

COTTON-CORPUS LEGENDARY

ed.: unpublished

MSS

1. Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 9: *ASM* 36.
2. London, BL, Cotton Nero E. i: *ASM* 344.
3. Salisbury, Cathedral Library 221–22: *ASM* 754.5–6.

Lists

none.

OE Vers – Quots/Cits

see below.

Refs

none.

Although entitled a legendary today, in early England the bulky collection of saints' legends known as the "Cotton-Corpus Legendary" would most probably be referred to as a *passionale*. The term *legendarius* is not recorded until the twelfth century, while *legenda* (as in *Legenda aurea*) comes into use in the thirteenth (Niermeyer 1993 p 595). *Passionale* and *passionarium*, on the other hand, denoting a volume of martyrs' *passiones*, are recorded in the ninth century (p 769), when evidence of the widespread compilation and copying of such collections becomes increasingly common (on their development up to the ninth century, see Philippart 1977 pp 27–36). Gneuss (1985 p 126) cites an isolated instance of *martyrologium* being used to mean a collection of full legends rather than brief summaries thereof (as in **BEDE'S MARTYROLOGIUM**). However, actual references to a *passionale* in early England are sparse. As Gneuss points out, *passionalem* occurs as an apparent loan-word in an Old English list of liturgical books that all priests should own (*þa wæpna to þam gastlicum weorce*, the weapons for spiritual work) in two of the three eleventh-century manuscripts of **ÆLFRIC'S LETTER TO WULFSIGE** (*ÆLet* 1.52 [B1.8.1], ed. Fehr 1914 p lxxxvi, 13.6 and textual note). The passage in question is closely paralleled in Ælfric's Latin letter to Wulfstan (p 51.20; see also note g). *Passionale* is used, again as a loan-word in the vernacular, in a Worcester booklist of ca. 1050: *þeo englissce passionale* (ML 9.1 and note), which may refer to a copy of Ælfric's **Lives of Saints** (*ÆLS*) and is apparently the only recorded instance of the word in the vernacular. In a longer and more detailed Old English list of liturgical books at Exeter under Bishop Leofric (1046–72) there is a "martyrlogium" [*sic*] (ML 10.18) but not a *passionale*. At some point in the thirteenth century, probably at Worcester, someone entitled the first volume of the present collection as follows: *Passionale a Kl. Jan. usque ii Kl. Octobris* (Wormald 1999 p 183; my thanks to Robert Upchurch for this reference). Unless otherwise noted, the Latin saints' names cross-referenced in this entry are the subjects of individual sub-entries under **ACTA SANCTORUM**, which should be consulted for further details.

Of the small number of legendaries surviving from before the twelfth century in England (see **ACTA SANCTORUM**, Introduction, in *SASLC* 1.38–40, and Love 1996 pp xiii–xvi), the so-called “Cotton-Corpus Legendary” is the only large, calendrically organized collection. It derives its name from two manuscripts, London, BL, Cotton Nero E. i (saec. xi^{3/4}, Worcester; *ASM* 344) and Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 9 (saec. xi^{3/4}, Worcester; *ASM* 36), which together form one complete legendary (see below for more details). But readers should note that the name “Cotton-Corpus Legendary” (henceforth “Cotton-Corpus”) was coined by Zettel (1979 and 1982) to refer *not* to the specific collection comprised by these two manuscripts, but rather to a lost *archetype*, which he believed to have been imported into England from northern France in the tenth century.

“Cotton-Corpus” is important in the history of hagiography in early medieval England (Lapidge and Love 2001 p 279) and in the textual history of Latin hagiography in general (as demonstrated in the editorial work of Bieler 1952, Delehaye 1923, Esposito 1912–13, Van Beek 1936, and by Levison in several editions of Merovingian and Carolingian lives in *MGH SRM*). Thanks to Zettel, it has also become well known among scholars of early medieval England as a rich resource for studying the hagiographic sources of the Old English legends composed by Ælfric (of whom more below) and his anonymous contemporaries in the late tenth century and later (see, e.g., Hugh Magennis’s entries for **EUSTACHIUS** and **MARIA AEGYPTIACA**; Magennis 2002 pp 30–35; as well as introductions to anonymous Old English translations of saints’ lives in Kramer, Magennis, and Norris 2020 pp vii–xxxix). For valuable introductions to the legendary, see Jackson and Lapidge (1996), as well as Love (1996 pp xiii–xxix) and Hall (2007 pp 247–51), who both situate the collection in the larger context of legendaries in early England.

The Worcester Recension

This London/Cambridge legendary was written at Worcester Cathedral in the third quarter of the eleventh century. The London manuscript, now divided into two separately foliated volumes, contains the legends of saints for January 1 to September 30, while the Cambridge manuscript has legends for October 1 to December 26, plus a supplement of eight legends associated with various feast days, several of which are for December saints. The London manuscript has been described as “a gigantic passion,” presumably for its original tally of 426 folios rather than its folio size of 400 × 270 mm (Gameson 1996 p 221); written space is 325 × 218 mm (Corona 2006 p 140), which is imposing but not unusual (see Philippart 1977 p 37 on the typical dimensions of twelfth-century legendaries).

The complete original set contains legends for approximately 150 saints (a precise count of “items” in the two manuscripts is difficult, owing to the composite nature of some of the individual legends, e.g. **NEREUS ET ACHILLEUS**, and the provision of several separate texts for some saints, e.g., **MARTINUS**). An apparently contemporary table of the contents of the legendary proper fronts the London portion (fol. 55r–v), covering January through October and numbered from I (**MARTINA**) to CVII (**HIERONYMUS**). Similarly, the Cambridge portion opens (p 61) with a contemporary table of the October–December saints, numbered I (**REMIGIUS**) to XLII (**COLUMBA**). The numbers supplied along with the actual texts in the Cotton manuscript match those in the table (more or less!) only up to **PATRICIUS** (number XXXV); thereafter, the text

numbers are intermittent and usually slightly behind or ahead of the equivalent items in the table, mainly because of the various discrepancies between the actual contents of the legendary and those of the table: for example, all the listings for the apostles in the London portion's table are unnumbered, interlinear interpolations, by later hands, although the pertinent texts were copied into the legendary proper; the Cambridge portion, by contrast, has neither texts nor table entries for the apostles of October–December. Another interlinear interpolation in the London portion's table is for the life of Wandrille (**WANDREGISILUS**), but the table lacks any notice for **GUTHLACUS**.

The thirty pages that originally came at the end of the Cambridge manuscript (containing the last part of the text of the Fleury *Adventus* of **BENEDICTUS** and Scholastica, along with the legends of **Silvester** and Columba of Sens) were at some point relocated to the end of the London manuscript, where they now occupy Part 2, fols. 166–80.

Additional items, mainly hagiographic, were incorporated at the beginning and end of each volume from the late eleventh through the thirteenth centuries, and texts throughout both volumes have been corrected and emended by later hands. There is good evidence that the set remained at Worcester until at least the thirteenth century (Jackson and Lapidge 1996 pp 132 and note 8; Wormald 1999 pp 183–84) and probably into the sixteenth century, since annotations by Archbishop Matthew Parker's secretary, John Joscelyn, appear in both (NRK 28). Why the larger of the two codices wound up in the Cotton library while the other stayed in Parker's collection, which passed to Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, is not yet known. The division of the bulky Cotton manuscript into two parts seems to have occurred in the modern era (Jackson and Lapidge 1996 p 132), possibly after the Cotton fire (Levison *MGH SRM* 7.350) or even later, since the early nineteenth-century British Library cataloguer Joseph Planta foliates the manuscript continuously (428 folios) and gives no indication that the manuscript is in two parts (1802 pp 239–41); although his itemized description of the manuscript follows *verbatim* that of Smith (1696 pp 58–60; rpt. 1984), the folio numbers are apparently Planta's own addition, so perhaps he actually handled the codex.

Along with the Smith and Planta lists of the contents of the London manuscript, the Cambridge manuscript's contents are itemized by James (1909–12 1.21–30), who was not aware of the London portion. More accessible and reliable as a guide to the Worcester legendary's original contents, with *BHL* numbers, is that by Jackson and Lapidge (1996 pp 135–44); they also mention some of the later “accretions” (pp 132–33; see also Lapidge and Winterbottom 1991 pp clxxv–clxxvii). Patrick Wormald (1999 pp 182–85), pointing out that the Cotton accretions do not presently occupy their original positions, uses an older set of folio numbers to work out the medieval ordering, according to which the whole collection came to be fronted by a twelfth-century copy of a life of Bede (*BHL* 1069; see also Hardy's *Descriptive Catalogue*, RS 26/1.450–51).

The Salisbury Recension

Apparently deriving from the same exemplar as the Worcester set is another legendary surviving, also in two volumes, as Salisbury, Cathedral Library 221–22 (formerly Oxford, Bodleian Library Fell 4 and 1; saec. xi^{ex.}, Salisbury; *ASM* 754.5–6). It was originally written at Salisbury towards the end of the eleventh century, and only returned there in 1985 after forming part of Bishop Fell’s collection in the Bodleian (*SC* 8689, 8688) for three centuries. For an extended study of these manuscripts, see Proud (2003).

The Salisbury legendary’s two volumes originally were divided January–June and June–December, thus more equally than the Worcester set, but the second volume (Salisbury 222) is now incomplete, lacking the October legends after **RICHARIUS** (October 9, fols. 283v–288v) and all those of November and December, plus the supplementary group mentioned above. That Salisbury 222 originally did have texts for these three months, with the supplement, has been inferred from a table of the October–December legends on fol. 184r, closely matching the equivalent batch in the Worcester legendary. The Salisbury table is dated “contemporary” by Webber (1992 p 157 note 68), but “s. xi/xii” by Ker and Piper (1969–94 4.260), who date the manuscript itself “s. xi ex.” The table begins a new gathering and the imposing life of **REMIGIUS** by **HINCMAR OF RHEIMS** (October 1) follows on fol. 184v. This situation is partly paralleled in the Worcester legendary’s Cambridge volume (see above), where the *Vita Remigii* is again preceded by a table of contents, but this is at the original beginning of the volume and is a complete list of the manuscript’s contents, not, as in Salisbury 222, a partial list abruptly inserted over half-way through the manuscript and possibly sometime after the copying of the preceding texts. It may also be significant that the gathering that ends with fol. 183 of Salisbury 222 is short by three leaves (Ker and Piper 1969–92 4.262).

The fullest description of the Salisbury manuscripts, with a *BHL* number for each item, is in Ker and Piper (1969–92 4.257–62); see also Webber (1992 pp 154–57).

The Worcester and Salisbury recensions of “Cotton-Corpus” have been the subject of brief but important notices by Ker (in addition to NRK 29 and 166, see also Ker 1939–40 pp 82–83; 1949 p 178; 1960 pp 49, 53 and plate 26). His identification of the main scribal hand of Cotton Nero E. i with one in a Worcester charter dated 1058 is confirmed by Gameson (1996 pp 219–22 at 219 and note 83), who also sees the same hand in portions of the “Wulfstan Portiforium” (Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 391, saec. xi^{3/4}, Worcester; *ASM* 104: see **LITURGY, DAILY OFFICE BOOKS**; Pfaff 1995 pp 57–58). Gameson also believes that a second scribe was responsible for the last few texts in Part 1 (fols. 175–208) as well as a large part of Part 2 (fols. 1–155), and that this second hand copied the text of **LANTFRED**’s *Translatio et miracula S. Swithuni* in Part 1 fols 35–53, which is one of the early additions to the Worcester set (Jackson and Lapidge 1996 p 132; see **SWITHUNUS**). The several scribal hands of the Salisbury recension are analyzed by Webber (1992 pp 11–21, 156–57; see also Ker and Piper 1969–92 4.259 and 262).

Gameson (1996 p 221) provides a facsimile of the verso of the first leaf of the London portion of the legendary (Part 1, fol. 55v), showing the elaborately decorated initial R that begins the legend of Martina after the table of contents. He finds the initial’s “general effect ... evocative of

Franco-Saxon initials (northern French of the later ninth century)” but adds that most of its features are also found in Anglo-Saxon work of the early eleventh century (e.g. the *Beatus* initial in the so-called “Ramsey Psalter,” London, BL, Harley 2904, fol. 4r: Gameson 1996 p 202; see also Liturgy, **PSALTERS**, no. 13; Pfaff 1995 p 65), so it does not necessarily constitute evidence of a ninth-century Frankish exemplar.

The first scholar to realize that the London and Cambridge manuscripts originally formed one large legendary was Wilhelm Levison in his 1920 “*Conspectus codicum hagiographicorum*” (*MGH SRM* 7.545–46; see also his very selective lists of the legendary’s contents, pp 573 and 601–02). He also first drew attention to the Salisbury legendary’s close affiliation with that of Worcester. Noting textual similarities between copies of some lives in “Cotton-Corpus” and Cambrai, Bibliothèque Municipale 864 and 865, he suggested that the English got their lives of saints from Flanders and northern France (pp 544–45).

Levison pointed to still other, partial copies of the lost original legendary, less closely affiliated to it than those of Salisbury and Worcester: namely, Oxford, Bodleian Library Bodley 354 (later twelfth century; only perfunctorily described at *SC* 2432), and Hereford, Cathedral Library P. VII. 6 (mid-twelfth century: contents itemized with *BHL* numbers in Mynors and Thomson 1993 pp 110–12; see also Levison’s stemma, *MGH SRM* 7.545). Each of these two later manuscripts, which represent the “Cotton-Corpus” collection at a more advanced stage of development than the eleventh-century copies, unfortunately covers only the legends for the later months of the year—the Oxford manuscript covering more or less exactly the calendar portion lost from the Salisbury set, as pointed out by Love (1996 p xx). Zettel (1979 pp 15–34) makes extensive use of the Oxford manuscript, and of the contents tables in the London, Cambridge, and Salisbury recensions, in his tabular reconstruction of the contents of the putative lost archetype of “Cotton-Corpus.” He also regards the Hereford manuscript, although the latest of the group, as textually the closest witness to Ælfric’s sources (1979 pp 36–39, 160–73, 238–62, and 310–15; and 1982 pp 32–37).

Hagiographic Contents, 1: The “Roman” Passional

A comprehensive historical survey of medieval Latin legends, one that might facilitate a more informed description of “Cotton-Corpus” as a hagiographic compilation, is yet to be written, although Philippart (1977) has provided the essential introduction to the early development of the various forms of legends and their oldest manuscripts, and in various places (e.g., 1981, 1994b) has reviewed continental studies of individual legends, but these largely ignore English collections, and there has been little attempt to collate the selection of texts in “Cotton-Corpus” with those in other contemporary or earlier legends, or with the massive collections, often comprising six or more volumes each, that were compiled in the twelfth century, “il secolo d’oro dei grande leggendari classici” (Philippart 1994b p 635). These include the *Legendarium Flandrense* (dominant in Cambrai, Hainault, Artois, and influential in Compiègne and Liège; see Dolbeau 1981), the *Legendarium Magnum Austriacum* (Southern Bavaria and Austria; see Ó’Riain 2015), and the *Liber de natalitiis* (a Cistercian legendary, important in the Seine region; see Rochais 1975, Dolbeau 1976, Lanéry 2013); on its possible relevance to the study of some of Ælfric’s sources see Morini 1991b and 1993 pp 107–237). The

following brief analysis, therefore, which has been greatly aided by the Bollandists' online database of hagiographic manuscript catalogues (*BHLms*), must be considered merely preliminary and tentative.

Basically, "Cotton-Corpus" is a collection of Roman and Eastern martyrs' *passiones*, augmented with some early Christian confessor saints (mainly bishops), some martyrs of early Christian Gaul, and a substantial number of confessors associated with cult centers mainly in north-eastern France. The large number of Gallic saints would lead one to expect that "Cotton-Corpus" derives ultimately from the so-called "Gallic" type of *passional*, but the core collection out of which "Cotton-Corpus" was most probably developed was a "Roman" *passional*, already available by the ninth century in the Frankish region, where it served as the source for the martyrology of **ADO** (Quentin 1908 pp 648–49). This Roman-type *passional* contained legends of well-known martyrs (such as **AGNES**, **MARCELLUS PAPA**, and **SEBASTIANUS**), mainly from early Christian Rome and Italy, but it also included certain saints of Eastern origin whose cults had become important in the West (e.g., **COSMAS ET DAMIANUS**, **GEORGIUS**, **MENNAS**, **SEBASTENI**, **SERGIUS ET BACCHUS**). According to Philippart (1977 pp 32–33; see also Franklin 2001 2.857–61), it did not originate as anything resembling an "official" or authorized collection, but was more likely compiled by Frankish clerics who procured copies of individual legends, or smaller compilations thereof, from saints' shrines and local communities they visited in Rome and elsewhere in Italy. Philippart (1994b p 635; see also Quentin 1908 pp 645–48 and Siegmund 1949 pp 202–03) identifies four recensions of the Roman *passional*, including Chartres, Bibliothèque Municipale 144 (Bollandists 1889 pp 125–37), and Vatican, Reg. lat. 516 (Poncelet 1910 pp 344–46). The former, dated in the tenth century and, unfortunately, destroyed during World War II, had legends for 90 saints throughout the year, while the ninth-century Vatican *passional* has 36 (only the portion covering January through June is extant), matching the equivalent run in Chartres almost exactly (a more developed recension of this *passional* is represented by Brussels, Bibliothèque des Bollandistes 14, dated 851 × 900 (itemized by Moretus 1905 pp 432–39). Lists of the contents of these manuscripts, with *BHL* numbers, can now be accessed online at *BHLms*. See Lanéry (2010) for an authoritative introduction to the corpus of early Christian martyrs' *passiones* (from Rome and Latium), many of which are included in the Cotton-Corpus *Legendary*.

All but a handful of the saints' legends that occur in the Chartres and Vatican *passionals* are represented among the 150 in "Cotton-Corpus," although not always in exactly the same textual version or in the same calendric order. The larger number of items in "Cotton-Corpus" is due to its inclusion of several additional groups: prominent confessor saints (such as **AMBROSIUS**, **AUGUSTINUS HIPONENSIS**, **BRIGIDA**, **GREGORIUS MAGNUS**, **MARTINUS**, and, in the supplement, **SILVESTER**; see **ACTA SANCTORUM**); further legends translated from Greek (such as, to take only the January feasts, **BASILIUS**, **THEOGENIS**, **POTITUS**, **ASCLAS**, **BABYLAS**, **POLYCARPUS**, and **THYRSUS**); a host of "Gallic" saints (see below); and special items like the legends of the Cross (**IESUS CHRISTUS: EXALTATIO** and **INVENTIO SANCTAE CRUCIS**), the *Apparitio* of the archangel **MICHAEL**, and *exotica* such as the legends of **THEOPHILUS** and **MARIA AEGYPTIACA**. The accompanying chart (Figure 1) displays the July–August portions of the Chartres and London manuscripts, illustrating the relative "ampleur du sanctoral" (Philippart 1977 pp 37 and 39) of "Cotton-Corpus" compared to that of Chartres, but also clearly demonstrating the shared ancestry of the two collections. That "Cotton-Corpus" is not directly

derived from Chartres 144, however, is strongly suggested by the absence from the English legendary of not only Susanna of Rome (August 11), but also of two December saints important from the late ninth century on: Barbara (December 3) and **Nicolaus** (December 6: the bishop of Myra is the subject of various texts *added* to Cotton Nero E. i on different occasions after the copying of the main legendary; there are no Nicolaus texts in the Salisbury recension).

Figure 1: Parallel Lists of July and August Legends in Chartres, Bibliothèque Municipale 144 and London, BL Cotton Nero E. i

<i>BHL</i>	Chartres 144	<i>BHL</i>	BL Cotton Nero E. i
6947	Processus & Martinianus	6947	Processus & Martinianus
	(see below)	2853	Felicitas & 7 filiis
7359	Rufina & Secunda	7359	Rufina & Secunda
2853	Felicitas & 7 filiis		(see above)
6920	Praxedis	6920	Praxedis
		8805	Wandregisilus (Wandrille)
0623	Apollinaris	0623	Apollinaris
	(occurs in June, out of orde	4057	Iacobus Maior
		2316	Dormentium Septem
6437	Pantaleon	6437	Pantaleon
7790	Simplicius & soc.	7790	Simplicius & soc.
2857	Felix II	2857	Felix II
7845	Stephanus I	7845	Stephanus I
2289	Donatus & Hilarianus		(see below)
		1632	Cassianus Aug. (Autun)
0006	Abdon & Sennen	0006	Abdon & Sennen
3962	Hippolytus Romanus.	3962	Hippolytus Romanus.
4753	Laurentius diaconus	4753	Laurentius diaconus
6884	Polychronius	6884	Polychronius
7801	Sixtus II	7801	Sixtus II
	(see above)	2289	Donatus & Hilarianus
		3287	Gaugericus (Géry, Aug. 11)
7937	Susanna Rom. (Aug. 11)		
2729	Euplus diaconus	2729	Euplus diaconus
2740	Eusebius presyter.	2740	Eusebius presbyter
		5355(d)	Assumptio BVM
0125	Agapetus Praeneste	125	Agapetus Praeneste
		7967	Symphorianus Aug. (Autun)
		0750	Audoenus
	(occurs in June, out of orde	1002	Bartholomaeus
3320	Genesius mimus	3304/07	Genesius Arletensis
		0785	Augustinus Hippon.
		7408	Sabina Trecis
7586	Serapia	7586	Serapia
7407	Sabina Romae	7407	Sabina Romae

Hagiographic Contents, 2: The Problem of the Apostles

Another, less visible discrepancy concerns the texts for the apostles. Although the legends of their acts and martyrdoms are distributed throughout the calendar year in the surviving recensions of the Roman passional, the positions of these texts often do not correspond to the apostles' standard feast days: e.g., in the table in Figure 1, notice how texts for both James (July 25) and Bartholomew (August 25) are positioned among the June saints. This may be because, as Philippart explains (1977 pp 87–93), the *passiones apostolorum* are often grouped separately in early medieval hagiographic manuscripts, and often not in calendar order but according to rank; in such manuscripts the texts for other saints following the apostles are seldom in calendric order either (as in Montpellier, Bibliothèque de la Faculté de Médecine 55, ca. 800, likely from Metz or Worms, containing an early version of the **APOSTOLIC HISTORIES**; see the entry under **APOCRYPHA**). A hybrid version of this situation occurs in the ninth-century martyrology of Ado, who does not include the apostles in the martyrology proper (which, as we have seen, is based on the Roman passional and ordered by the calendar), but rather provides a separate *Libellus de festiuitatibus sanctorum apostolorum* as a prelude to the *Martyrologium* (PL 123.182–202; Dubois and Renaud 1984 pp 3–30; see also p xxiii). It seems possible therefore that some early recensions of the Roman Passional did not have texts for the apostles at all, and what we see in Chartres 144 (and its close affiliate Vatican, Reg. lat. 516) represents an early, imperfect attempt to incorporate their legends among those of the other saints. The relevance of all this for us lies in the fact that it is by no means certain that the original “Cotton-Corpus” included legends of the apostles in their calendric places, or even at all (for the apostle legends mentioned below, see the relevant sub-entries in **APOCRYPHA**). As noted in passing by Zettel (1979 p 19 note 48), the contemporary table of contents in the London manuscript of the Worcester recension (Part 1, fol. 55r–v) did not originally make provision for the apostles Philip and James: the entries for late April and early May, for example, are listed as follows:

xli	viii kl. mai Passio Sci georgii mar.
xlii	vii kl. mai. Passio Sci marci eugle.
xliiii	iiii kl. mai. Passio Sci. uitalis m. & scorum geruasii et protasii
xliiii	v. NON. mai. Inuentio Sce crucis
xlv	iiii NON. mai. Eodem die pass. Sci alexandri pp. et al.

Missing between Vitalis (April 28) and the Cross Invention (May 3) are notices for the apostles Philip and James the Less, who share May 1. The texts of their *passiones* were nonetheless copied into the manuscript at the appropriate point, where they form the last texts in a gathering, the final column of which, unusually for this manuscript, has been left blank (fol. 208v). This coincides with the end of the present Part 1 of the manuscript. A later scribe numbered the text for Philip in the margin “xxxxiiii,” which in the original table of contents is assigned to “Inuentio Sanctae Crucis,” the first of four texts lost from the manuscript at this point, and doubtless comprising two gatherings, since the ending of the fourth lost text (**GORDIANUS**) begins the next surviving gathering (Part 2, fol. 1r).

Zettel did not make clear that not only are entries for Philip and James absent from the original table of contents but also entries for Peter and Paul (June 29 and 30), James the Great (July 25), Bartholomew (August 25), and Matthew (September 22), although, again, in each case texts are

provided for them in the manuscript at the appropriate places (Part 2, fols. 32v–40v, 52r–53r, 91v–94r, and 133v–137r). Later hands, however, have inserted interlinear notices for these apostles (but not for James and Philip) in the table, without numbers. Even more puzzling is the fact that in the second (October–December) volume of the Worcester recension (the Cambridge manuscript), the apostles Simon and Jude (October 28), Andrew (November 30), Thomas (December 21) and John the Evangelist (December 27) are all absent from both the table of contents and the text of the legendary proper (also mentioned by Love 1996 p xxi note 45). The contemporary table of contents (CCCC 9, p 61, numbered afresh from I–XLII) offers no clues as to why the apostles are omitted. Zettel (1979 p 32 note 105) notes that provision for these apostles is made in the table of contents in the Salisbury recension (from which, unfortunately, all the texts after early October have been lost), while in the Worcester recension’s Cambridge manuscript a second, intermittent enumeration system, competing with that of the original scribe, supplies numbers in the margins of the text for **SATURNINUS ET SISINNII** “CXXXVIII” and for the immediately adjacent text, **CHRYSANTHUS ET DARIA**, as “CXL,” apparently thereby allowing for the missing text for the apostle Andrew numbered CXXXIX. Zettel takes this to mean that the Worcester scribe has omitted Andrew deliberately (for reasons unknown) and that the second numbering system (which is spasmodic rather than continuous) is a reliable guide to the contents of the original “Cotton-Corpus.” But if this is true, why were similar numerical notations not inserted to signal the manuscript’s omission of the apostles Simon and Jude, Thomas, and John the Evangelist? The available evidence suggests that the immediate exemplar of the Worcester legendary lacked provision for any of the apostles, and that while texts for some of the apostles were made available for insertion during the copying of the January–September legends, there were none available for the October–December portion. The haphazardly added cumulative numbers could merely be the work of later scribes who had a subsequent recension of the legendary, such as Salisbury, to compare with the Cambridge copy. The choice of only Andrew for this cross-indexing treatment is curious, but it may not be coincidental that his is the only apostolic legend (*BHL* 430) added to the collection by even later scribes (Part 1, fols. 53v–54v, incomplete).

Hagiographic Contents, 3: “Gallic” saints and the Provenance of the “Cotton-Corpus Legendary”

While the hagiographic core of “Cotton-Corpus” may be seen to derive ultimately from a passion of the “Roman” type, rather than from one of the “Gallic” type, its “Gallic” content, as mentioned above, is substantial. Zettel (1979 p 9 and 1982 p 18) suggests that the presence in the legendary of a cluster of saints from Flanders and northern France may indicate that “Cotton-Corpus” originated in this region. This view is echoed by Jackson and Lapidge (1996 pp 133–34; also Love 1996 p xix). They enlarge Zettel’s short list of “localizable” saints and point to the diocese of Tournai-Noyon within the archdiocese of Rheims. The group of saints singled out comprises Carolingian lives of primarily historical saints of the later Merovingian era, most of them monastic founders and bishops, and almost exclusively male: **AMANDUS** (Ghent and Saint-Amand), **ANIANUS** (Orléans), **AUDOMARUS** (Thérouanne and Saint-Omer), **AUDOENUS** (Rouen), **BERTINUS** (Saint-Bertin), Columba (Sens), **ELIGIUS** (Noyon and Trier), **FURSEUS** (Lagny and Péronne), **GAUGERICUS** (Cambrai), **HUCBERTUS** (Liège), **IUDOCUS** (Montreuil/Saint-Josse/Winchester) **LAMBERTUS** (Tongres-Maastricht), **LEODEGARIUS** (Autun), **MEDARDUS** (Soissons), **REMIGIUS** (Rheims), **RICHARIUS** (Celles, Saint-Riquier), **TRUDO** (Saint-Trond and

Louvain), **VEDASTUS** (Arras), **WANDREGISILUS** (Fontanelle/Saint-Wandrille), **WINNOCUS** (Saint-Bertin, Wormhoudt).

“Cotton-Corpus,” however, contains legends of many other French saints in discernible categories. One special group is formed by a set of *Martiniana* or texts concerning Martin of Tours (ten in all, including the life of Martin’s successor, Brice: see Martinus and **Briccius**); another group is formed by three prose lives of sixth-century Gallic bishops by **VENANTIUS FORTUNATUS**: **ALBINUS** (Angers), **GERMANUS PARISIENSIS**, and **HILARIUS** (Poitiers). Comprising another layer of French saints, less concentrated in the north-east than the Tournai/Noyon group above, are the legends of earlier Gallic martyrs and confessors, such as **CASSIANUS** (Autun, Saint-Quentin), **CRISPIN ET CRISPINANUS** (Soissons), **DIONISIUS** (Paris), **FERREOLUS ET FERRUCCIO** (Besançon), **FIRMINUS** (Amiens), **FUSCIANUS** (Boulogne and Amiens), **GENESIUS** (Arles), **GENOVEFA** (Paris), **LUCIANUS** (Beauvais), **MARCELLUS** (Chalon-sur-Saône), **MAURITIUS** (Saint-Maurice), **PATROCLUS** (Troyes), **PIATO** (Tournai), **QUINTINUS** (Saint-Quentin), **SABINA** (Troyes), **SPEUSIPPUS** (Langres), **SULPICIUS** (Bourges), **SYMPHORIANUS** (Autun), and **VALERIANUS** (Tournus).

When placed in this larger context, the concentration of lives from north-east France and Flanders, singled out by Zettel (1979) and by Jackson and Lapidge (1996), perhaps appears less significant, and the legendary could plausibly be regarded as merely displaying the typical early medieval hagiographer’s tendency to include more and more important texts, thus creating larger and larger legends. Yet the absence of saints from the lower Rhone valley (Genesius of Arles excepted) or Aquitaine and the South West (Spain is represented by **EULALIA**, **FRUCTUOSUS** and **VINCENTIUS**), or from Brittany in the west, or from Alsace, the Rhineland, and points further east, strongly suggests the compiler’s preference for the saints of the large region watered by the Scheldt, Somme, Seine, Marne, Yonne, Loire, and Saône rivers, namely the region with which clerics from early England had close relations (Ortenberg 1992 pp 21–40, 218–63). What the “Cotton-Corpus” roster does not have, in my view, is evidence for localizing it in any one center in this large region; it reads more like a selection of the most important saints from northern France as a whole, rather than the product of a specific cult center: perhaps it was made for export rather than domestic consumption.

Problems in Dating “Cotton-Corpus”

Another important and surprising aspect of the collection, first pointed out by Zettel (1979 p 9 and note 19), is that it does not appear to include any works composed later than the late-ninth century. Zettel points to the Pseudo-Faustus life of **Maurus**, composed *ca.* 863 by Odo of Glanfeuil, as the latest work in the legendary and thus its terminus post quem, but this is problematic in that the Maurus legend is not included in the Worcester recension proper (or its table of contents), although it was evidently part of the Salisbury recension’s supplementary set, to judge from its table of contents (see Webber 1992 p 157 note 68). Jackson and Lapidge (1996 p 134), however, disregard Maurus and designate Hincmar’s lengthy life of Rémy (Remigius), composed 877–78, as the latest work. Other works more or less securely dated in the late ninth century include two by **PAUL THE DEACON** of Naples: the lives of Mary of Egypt and Theophilus, which are dated around 876 (Siegmond 1949 p 269). The account of the translation

of the relics of Wandrille, listed in the set of *capitula* fronting the *Vita Wandregisilus*, but now lost from the manuscript, must have been composed sometime after 885, the date of the translation itself (see the entry for *Miracula Wandregisili*). One study has dated the life of Judoc to 913–31 (Le Bourdellès 1993; cf., however, Lapidge 2000 p 260), but neither Wandrille nor Judoc necessarily affects the date of the main “Cotton-Corpus” collection, since they are both among the texts grouped in a supplement at the end, out of calendar order. The Worcester copyist incorporated the life of Wandrille into the main collection, but at Salisbury it remained in the supplement, according to the table of contents (see Webber 1992 p 157 note 68).

While it is legitimate to use such data for establishing the *terminus post quem* of “Cotton-Corpus,” it seems hazardous to claim that the collection must therefore have been compiled soon after such a *terminus* (i.e. in the late ninth or early tenth century). Detailed work on the texts of individual legends in “Cotton-Corpus,” such as the *Vita Remigii*, would seem to be necessary in order to estimate, at least roughly, the length of time between their original composition and their copying into “Cotton-Corpus.” There is some information of this sort in the editorial work of Krusch and Levison on the Merovingian saints’ lives, where “Cotton-Corpus” texts are sometimes classified in relation to other extant copies (usually they are not among the “best” texts: see, however, the *Acta Sanctorum* entries for **AUDOMARUS**, **BRIGIDA**, **MARCELLUS TINGI**, **PATRICIUS**, and **PERPETUA**).

The assumption of a compilation date for “Cotton-Corpus” in the late ninth or early tenth century is important for Ælfric scholars (see below). If the legendary was in existence in the tenth century, then it can be assumed to have been available to Ælfric in England in the late tenth century. This idea has been widely accepted by scholars over the past twenty years, but there are some possible objections to it that should be mentioned here (see also the next section for some additional problems regarding Ælfric’s possible use of “Cotton-Corpus”).

The most obvious objection is that the legendary shows little sign of having been in England for long. The earliest surviving “Cotton-Corpus” recension, that of Worcester, contains the life of only one English saint, Guthlac, and this was clearly absent from the common exemplar of both the Worcester and Salisbury sets. Not only does Salisbury not include Guthlac (or any other English saints), but there is no entry for his feast in the contemporary table of contents for the Worcester legendary’s Part 1 (fol. 55r). Other signs that the inclusion of the *Vita Guthlaci* was an ad hoc decision at Worcester are that the preceding text, the life of Maria Aegyptiaca, shows a marked crowding of words on each line and is rather awkwardly made to end at the bottom of fol. 184v; the flamboyant display script of the *Vita Guthlaci* marks an abrupt departure from the more subdued style found elsewhere in the legendary.

In addition to the *Vita Guthlaci*, the Worcester Legendary also includes various homilies and apocrypha, rarely found in calendric legends before the twelfth century (an exception is Montpellier, Bibliothèque de la Faculté de Médecine 55), for the Marian feasts of the Purification, Assumption, and Nativity, and for the Nativity of **IOHANNES BAPTISTA** (Jackson and Lapidge 1996 pp 136, 138–140, nos. 29, 69, 91, and 104). More English saints were added at the beginning not long after the main copy was made (**SWITHINUS**, **OSWALDUS WIGORNIENSIS**, and **BIRINUS**: see Jackson and Lapidge 1996 p 132; Love 1996 pp xxi–xxiii), as were also, at the

end, readings for other feasts of apparent importance at Worcester (see **LEO IX**, and **NICOLAUS**, lectiones).

This state of affairs is difficult to reconcile with the notion, widely accepted by scholars over the past twenty years, that a version of “Cotton-Corpus” was known to and used by Ælfric seventy years before the Worcester recension was made, and that this Ælfrician legendary was an “early form” of the one later copied at Worcester (Zettel 1979 p 266). It is hard to see how a continental legendary could have circulated and grown in size from its “early form” in England for three quarters of a century (say, between about 980 and 1060), without any local saints’ lives being added, such as **CUTHBERTUS**, King Edmund (see **ABBO**, **PASSIO EADMUNDI**), and **DUNSTANUS**, each time it was recopied, as was the standard practice elsewhere (Philippart 1977 p 101). Such accretions are well illustrated in the later recensions of “Cotton-Corpus” itself, such as Bodley 354 and Hereford P. VII. 6: the latter has “grown” through the addition of locally culted saints such as **MACHUTUS**, **BIRINUS**, **EDBURGA**, and **EGWINUS**, as well as additional non-English saints such as **IOHANNES ELEEMOSYNARIUS**, **PATERNUS**, **CUNIBERT**, **COLUMBANUS**, and **CATHARINA**, to mention only half the additions in November–December (Mynors and Thomson 1993 pp 110–11); see also the Chester Legendary, of the early twelfth century (Ker and Piper 1969–92 2.52–54), for a similar sprinkling of English saints in a legendary only a generation or two younger than those of Worcester and Salisbury. It seems more plausible to assume, with Martin Brett (1991 pp 282–83 and note 28), that “Cotton-Corpus” had arrived in England from abroad not long before the Worcester copy was made, and that the process of local adaptation began at that point.

At Salisbury, the main legendary was also supplemented soon after it was first copied, but in a different way, namely by the compilation of additional volumes, such as Salisbury, Cathedral Library 223 (formerly Oxford, Bodleian Library Fell 3; saec. xii, Salisbury), which includes lives of **WILFRIDUS**, Cuthbert, and **BONIFATIUS**; and Dublin, Trinity College 174 (saec. xi^{ex}, Salisbury; *ASM* 215), which includes lives of Guthlac and **ANDREW** (see entry under **APOCRYPHA**). See Ker and Piper 1969–92 4.262–64; Webber 1992 pp 158 and 169–170; and Colker 1991 1.320–29.

Ælfric and “Cotton-Corpus”

In the research for his 1979 dissertation Patrick Zettel compared the Old English hagiographic works of Ælfric with two sets of texts: the printed editions of the Latin source legends identified by earlier scholars such as Ott and Förster, and the versions of these same Latin legends in “Cotton-Corpus.” In numerous instances, Zettel found Ælfric’s versions corresponding textually more closely with those in the Worcester and Salisbury recensions of “Cotton-Corpus” than with the printed editions. He also found that even in cases where neither the Worcester nor Salisbury legendaries seemed to contain Ælfric’s sources (e.g. for most of the apostles), other affiliated manuscripts, such as the twelfth-century Hereford set for November–December, often did. Thus, Zettel was prompted to posit a lost archetype of “Cotton-Corpus” known to Ælfric but not faithfully preserved in any of the surviving legendaries. Zettel believed this lost but reconstructable legendary contained the sources of most of the narrative saints’ legends that Ælfric included in his **CATHOLIC HOMILIES** and *Lives of Saints*, excluding only the lives of

English saints (for which Ælfric relied on Bede and other authors close to home), and some others such as Benedict, *Inventio Sanctae Crucis*, and the **MARTYRDOM OF PETER AND PAUL** (see entry under **APOCRYPHA**), for which he found sources elsewhere.

Even if Zettel's claim (1982 p 21) that "Cotton-Corpus" contains "some fifty of Ælfric's known sources" is manifestly exaggerated (between thirty and forty would be more accurate), it is nonetheless striking that some of the correspondences between "Cotton-Corpus" and Ælfric's legends involve rather rare recensions, such as specific versions of the legends of Georgius (*BHL* 3373/3374) and **Eugenia** (*BHL* 2666m). It should be noted, however, that Ælfric's *George* shares only one unique variant reading with the "Cotton-Corpus" text; otherwise, Ælfric's source was apparently indistinguishable from the rest of the manuscripts of the "Z" group (*BHL* 3372–74) isolated and collated by Matzke (1902) and Huber (1906), all from northern France and Flanders. In the case of Ælfric's *Eugenia*, both Zettel (1979 p 111 note 13) and Roy (1992 p 21 note 3) cite the *passio* not from "Cotton-Corpus" manuscripts but from the printed edition by Fábrega Grau (1953–55 2.83–98), which is based on several manuscripts of Hispanic provenance. Neither Zettel nor Roy comments on this, but it seems to imply once again that the "Cotton-Corpus" version is not quite so distinctive or crucial as a guide to Ælfric's sources (for a different kind of example of the same problem, see Whatley 1996 p 481).

Zettel also attached great importance to the fact that Ælfric complained about having no source for the legend of the apostle Matthias, and that this legend is not included in "Cotton-Corpus" (Zettel 1982 pp 22–24). Again, this turns out to be less significant than Zettel proposes, since it is unlikely that any legendary compiled north of the Alps before the end of the eleventh century would have contained a legend for Matthias. The earliest acts of Matthias were not composed until the late ninth century at Monte Cassino (*BHL* 5695) by Abbot Bertharius, and, to judge from the data supplied in *BHLms*, copies appear to have been scarce outside Italy until the twelfth century, since the apostle's more northerly cult only began to be promoted after the mid-eleventh century at Trier (*LTK* 6.1485–87). (For the inclusion of a legend for Matthias in the *Apostolic Histories*, however, see the entry under **APOCRYPHA**.)

Zettel's ideas concerning "Cotton-Corpus" as Ælfric's source legendary have achieved wide currency and acceptance, even though the 1979 dissertation where most of these ideas are explored remains unpublished and difficult to access, and Zettel produced only one short article outlining his views (1982) before retiring from active scholarship. For this and many other reasons, it is necessary that his remarkable pioneer effort—surely one of the most important pieces of Ælfrician scholarship in the past century—be tested with respect to each individual Ælfrician legend by thorough study of the surviving manuscript traditions, continental as well as English, since the scope of Zettel's broad study made it difficult for him to extend his manuscript research outside England.

Joyce Hill's work on Ælfric's sources indicates that our knowledge of the subject remains somewhat partial or incomplete with reliance only on "Cotton-Corpus" to the exclusion of other possibilities. In particular, she has argued that a comparative study of Ælfric's hagiographic corpus may well show a greater indebtedness of his sanctorale than hitherto assumed to the Carolingian homiliaries of Paul the Deacon, **HAYMO OF AUXERRE**, and **SMARAGDUS OF**

ST. MIHIEL, “which defined for him the reformist tradition to which he belonged, and the tradition which he worked so hard to promote” (2014 p 22; 2002; 2003; and 2005).

Other close studies of individual legends, some of which are sketched below, have similarly refined and complicated Zettel’s work. One such effort so far, by Morini, on the sources of Ælfric’s *Agatha* (1991a, 1991b, 1993) and *Lucy* (1990), involving the collation of dozens of copies of these saints’ *passiones* all over Europe, does not corroborate Zettel’s conviction that Ælfric depended on the relevant texts in “Cotton-Corpus.” One of the leading modern experts on “Cotton-Corpus,” Love, agrees that “it cannot be proved by reference to Ælfric alone that the ‘Cotton-Corpus legendary’ came to England much before the mid-eleventh century” (Love 1996 p xvii, citing the above references to Morini along with Magennis 1985 p 295 and 1991 pp 45–46; see also Webber 1992 p 70).

Another example concerns Martin of Tours. Zettel was the first to identify among the sources of Ælfric’s first life of Martin (*Catholic Homilies* II, 34; ed. *EETS* SS 5) **ALCUIN**’s *Laudatio* (*BHL* 5625–26; Zettel 1979 pp 64–65, 99–110; 1982 pp 24–28; see also Mertens 2017 pp 67–70). Although this work is not included in the sets of *Martiniana* in the Worcester and Salisbury legendaries, it does appear in the derivative legendary partially preserved in the late twelfth-century manuscript mentioned above, Bodley 354. From this Zettel deduced that Alcuin’s *Laudatio* was included in a form of “Cotton-Corpus” available to Ælfric (1979 p 65). Biggs (1996), however, considers the text in Bodley 354 to be “substantially that of Migne” and less reliable as a guide to Ælfric’s source than a copy in a Bury St. Edmunds homiliary, now Cambridge, Pembroke College 25 (saec. xi/xii; *ASM* 131), a late eleventh-century English recension of the **HOMILIARY OF SAINT-PÈRE DE CHARTRES** (p 290). It is perhaps worth adding that the Alcuinian life of Martin survives mainly in continental *Martinelli* (separate *libelli* of *Martiniana*, such as the ninth-century manuscript, Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale Lat. 5325), but hardly ever appears in large organized legendaries, even those that contain, as many do, significant *Martiniana* collections (one exception I have found, via *BHLms*, is Chartres, Bibliothèque Municipale, 193, of the tenth century). So it is not altogether surprising that the *Laudatio* is absent from all the “Cotton-Corpus” recensions except the latest: it is most unlikely that it was ever in the archetype.

In an instance where the Worcester and Salisbury recensions of “Cotton-Corpus” fail to supply Ælfric’s source, namely for the Assumption of John the Evangelist (*Catholic Homilies* I, 4; see also **APOCRYPHA, APOCRYPHAL ACTS, PSEUDO-MELITO MARTYRDOM OF JOHN**), Zettel again believed the deficiency could be supplied by means of a text from another twelfth-century derivative of “Cotton-Corpus”: Hereford, Cathedral Library P. VII. 6. The Hereford copy shares with Ælfric a lengthy passage (*Catholic Homilies* I, 4.174–93), relating the circumstances surrounding John’s composition of the fourth gospel, which is not found in any of the earlier recensions of “Cotton-Corpus” or later printed versions of the *Passio Iohannis* (Zettel 1979 pp 160–62). Zettel singles out this correspondence as prime evidence of the importance of the Hereford manuscript as a witness to the lost version of “Cotton-Corpus” that Ælfric must have used (1982 pp 32–34). But, as Godden has since pointed out (*EETS* SS 18.35–36), the passage in question is in fact an interpolation from Haymo of Auxerre’s **HOMILIARIUM**, Homily 11 (quoted by Godden from *PL* 118.75). The equivalent passage in Ælfric corresponds more fully to Haymo’s homily than to the portion interpolated in the Hereford copy of the *Passio*, and while it

is possible that Ælfric had a copy of the *Passio* that included a fuller version of the Haymo interpolation, it seems just as likely that Ælfric was himself responsible for the interpolation, and that the Hereford text merely reflects a textual tradition he initiated. Ælfric knew Haymo well (see Godden's overview in *EETS* SS 18.liv–lv), had drawn on another Haymo homily earlier in *ÆCHom* I, 4, and his fondness for combining materials from different sources has been well demonstrated by Godden throughout his commentary on the *Catholic Homilies* as well as elsewhere (*EETS* SS 18 *passim* and 1996 pp 269–71). On the surviving manuscript evidence for Ælfric and Orderic Vitalis as abridgers and interpolators of Latin saints' lives, see Lapidge and Winterbottom (1991 pp cxlvii–cl).

Corona's (2006) examination of Ælfric's *Basil* (*ÆLS* 4, ed. *EETS* OS 76 and 82) mainly focuses on English manuscripts for studying Ælfric's handling of his Latin source and for re-editing the Old English text, and thus does not seek to throw further light on the "Cotton-Corpus" issue in a larger context, but in the process she provides the *editio princeps* of the Latin *Vita Basilii* attributed to "Euphemius" (*BHL* 1023), of which Surius's much emended and abridged printed versions are useless for modern scholarly purposes (see esp. pp 143–48). Corona's edition is based on the texts in the Worcester and Salisbury legendaries.

Ostacchini (forthcoming) argues that Ælfric relied for his account of Saint Dionysius (*ÆLS* 29, ed. *EETS* OS 76 and 82) on not only the *Life* by **HILDUIN OF SAINT-DENIS** (*BHL* 2175; ed. Lapidge 2017) as found in "Cotton-Corpus" but also on details from the independent anonymous *Life of Dionysius* (*BHL* 2178; ed. Lapidge 2016). Ostacchini demonstrates that Ælfric specifically refers to links between Dionysius and Spain as well as other narrative details that do not appear in Hilduin's text but are present in the anonymous *Life*. It is likely, then, that Ælfric relied on either multiple sources or a hybrid source different from Hilduin's text as included in surviving copies of "Cotton-Corpus."

Hawk (forthcoming) has examined Ælfric's use of apostolic acts in relation to both "Cotton-Corpus" and the **APOSTOLIC HISTORIES** (see **APOCRYPHA**), arguing that Zettel's claims and subsequent acceptance of them are more complicated than the manuscript evidence bears out. As Hawk suggests, because of the substantial overlap between the apostolic acts included the two collections, as well as the fluidity of both collections in contents and organization, it is difficult to make any definitive claims that Ælfric relied solely on a copy of the "Cotton-Corpus Legendary," and it is just as likely that he could have known the acts as in the Apostolic Histories. This is the case with Ælfric's general comments and discussions about the apostles that rely on apocryphal acts (as in the *Letter to Sigeward*), and Hawk specifically focuses on similar challenges to Zettel's claims regarding Ælfric's uses of acts for Simon and Jude and Philip and James the Less.

More such instances could be adduced to question the current opinion that Ælfric's hagiographic sources have been conclusively located in the surviving manuscripts of "Cotton-Corpus" (see Whatley 1996 pp 472–82). Zettel's work, however, remains of great importance in general terms because he helped turn the attention of scholars away from dependence on unreliable printed editions of Latin sources to focus on manuscript sources as near as possible in time to Ælfric's.

In retrospect, it is not altogether surprising that a mid-eleventh-century legendary from the Anglo-Frankish orbit would be found to approximate Ælfric's hagiographic sources more closely than early modern printed editions based on late, and often contaminated, manuscripts from more diverse regions. The surviving recensions of "Cotton-Corpus" do indeed form a valuable representative repository of hagiographic textual traditions developed during the late Carolingian era and in circulation among the numerous clerical communities of northern France, Flanders, and England in the tenth and eleventh centuries and beyond. In that regard, for example, Hawk (2018 pp 48–51, 58, 215–16) situates "Cotton-Corpus" among other significant collections from the continent and known in early England in relation to apocrypha, including acts of apostles.

Much more detailed research is needed before it will be possible to regard "Cotton-Corpus" conclusively as "Ælfric's legendary" or to reject such a claim entirely. It is only one of dozens of such legendaries surviving largely unexplored in European libraries. They should not be neglected by future students of Ælfric's *Homilies* and *Lives of Saints*.

E. Gordon Whatley

Works Cited

- Bieler, Ludwig. 1952. *Libri epistolarum Sancti Patricii Episcopi*. Reprinted Dublin, 1993.
- Biggs, Frederick M. 1996. "Ælfric as Historian: His Use of Alcuin's *Laudationes* and Sulpicius' *Dialogues* in His Two Lives of Martin." In Szarmach 1996 pp 289–315.
- Bollandists. 1889. "Catalogus codicum hagiographicorum bibliothecae civitatis Carnotensis." *Analecta Bollandiana* 8: 86–208.
- Brett, Martin. 1991. "The Use of Universal Chronicle at Worcester." In *L'historiographie médiévale en Europe*. Ed. Jean-Philippe Genet, pp 277–85. Paris.
- Colker, Marvin L. 1991. *Trinity College, Dublin. Descriptive Catalogue of the Medieval and Renaissance Latin Manuscripts*. 2 vols. Brookfield, VT.
- Corona, Gabriella, ed. 2006. *Ælfric's Life of Saint Basil the Great: Background and Context*. Anglo-Saxon Texts 5. Cambridge.
- Delehaye, Hippolyte. 1923. "Les actes de S. Marcel le centurion." *Analecta Bollandiana* 41: 257–87.
- Dolbeau, François. 1976. "Notes sur la genèse et sur la diffusion du «Liber de Natalitiis»." *Revue d'Histoire des Textes* 6: 143–95.
- _____. 1981. "Nouvelles recherches sur le «Legendarium Flandrense»." *Recherches Augustiennes* 16: 399–455.

- Dubois, J., and G. Renaud, eds. 1984. *Le martyrologe d'Adon. Ses deux familles, ses trois recensions. Texte et commentaire*. Paris.
- Esposito, Mario. 1912–13. “On the Earliest Latin Life of St. Brigid of Kildare.” *Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy C* 30: 307–26.
- Fábrega Grau, Angelo, ed. 1953–55. *Pasionario Hispánico*. 2 vols. Madrid and Barcelona.
- Fehr, Bernhard, ed. 1914. *Die Hirtenbriefe Ælfrics in altenglischer und lateinischer Fassung*. Reprinted Darmstadt, 1966.
- Franklin, Carmela Viricillo. 2001. “Roman Hagiography and Roman Legendaries.” In *Roma nell'Alto Medioevo*, 2: 857–95. 2 vols. Settimano di Studio del Centro Italiano di Studi sull'Alto Medioevo 48. Spoleto.
- Gameson, Richard. 1996. “Book Production and Decoration at Worcester in the Tenth and Eleventh Centuries.” In *St Oswald of Worcester: Life and Influence*, ed. Nicholas Brooks and Catherine Cubitt, 194–243. Leicester.
- _____. 1999. *The Manuscripts of Early Norman England (c. 1066–1130)*. Oxford.
- Gneuss, Helmut. 1985. “Liturgical Books in Anglo-Saxon England and Their Old English Terminology.” In *Learning and Literature in Anglo-Saxon England*. Ed. Michael Lapidge and Helmut Gneuss, pp 91–141. Cambridge.
- Godden, Malcolm. 1996. “Experiments in Genre: The Saints' Lives in Ælfric's *Catholic Homilies*.” In Szarmach 1996 pp 261–87.
- Hall, Thomas N. 2007. “Latin Sermons for Saints in Early English Homiliaries and Legendaries.” In *The Old English Homily: Precedent, Practice, and Appropriation*. Ed. Aaron J Kleist, pp 227–63. *Studies in the Early Middle Ages* 17. Turnhout.
- Hawk, Brandon W. 2018. *Preaching Apocrypha in Anglo-Saxon England*. Toronto Anglo-Saxon Studies 30. Toronto.
- _____. Forthcoming. “Ælfric's Traditions about the Apostles and Media Networks.”
- Hill, Joyce. 2002. “Ælfric's Authorities.” In *Early Medieval English Texts and Interpretations: Studies Presented to Donald G. Scragg*. Ed. Elaine M. Treharne and Susan Rosser, pp 51–65. Tempe, AZ.
- _____. 2003 [1997]. “Translating the Tradition: Manuscripts, Models and Methodologies in the Composition of Ælfric's Catholic Homilies.” *The Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 79: 43–65; rptd. with revisions in *Textual and Material Culture in Anglo-Saxon England. Thomas Northcote Toller and the Toller Memorial Lectures*. Ed. Donald G. Scragg, pp 241–59. Cambridge.

- _____. 2005. "Authority and Intertextuality in the Works of Ælfric." *Proceedings of the British Academy* 131: 157–81.
- _____. 2014. "The Context of Ælfric's Saints' Lives." In *Hagiography in Anglo-Saxon England: Adopting and Adapting Saints' Lives into Old English Prose (c. 950-1150)*. Ed. Loredana Lazzari, Patrizia Lendinara, and Claudia Di Sciacca, pp 1–27. FIDEM. TEMA 73. Barcellona and Madrid.
- Huber, P. M. 1906. "Zur Georgslegende." In *Festschrift zum XII Allgemeinen Deutschen Neuphilologentage in München, Pfingsten 1906*. Ed. E. Stollreither, pp 175–235. Erlangen.
- Jackson, Peter, and Michael Lapidge. 1996. "The Contents of the Cotton-Corpus Legendary." In *Szarmach 1996* pp 131–46.
- James, M. R. 1909–12. *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Library of Corpus Christi College Cambridge*. 2 vols. Cambridge.
- Ker, N. R. 1939–40. "Membra Disiecta, Second Series." *British Museum Quarterly* 14: 79–86.
- _____. 1949. "Salisbury Cathedral Manuscripts and Patrick Young's Catalogue." *Wiltshire Archeological and Natural History Magazine* 53: 153–83.
- _____. 1960. *English Manuscripts in the Century after the Norman Conquest*. Oxford.
- Ker, N. R., and A. J. Piper. 1969–92. *Medieval Manuscripts in British Libraries*. 4 vols. Oxford.
- Kramer, Johanna, Hugh Magennis, and Robin Norris, eds. and trans. 2020. *Anonymous Old English Lives of Saints*. *Dumbarton Oaks Medieval Library* 63. Cambridge, MA.
- Lanéry, Cécile. 2010. "Hagiographie d'Italie (300-550) 1. Les Passions latines composées en Italie," in Philippart, ed. 2010, 5.15-369.
- _____. 2013. "Nouvelles recherches sur le légendier de Clairvaux." *Analecta Bollandiana* 131: 61–133.
- Lapidge, Michael. 2002. "A Metrical *Vita S. Iudoci* from Tenth-Century Winchester." *Journal of Medieval Latin* 10: 251–306.
- _____. 2016. "The 'Anonymous *Passio S. Dionysii*' (BHL 2178)." *Analecta Bollandiana* 134: 20–65.
- _____, ed. and trans. 2017. *Hilduin of Saint-Denis: The Passio S. Dionysii in Prose and Verse*. *Mittellateinische Studien und Texte* 51. Leiden.
- Lapidge, Michael, and Rosalind. C. Love. 2001. "The Latin Hagiography of England and Wales (600–1550)." In Philippart 1994a–, 3.203–325.

Lapidge, Michael, and Michael Winterbottom, eds. 1991. *Wulfstan of Winchester: The Life of St Æthelwold*. Oxford.

Le Bourdellès, Hubert. 1993. "Vie de St Josse avec commentaire historique et spirituel." *Studi Medievali* 3rd ser. 34: 861–958.

Love, Rosalind C, ed. 1996. *Three Eleventh-Century Anglo-Latin Saints' Lives: Vita S. Birini, Vita et Miracula S. Kenelmi and Vita S. Rumwoldi*. Oxford Medieval Texts. Oxford.

Magennis, Hugh. 1985. "On the Sources of the Non-Ælfrician Lives in the Old English *Lives of the Saints*, with Reference to the Cotton-Corpus Legendary." *Notes and Queries* n.s. 32: 292–99.

_____. 1991. "The Anonymous Old English Legend of the Seven Sleepers and its Latin Source." *Leeds Studies in English* n.s. 22: 43–56.

_____, ed. 2002. *The Old English Life of Saint Mary of Egypt*. Exeter.

Matzke, R. 1902. "Contributions to the History of the Legend of Saint George, with Special Reference to the Sources of the French, German, and Anglo-Saxon Metrical Versions, I." *Proceedings of the Modern Language Association* 17: 464–535.

Mertens, Andre. 2017. *The Old English Lives of St Martin of Tours: Edition and Study*. Göttingen.

Moretus, H. 1905. "Catalogus codicum hagiographicorum latinorum Bibliothecae Bollandianae." *Analecta Bollandiana* 25: 425–72.

Morini, Carla. 1990. "Pascasio, il fidanzato di Lucia: il riflesso di una 'varia lectio' nella S. Lucia di Ælfric." *Le Forme e la Storia* n.s. 2: 315–23.

_____. 1991a (for 1987–88). "Le Fonti della *Passio S. Agathae* di Ælfric." *AION-Filologia germanica* 30–31: 83–94.

_____. 1991b. "Una redazione sconosciuta della *Passio S. Agathæ*: Ms. Auxerre, Bibl. Mun., 127 (s. XII in.), f. 17^r–19^r." *Analecta Bollandiana* 109: 305–30.

_____, ed. 1993. *La passione di S. Agata di Ælfric di Eynsham*. Alessandria.

Mynors, R. A. B., and Rodney Thomson. 1993. *Catalogue of the Manuscripts of Hereford Cathedral Library*. Woodbridge, Suffolk.

Niermeyer, J. F., et al. 1993. *Mediae Latinitatis Lexicon Minus*. Leiden.

Ó'Riain, Diarmuid. 2015. "The *Magnum Legendarium Austriacum*: A New Investigation of One of Medieval Europe's Richest Hagiographical Collections." *Analecta Bollandiana* 133: 87–165.

Ortenberg, Veronica. 1992. *The English Church and the Continent in the Tenth and Eleventh Centuries: Cultural, Spiritual, and Artistic Exchanges*. Oxford.

Ostacchini, Luisa. Forthcoming. “BHL 2178: A New Source for Ælfric’s *Life of Dionysius*.” *Notes and Queries*.

Pfaff, Richard W., ed. 1995. *The Liturgical Books of Anglo-Saxon England*. Kalamazoo, MI.

Philippart, Guy. 1977. *Les légendiers latins et autres manuscrits hagiographiques*. Turnhout.

_____. 1981. “L’édition médiévale des légendiers dans le cadre d’une hagiographie générale.” In *Hagiography and Medieval Literature: A Symposium*. Ed. Hans Bekker-Nielsen et al., pp 127–58. Odense.

_____, ed. 1994a–. *Hagiographies. Histoire internationale de la littérature hagiographique, latine et vernaculaire, des origines à 1550*, vol. 5. Turnhout.

_____. 1994b. “Martirologi e leggendari.” In *Lo spazio letterario del Medioevo. 1. Il Medioevo latino*. Ed. G. Cavallo, C. Leonardi, and E. Menesto. Vol. 2: *La circolazione del testo*, pp 605–48. Rome.

Planta, Joseph. 1802. *A Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Cottonian Library Deposited in the British Museum*. London.

Poncelet, A. 1910. *Catalogus codicum hagiographicorum latinorum bibliothecae Vaticanae*. Brussels.

Proud, Joana. 2003. “The Cotton-Corpus Legendary into the Twelfth-Century: Notes on Salisbury Cathedral Library MSS 221 and 222.” In *Early Medieval English Texts and Interpretations: Studies Presented to Donald G. Scragg*. Ed. Elaine Treharne and Susan Rosser, pp 341–52. *Medieval & Renaissance Texts & Studies* 252. Tempe, AZ.

Quentin, Henri. 1908. *Les martyrologes historiques du Moyen Age*. Paris.

Rochais, Henri. 1975. *Un légendier cistercien de la fin du XII^e et XIII^e siècle. le «Liber de Natalitiis» et de quelques grands légendiers des XII^e et XIII^e s.* *Documentation cistercienne* 15. 3 vols. Rochefort.

Roy, Gopa. 1992. “A Virgin Acts Manfully: Ælfric’s *Life of St Eugenia* and the Latin Versions.” *Leeds Studies in English* 23: 1–27.

Siegmund, Albert. 1949. *Die Überlieferung der griechischen christlichen Literatur in der lateinischen Kirche bis zum zwölften Jahrhundert*. Munich.

Smith, Thomas. 1696. *Catalogus librorum manuscriptorum bibliothecae Cottonianae*. Oxford. Ed C. G. C. Tite. Cambridge, 1984.

Szarmach, Paul E., ed. 1996. *Holy Men and Holy Women: Old English Prose Saints' Lives and Their Contexts*. Albany, NY.

Van Beek, C. J. M. J., ed. 1936. *Passio Sanctarum Perpetuae et Felicitatis: Latine et Graece*. Nijmegen.

Webber, Teresa. 1992. *Scribes and Scholars at Salisbury Cathedral c. 1075–c. 1125*. Oxford.

Whatley, E. Gordon. 1996. "Late Old English Hagiography, ca. 950–1150." In Philippart 1994a–, 2.429–99.

Wormald, Patrick. 1999. *The Making of English Law: King Alfred to the Twelfth Century. Volume I. Legislation and Its Limits*. Oxford.

Zettel, Patrick H. 1979. "Ælfric's hagiographic sources and the Latin legendary preserved in N.L. MS Cotton Nero E. i + CCC MS 9 and other manuscripts." Unpubl. PhD diss., Oxford University.

_____. 1982 "Saints' Lives in Old English: Latin Manuscripts and Vernacular Accounts: Ælfric." *Peritia* 1: 17–37.