed the last lines to spill over onto a further page or pages now missing (a single folio or a complete quire?). If, then, these quires did circulate as a separate unit, they did so with at least a further leaf and possibly with further items at the end. Signs of wear bear out such a conclusion. At the opening, f. 25r has sustained water damage that stains forward through much of the quire, although it does not have the soiled look of f. 2 and so does not appear to have served as the wrapper for a collection that circulated widely. At the close, f. 61v is as clean as any other page and presumably never circulated as an outside leaf. These quires, then, may have constituted a distinct unit with a lost (and now unrecoverable) conclusion.

Finally, Quires X and XI (ff. 62–81) constitute a distinctive unit to the extent that they completely contain a single homily (item 8 starts on f. 62r/1 and ends at f. 81r/11) and end with considerable blank space (f. 81r/12–15 and all of f. 81v but for later additions). Quire XI has two added leaves, perhaps inserted to ensure that the homily could be completed within the quire. F. 81v is discolored and shiny in a manner that might suggest it circulated as an outer wrapper. The similarities of format and the recurrence of the scribe suggest, on the other hand, that this unit was created specifically to be associated with Quires IV–VIII and perhaps with the book as a whole.

Each of the now separate manuscripts is contained in a plain 17c binding of a similar style, with the sewing anchors visible through the boards, coated in a thin and dirty cream-color leather. The binding of Junius 85 is slightly different in dimensions from Junius 86: Junius 85 has outer boards of 170 × 113 mm., Junius 86 of 162 × 108 mm., and Junius 85 is also a somewhat thinner book (Junius 85 measures 18 mm. between outer boards, Junius 86 measures up to 28 mm., although its covers are now considerably warped). Junius 85 has three sewing bands visible in the spine, which is showing signs of cracking; Junius 86 has no such raised bands and the spine looks to have been more recently repaired: it alone has the classmark printed on the spine. Junius 85 has the remains of ‘*α*’ written in ink on the cover, while Junius 86 has ‘*β*.’ clearly visible at the equivalent place.

In addition to paper flyleaves from the time of the binding, there is now one medieval parchment flyleaf and was once another. F. 1 of Junius 85 is a fragment from a 12c missal with text visible sideways on the recto containing readings for the masses of Kings and Abbots (according to Hea-

ley 1978: 9). A hint of binding parchment with further text is visible in a narrow strip at the top left of the inside backboard of Junius 85 beneath the paper pastedown and at the mid right of the inside frontboard of Junius 86 beneath the paper pastedown there. The middle right-hand side of the first paper flyleaf of Junius 86 (i. e. f. [iii] verso) contains the inverse impression of writing from f. 36r, which it must once have lain beside without the presence of the next paper flyleaf (f. [iv]) which contains no such impression.

COLLATION: Junius 85 (ff. 2–35) I¹ (f. 2, displaced singleton, original form of quire not now knowable); II¹⁰ wants 1 before f. 3 (ff. 3–11); III⁶ 1, 2, 5, 6 are singletons (ff. 12–17); IV⁸ wants leaf 8, probably blank, after f. 24 (ff. 18–24); V⁸ (ff. 25–32); VI³ 2 is a singleton, 1 and 3 (ff. 33 and 35) may be conjoint or may be singletons || Junius 86 (ff. 36–81) VII⁶ (ff. 36–41); VIII¹⁰⁺¹ 7 (f. 48) added half-sheet (ff. 42–52); IX⁸⁺¹ 8 (f. 60) added half sheet, 2 and 7 singletons (ff. 53–61); X¹⁰ (ff. 62–71); XI¹⁰ 6 and 10 singletons (ff. 72–81).

CONTENTS:

- a. f. 1rv 12c flyleaf with later additions [not on film].
- f. 1r 13c(?) heading: ‘Pars psalt(er)ii g(re)ci’; 17c note by Junius on MS contents: ‘Imperitia(m) possessorum inscriptus . . . pagina | decima(m) octava(m)’ [*sic*] (written over an illegible 12c liturgical text, rotated).
- f. 1v continuation of the 12c liturgical text (badly faded and rotated)
1. f. 2r/1–14 OE Homily “Tuesday in Rogationtide”, fragment (HomS 40.1 (Nap 49)) begins imperfectly: ‘song 7 godes lof [. . .] | stan cynincges’; ends ‘soðlice butan | ænde: — AMEN’ (ed. Napier 1883: 265, lines 13-end, no. 49; same as Blickling 9 and Vercelli 10; this version ed. Szarmach 1977).
- [Note: Text partly touched up, partly faded to invisibility. Added 17c title above, ‘Pars Psalterii Saxonici’.]
- 2a. f. 2v/1–20 OE Homily, fragment (HomM 14.1 (Healey)), which continues on f. 12r (no. 2b): ‘Men ða leofestan we `ge`leornodon on | godcundum gewritum . . . he self | [wæs on rode] gefæstnod. his fet 7 his hand[.] genæglu(m) 7 ðurh ð[a ðrowunge he us]’ || (continued on f. 3r, lower margin) ‘[wolde o]f hylle [witum a]ly[s]an’ (ed. Fadda 1977: 163–65, no. 8, lines 1–13, with readings not legible in manuscript supplied in brackets from her edition).
 3. ff. 3r/1–11v/16 OE Vision of St. Paul (HomM 1 (Healey)), begins imperfectly: ‘7 .m(en ða leofestan). hit sægð her on ðisum halgum ge-|write’;

ends imperf. ‘7 hio hin’e’ ðan(ne) gegrétað | ðæs synfullan mannes’ (ed. Healey 1978: 63–73).

[Note: The text on ff. 3–6 has been altered a good deal in a contemporary hand, perhaps that of Scribe A. Healey argues that the fragmentary text is brought into deliberate harmony with the item 2b that follows (see Healey 1978: 4–5).]

2b. ff. 12r/1–17r/5 OE Homily, fragment continued from f. 2v (HomM 14.1 (Healey)): ‘sawl. 7 ðus cweð. gehyrstu héarda | lichoma.’; ends ‘mid his gecorenium | ænglum; a in ealra wurulda wu|ruld; a buton ænde; amen’ (ed. Fadda 1977: 165–73, remainder no. 8, lines 14–127, continued from f. 2v with one or more leaves probably missing between ff. 2 and 12).

4. f. 17r/5–17v/17 Four charms in Latin and OE with OE titles and directions for use, written without break after homily and without marking rubrics:

a. f. 17r/5–17v/5 **wið | wif bearneacenu.** ‘Maria uirgo | peperit . . . 7 bind under hire | swiðran fót’ (ed. Storms 1948: 283, no. 45).

b. f. 17v/5–10 **Wið gestice.** ‘Wrið | cristes mæl. 7 sing ðrywe ðær|an . . . & recessit | dolor’ (ed. Storms 1948: 286, no. 49).

c. f. 17v/10–16 **Wið uncuðum swyle.** ‘sing | on ðine læcefinger . . . Fuge | [. . .] diabolus.’ (ed. Storms 1948: 279, no. 41).

d. f. 17v/16–17 **Wið toðeace.** | ‘S(an)c(tu)s petrus supra mármóream’; ends imperfectly (complete sequence of charms, ed. Cockayne 1864–66: 1: 392–94).

[Note: F. 17v is probably a palimpsest.]

5. ff. 18r/1–24r/12 Ælfric, ÆCHom II, 7: **DOMINICA I IN QUADRAGESIMA.** | ‘MEN ÐA LEOFESTAN EOW EALLUM IS CUÐ. | ðes gærlica ymbryne us gebringð efne. | nu ða clænan tíð længtenlices fæstenes’; ends: ‘.Á. in ealra worulda woruld Amen’ (ed. Godden 1979: 60–66).

[Note: On f. 20v, in lower margin, rotated, in a 12/13c hand is the incipit for a hymn for St. Denis, ‘gaude prole grecias gloriét(ur) gaullia patre dyonisio exultet | gaude prole’, and in the gutter (barely visible on film) is ‘odo de moteroil’ (see Ker, *Cat.*, 410–11). In the bottom margin of f. 21r, upside-down, in 12c hand is a scribble: ‘depromit’ and ‘depromit d(omi)no sede a’ (Ps. 109.1 (?)). F. 24r/13–19 blank except for ‘Legem’ (12c) written on line 20.]

f. 24v blank but for later additions: ‘anim’ (12/13c); ‘D(omi)ne ne in furore tuo arg[.]’

(Ps. 6.2) (12/13c); and the foot of the page, upside-down in a small script ‘decidit’.

6. ff. 25r/1–40r/17 Homily (HomM5 (Willard)): ‘Geherað nu mæn ða leofestan hu ús | godes béc moniegaþ. 7 myndigað to | ures lifes clæn-

nesse 7 licháman | 7 saule.; ends ‘wuniað ðon(ne) mid criste | ðam ðe nu lyfað. 7 ricsað. mid god | fæder. ðam sie wuldor. 7 lof. a in ea|ra. worulda. woruld. a búten áende’ (ed. Fadda 1977: 6–31, no. 1).

7. ff. 40v/1–61v/14 Homily ‘GEHÉRAÐ NU mæn ða léofestan. hwæt | her sægþ on ðissum bócum. be | manna teoðungcéapa’; ends imperfectly: ‘sie lof 7 wuldor. á on ea|ra’ (ed. from the Blickling MS by Morris 1880: 39–53/2, 195, 52/2-end, no. 4 and 16 [in fact all one] but with many verbal differences; the distinct version here partly ed. Willard 1949: 72–78).

[Note: F. 43v has the name ‘teobald(us) ade de | richebor’ added in a 12/13c script in top margin; f. 44v–45r has several scribbles in the top and left margins (12/13c), including ‘decid(it) omnia vi(n)cit amor et nos cedam(us) amori’ (Vergil, Eclogue X.69) in both the top and left margins.]

8. ff. 62r/1–81r/11 Homily (LS17.2 MartinVerc 18) ‘HER we magon hwylcum|hwega wórdum sécgan be | ðære árwyrdan gebýrda. 7 be þam | halgan lífe 7 forðfore ðæs éadi|gan weres. s(an)c(tu)s martinus’; ends: ‘to ðan ús gefúltumige ure | drihten. se leofað. 7 ricsað. a | butan áende. AMEN’ (ed. Scragg 1992: 291–308, no. 18; same as Vercelli 18 and Blickling 17) [F. 81r/12–15 is blank].

- f. 81v blank but for the addition at f. 81v/1–3 of the first words of Psalm 1 in Latin and at f. 81v/4 for scribbles of the alphabet, followed by a repeated ornamental B.

PHOTO NOTES: The paper flyleaves are not photographed; only [i] verso, [ii] recto, [iv] verso, and [v] recto are visible in the film.

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

- Chadbon, John Nicholas. “Oxford, Bodleian Library, MSS Junius 85 and 86: An Edition of a Witness to the Old English Homiletic Tradition.” Unpublished Ph.D diss., University of Leeds, 1993.
- Cockayne, Thomas Oswald, ed. *Leechdoms, Wortcunning and Starcraft of Early England*. 3 vols. London: Longman, 1864–66.
- Fadda, A. M. Luiselli, ed. *Nuove Omelie Anglosassoni della Rinascenza Benedettina*. Filologia Germanica Testi e Studi 1. Florence: Felice le Monnier, 1977.
- Godden, Malcolm, ed. *Ælfric’s Catholic Homilies: The Second Series; Text*. Early English Text Society, s.s. 5. London: Oxford University Press, 1979. [= ÆCHom II]

- Healey, Antonette diPaolo, ed. *The Old English Vision of St. Paul*. Speculum Anniversary Monographs 2. Cambridge, MA: Medieval Academy of America, 1978.
- Kiernan, Kevin. "The Source of the Napier Fragment of Alfred's Boethius." *Digital Medievalist* 1.1 (Spring 2005), <http://www.digitalmedievalist.org/article.cfm?RecID=5>.
- Madan, Falconer, H. H. E. Craster, and N. Denholm-Young. *A Summary Catalogue of Western Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library at Oxford*. Volume 2, part ii. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1937.
- Morris, Richard., ed. *The Blickling Homilies*. Early English Text Society, o.s. 58, 63, 73. London: Oxford University Press, 1874, 1876, 1880; repr. as one volume 1967.
- Napier, Arthur. "Bruchstück einer altenglischen Boetiushandschrift." *Zeitschrift für deutsches Alterthum* 31, n.F. 19 (1887): 52–54
- , *Wulfstan: Sammlung der ihm zugeschriebenen Homilien nebst Untersuchungen über ihre Echtheit*. Berlin: Weidmann, 1883. Repr. with a bibliographical appendix by Klaus Ostheeren, Dublin: Weidmann, 1967.
- Ogawa, Hiroshi. "The Retoucher in MSS Junius 85 and 86." *Notes & Queries* n.s. 41 (1994): 6–10.
- Robinson, P. R. "Self-Contained Units in Composite Manuscripts of the Anglo-Saxon Period." *Anglo-Saxon England* 7 (1978): 231–38. Repr. in *Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts: Basic Readings*, ed. Mary P. Richards, 25–35. New York: Garland, 1994.
- Scragg, D. G., ed. *The Vercelli Homilies and Related Texts*. Early English Text Society, o.s. 300. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992.
- Sedgefield, Walter John, ed. *King Alfred's Old English Version of Boethius' De consolatione philosophiae*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1899.
- Storms, G. *Anglo-Saxon Magic*. The Hague: Nijhoff, 1948.
- Szarmach, Paul E. "MS Junius 85 f. 2r and Napier 49." *English Language Notes* 14 (1977): 241–46.
- Wanley, Humfrey. *Antiquæ literaturæ septentrionalis liber alter. Seu Humphredi Wanleii librorum vett. septentrionalium, . . . catalogus historico-criticus*. Oxford: Sheldonian Theatre, 1705.
- Wilcox, Jonathan. "The Use of Ælfric's Homilies: MSS Oxford, Bodleian Library, Junius 85 and 86 in the Field." In *Companion to Ælfric*, ed. Hugh Magennis and Mary Swan. Leiden: Brill, forthcoming, 2009.

- Willard, Rudolph. "The Address of the Soul to the Body." *PMLA* 50 (1935a): 957-83.
- . "The Blickling-Junius Tithing Homily and Caesarius of Arles." In *Philologica: The Malone Anniversary Studies*, ed. Thomas A. Kirby and Henry Bosley Woolf, 65-78. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1949.
- . *Two Apocrypha in Old English Homilies*. Beiträge zur englischen Philologie 30. Leipzig: Tauchnitz, 1935b.