**Ephraem Latinus**, Paruum corpus sermonum [EPHRAEM.LAT.serm.]: CPL 1143; CPG 3909, 3915, 3920, 3935/2b, 3935/2a, 3940, 3968, 4002, 4080–81, 4089; DS 4/1.815–18; RGAEL 1.261–62 (EPH).

ed.: Fischer ca. 1491.

**MSS**
1. Cambridge, University Library, Ee.1.23 (ASM 2.8).
2. ?Salisbury, Cathedral Library, 131 (HG 732): see below.

For manuscripts that transmit only one of the sermons, see the subentries on *De die iudicii et resurrectione* and *De compunctione cordis*.

**Lists**
see below.

**OE Vers**
see the subentries on *De paenitentia* and *De compunctione cordis*.

**Quots/Cits**
see the subentries below.

**Refs**
see below.

For details on the prolific Syrian author Ephraem (d. 373) and the works attributed to him see **EPHRAEM SYRUS**. For Greek writings attributed (for the most part wrongly) to Ephraem see **EPHRAEM GRAECUS**. For spurious Latin writings see **PSEUDO-EPHRAEM** and **ACTA SANCTORUM, VITA S. ABRAHAE ET MARIÆ** (vol. 1A, pp 40–42). The standard bibliography on Ephraem, which includes editions of and scholarship on Ephraem Latinus, is den Biesen (2012). See also Brock (2020), a guide to editions and translations, an earlier version of which is available online (Brock n.d.).

As Brock (1995 p 40) cautions, “Very little... of the extant Ephrem Graecus and Ephrem Latinus is genuine Ephrem, and most cases probably did not even start out in Syriac.” The distinction between the Greek and Latin “Ephraem” on the one hand, and “Pseudo-Ephraem” on the other, is thus to a great extent a bibliographical convention based on language and manuscript ascription rather than on scholarly attribution. Most works attributed to Ephraem Latinus do have Greek originals (an exception being *De die iudicii et resurrectione*), while those attributed to pseudo-Ephraem as a rule do not. In the present entry, the name “Ephraem” will be used as shorthand for Ephraem Latinus, without implying that any of the works attributed to that figure were originally composed by Ephraem the Syrian.

Evidence for knowledge in early medieval Europe of Latin writings attributed to Ephraem (also spelled “Ephrem” or “Ephraim,” and in medieval manuscripts usually “Effrem”) is surveyed by
Bardy (1946), Siegmund (1949 pp 67–71), Schmidt (1973 and 1980), Ganz (1999), and Brock (2003). For extracts from the sermon *De die iudicii* and *De compunctione cordis* in

**DEFENSOR, LIBER SCINTILLARUM** see those subentries (and below, p 9). For extracts from *De compunctione cordis* in Pseudo-Macarius, *Epistula 3* (ca. 700; CPL 1843; RGAEL 2.640 [PS-MAC ep 3]), see Wilmart (1922 pp 414–15, 417–18); for quotations from *De compunctione cordis* by Elipandus of Toledo (d. ca. 800; ISLMAH 414) and Samson of Córdova (d. 890; ISLMAH 508), see Hemmerdinger-Iliadou (DS 4/1.819) and Pena (2002a); for an extract in

**BENEDICT OF ANIANE, Libellus ex diuersis patrum sententii**, see Dolbeau (2008 p 68); for extracts from four of the six Latin sermons attributed to Ephraem Latinus as well as from Pseudo-Ephraem, *Liber de paenitentia* (CPL 1143a) in **FLORUS OF LYON, COLLECTIO EX DICTIS XII PATRUM** (*CALMA* III/3.363), see Fransen (1977, with Fransen’s edition of the text in *CCCM* 193B); for extracts from *De beatitudine animae* in **SMARADGUS, DIADEMA MONACHORUM**, see Hemmerdinger-Iliadou (*ibid.*) and Soage (2017 pp 218–20); and for extracts from *De beatitudine animae* and *De compunctione cordis* in the *Florilegium sapientale*, see Soage (2017 pp 124, 132, 139–40, 186 and 218–20).

The evidence for transmission of Ephraemic writings in early England is surveyed by Bestul (1981), Sims-Williams (1985), Stevenson (1988), Wright (2002), and Torabi (2020, without reference to the findings of Sims-Williams or Wright).

This main entry and the following subentries cover a corpus of six Latin sermons ascribed to Ephraem in the manuscripts, five of which translate or adapt Greek originals, though only the sixth has a Greek source that makes use of any genuine Syriac works by Ephraem. The six sermons comprising the *Paruum corpus sermonum* (as the collection is called in CPL) are as follows (for details on each see the individual subentries):

1. *De die iudicii et resurrectione* (inc.: “Gloria omnipotenti Deo”).
2. *De beatitudine animae* (inc.: “Beatus qui odio habuerit hunc mundum”).
3. *De paenitentia* (inc.: “Dominus qui odium habuit hunc mundum”).
4. *De luctamine spiritali* (inc.: “In luctaminibus huius seculi nullus sine agone”).
5. *De die iudicii* (inc.: “Venite dilectissimi frater, exhortationem meam”). [An abbreviated version of this work and a brief set of excerpts from it are given separate subentries below as 5a and 5b.]

The relevant CPL entries are available online via the *Clavis Clavium*: <https://clavis.brepols.net/clacla/OA/Details.aspx?id=2D890570CABD42F88D3C303484415C59>.

These sermons usually circulated as a group (without a specific title other than “Liber Sancti Effrem” or the like), though several of them also sometimes circulated separately. There is no modern critical edition, but the sermons are available in Fischer’s *editio princeps* (*GW* 9334 <https://www.gesamtkatalogderwiegendrucke.de/docs/GW09334.htm>) and in a variant textual form in Menchusius (1563; see Weber 2020 p 856 n 13). The chapter headings in Fischer appear to be editorial additions, though it is possible that they are drawn from a late manuscript; whether Fischer’s chapter divisions reflect divisions in any manuscripts is unclear. Later Latin
translations of Greek Ephraemic sermons were made by Ambrogio Traversari (Ambrosius Camaldulensis, d. 1439; CALMA 1/2.204–07 <http://www.mirabileweb.it/calma/ambrosius-traversarius-n-16-9-1386-m-21-10-1439/2607>) ca. 1430, as part of a larger collection of 19 sermons, printed in 1481 (GW 9331 <https://www.gesamtkatalogderwiegendrucke.de/docs/GW09331.htm>; contents analyzed by Brock 2003 pp 79–80); and by the Catholic scholar Gerardus Vossius van Borgloon (d. 1609, not to be confused with the Protestant scholar Gerardus Vossius, d. 1649), first printed in 1589–98, with a second edition in 1603. For a list of the Greek texts translated by Traversari corresponding to the edition by Assemani see Iliadou (1975–76 p 359 n 2).

The Greek originals are ed. Assemani (1732–46; references below are to the Greek and Latin volumes 1–3 by page, section, and line). The contents of Assemani’s edition, which draws heavily on the edition of Thwaites (1709), are analyzed in CPG and by den Briesen (2012 pp 441–47). See also Hemmerdinger-Iliadou (1958). Assemani’s edition (often called “the Rome edition”; see Brock 2003 pp 73–75) has frequently been characterized as careless and difficult to use, but for most Ephraemic writings it remains the most widely cited edition. That of Phrantzolas (1988–98) is based largely on Assemani’s, according to Brock (n.d.), who analyzes its contents by CPG numbers. The accompanying Latin translations in Assemani are generally from Vossius, though for De die iudicii et resurrectione and for De luctamine spirituali Assemani does include texts of the early Latin translations from manuscripts. For the other sermons in the Paruum corpus, therefore, only the Fischer or Menchusius prints should be cited (or better, accessible manuscripts of early date). Biblical quotations in the Paruum corpus are extracted in the ITSEE citations database <https://itsee-citations.wce.birmingham.ac.uk/citations/author/206?offset=200&limit=100>.

On the Ephraemic Paruum corpus see Mercati (1920), Hemmerdinger-Iliadou in DS, supplemented by Iliadou (1975–76), and especially Weber (2020) for a survey of the corpus, with comments on its origins, authorship, Latinity, biblical text, and techniques of translation. Weber (p 859) states that it is an open question as to whether the sermons were all translated by the same person. Their date(s) are also uncertain; the earliest copy (of De compunctione cordis only) is Paris, BnF, lat. 12634, digital facsimile online at <https://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/btv1b90668277.r> + St. Petersburg, Public Library, Q.v.1.5 (CLA 5.645–46; provenance Corbie), written in Italy in the late sixth or early seventh century (see also Ganz 1990 p 157). The earliest copy of the entire collection, dating from the second half of the eighth century, is Vatican, BAV, Barb. lat. 671 (Italy, prov. San Salvatore, Settimo) (CLA 1.64), digital facsimile online at <https://digi.vatlib.it/view/MSS_Barb.lat.671>. (Its text of De compunctione cordis, however, transmits only the opening chapters of book 2, as far as Fischer fol. 10ra/24 “et retributio iustorum [gestorum, Fischer] est”: see Petitmengin 1971 p 11 n 25).

As a group, these sermons focus on the need for compunction and penance motivated by awareness of sin and fear of the Last Judgment, but tempered by the promise of God’s forebearance and the prospect of heavenly rewards for those who weep for their sins. “Ephraem” (who names himself at the beginning of one sermon, De die iudicii) frequently addresses an audience of fratres, urging them to cultivate prayer and especially tears (Wright 2007 p 50 speaks of Ephraem’s “lachrymose spirituality”) in order to receive God’s mercy and to earn the
rewards prepared by him for those who do so. Though Ephraem the Syrian was a deacon, not a monk, some of these sermons (notably De beatitudine animae and De compunctione cordis) invoke the monastic way of life, and hence the collection was especially popular in medieval monastic communities. Stylistically the sermons are strongly marked by parallelism and anaphora, as well as by metaphor. Among recurrent images are the biblical one of Christ as bridegroom as well as Christ as doctor. The passage from De paenitentia translated selectively in two anonymous Old English homilies (see the subentry below, OE Vers 1) is typical in many ways, with its highly-wrought exhortation to tears as a cure for the wounds of sin revealed to Christ the doctor; its extended anaphoric series of “Hic... ibi” contrasts between this world and the next; and its vivid descriptions of the Day of Judgment, balanced by a description of the union of the blessed with the heavenly bridegroom.

It is not known precisely how the Greek sources of these Latin sermons were transmitted to Western Europe. One possible avenue of transmission to England was THEODORE OF CANTERBURY. According to Bischoff and Lapidge (1994), Theodore was familiar with a number of Ephraemic writings and exegetical themes, including some apparently in Syriac, and “was probably the agent of transmission of certain aspects of Syriac learning to Anglo-Saxon England” (p 237). Taking into account evidence for the use of Ephraemic writings in the

CANTERBURY COMMENTARIES deriving from Theodore’s school as well as in later English prayerbooks (see the subentry on De compunctione cordis), Bischoff and Lapidge speculate that “a small corpus of Greek Ephremic texts” (including the sources of the De compunctione cordis and De paenitentia of the Paruum corpus) “was available at the school at Canterbury in the late seventh century and was used selectively for various exegetical and devotional purposes, including translation into Latin” (p 239). Stevenson (1995 pp 69–70 and 183–84 and 1998 pp 261–66) has surveyed evidence for the use of Ephraemic writings and themes in the

LATERCULUS MALALIANUS attributed to Theodore, concluding (p 69) that Theodore was “significantly influenced” by Ephraem (though none of the parallels is from the sermons belonging to the Paruum corpus). Still, as Wright (2002 p 219) cautions, “we have no proof that Theodore brought to Anglo-Saxon England manuscripts of any Ephremic work, genuine or spurious, Greek or Syriac.” The possibility that BEDE was familiar with the De paenitentia (see p 16 below), if accepted, would increase the likelihood that Latin versions of some Ephraemic writings were transmitted via Theodore.

Sims-Williams (1985 pp 215–20) views skeptically Edmund Bishop’s arguments (apud Kuypers 1902 pp 277–80) for transmission through Spain of prayers based on Ephraemic writings, though some Ephraemic writings including the Paruum corpus were known in early medieval Spain (see Pena 2002a, 2002b, 2006, and 2014). Schmidt (1973 p 181) speculates about the role of the Irish missions and specifically of Bobbio in the transmission of Ephraem Latinus, but there seem to be no documented quotations from or references to Ephraemic writings in Hiberno-Latin sources. There was a “liber Effrem Scotticum volumen I” in the library of the abbey of Saint-Èvre Toul in the eleventh century (see Becker 1885 p 151; this is presumably the “Codex Scotticus” mentioned but not documented by Schmidt); the reference, however, could also be to a manuscript in Anglo-Saxon script.

Early manuscripts of the Paruum corpus (complete or partial) were widely disseminated across the Continent, including in centers of Insular influence. Ganz (1999 p 41) draws attention to the
popularity of Ephraem in Bavaria, which may reflect “the legacy of Anglo-Saxon missionaries.” Three Continental manuscripts written in Insular script in Germany transmit copies of individual sermons: Ludwigsburg, S. (see the subentry on De paenitentia); Vatican City, BAV, Pal. lat. 556 (see the subentry on the abbreviated version of De die iudicii 5a) and Nürnberg, Germanisches Nationalmuseum, 7152 (see the subentry on De compunctione cordis). As possible sites of transmission of Ephraemic texts between England and the Continent, Bestul (1981 pp 12–15 and 23) refers to Corbie, St. Riquier, Fleury, and St. Bertin; Wright (2002 p 232) refers to Continental centers with close ties to the English missions, including Werden, Fulda, and Lorsch, and for the later period to Fleury during the abbacy of ABBO OF FLEURY (988–1004).

The sermons circulated in diverse manuscript contexts (Ganz 1999 lists other major contents of early manuscripts), but some recurring companion texts include CAESARIUS OF ARLES, SERMONES (Bardy 1946 pp 299–300; Ganz pp 40–41; CCSL 103.xxvii–xxviii, xxxviii–xxxix); monastic rules and canonical legislation (see Ganz pp 40 and 42; Bestul 1981 pp 22–24; Wright 2002 pp 231–32); ISIDORE OF SEVILLE, SYNONYMIA and other works (see Di Sciacca 2006 p 384 n 117; 2008 pp 164, cf. 174–75); and works by ALCUIN.

There seems to be no evidence for the knowledge in early England of three other Latin translations of Greek sermons attributed to Ephraem that circulated separately from the Paruum corpus: Sermo in pulcherrimum Ioseph (CPG 3938); De sermo adversus improbas mulieris (CPG 4001); and PSEUDO-AUGUSTINE, SERMONES, Sermo Mai 97 (CPL 1149; CPG 4082) = Caesarius of Arles, Sermo 143 (CPPM IB.1704). Two sermons of Caesarius of Arles were falsely attributed to Ephraem (Sermo 72 = CPPM IB.1068; CPG 4091; Sermo 77 = CPPM IA.1071; CPG 4129). For the so-called Dicta Sancti Effrem, see PSEUDO-EPHAEM.

MSS

For the manuscripts of the collection see, in addition to Hemmerdinger-Iliadou (in DS), Siegmund (1949 pp 69–71), Ganz (1999 pp 43–46: lists manuscripts before ca. 1030), and Pattie (1987 p 3: lists mainly twelfth-century manuscripts). Not listed by Siegmund or Ganz is Paris, BnF, lat. 10612 (saec. ix1, Tours region; Bischoff, Katalog 3.166, no. 4653), which contains an extract from De beatitudine animae (see Gorman 1997 p 347). Detailed listings of the contents of some of these manuscripts can be found in the relevant manuscript catalogues, and further details on the ninth-century copies can now be found in Bischoff, Katalog. See also the listings in the In Principio databaset <https://about.brepolis.net/in-principio-incipit-index-of-latin-texts/> , the Mirabile database <https://www.mirabileweb.it/author/ephraem-syrus-author/42735/>, and in the Monastic Manuscript Project <http://www.earlymedievalmonasticism.org/texts/Ephrem-de-compuntione-cordis.html >. The order of the sermons varies somewhat, but in most early manuscripts that contain all six, De compunctione cordis either begins or ends the collection, and the most common order of the remaining sermons is 1–5 as in the list above. In Fischer the sermons are printed in the order 6, 1–5.

Pattie (1987 pp 6, 9–16) distinguishes three main families of manuscripts (based on variants in De paenitentia): (1) an English family, which includes Cambridge University Library, Ee.1.23 as well as two of the early twelfth-century manuscripts referenced below (London, BL, Royal S.E.iii and Salisbury, Cathedral Library, 131); (2) a Continental group comprised of London, BL,
Harley 3068 and Munich, BSB, Clm 11340, which shares some distinctive readings with the English group; (3) another Continental group comprised of Munich, BSB, Clm 2461 and the unidentified manuscript used by Fischer.

Despite the existence of an English family of twelfth-century manuscripts, the manuscript evidence for the circulation of these sermons in England before 1100 is very scant. There are just two doubtfully relevant manuscripts that contain all six sermons.

MSS 1. The only manuscript possibly dating before 1100 that contains all six is CUL Ee.1.23 (with the order 6, 1–5), dated saec. xi/xii by Gameson (1999 p 57, no. 20) and in ASM, but saec. xii$^{1/4}$ by Binski and Zutshi (2011 pp 264–65, no. 290). The manuscript belongs to the English family according to Pattie (1987 pp 3 and 13, who dates the manuscript incorrectly to the thirteenth century, following the CUL manuscripts catalogue). It also contains PASCHASIUS RADBERTUS, DE ASSUMPTIONE BEATAE MARIAE VIRGINIS. No available description provides the headings and incipits of the sermons. The manuscript has not been digitized, but for a reproduction of fol. 13r (the beginning of De compunctione cordis) see <https://exhibitions.lib.cam.ac.uk/moving-word/artifacts/cul_ms_ee-1-23_f13r/>. The text is headed “Incipit liber primus Beati Effrem diaconi.”

MSS 2. Salisbury 131 (also with the order 6, 1–5) was included in HG but excluded from ASM. On the manuscript see Ker (1976 p 129, no. 420 = Ker 1957 [1990] p 577); Gameson (1999 p 151, no. 865); and Webber (1992 p 167, who notes that two scribes each supplied one quire in the first half of the twelfth century). Bestul (1981 p 14) argues that Salisbury 131 “may rest upon an Anglo-Saxon manuscript tradition in view of an OE scribble in its margin,” and Ker suggests that the scribble was copied from the exemplar. If so, that exemplar was likely a manuscript written or owned in England before 1100, and for that reason it has been listed in the headnotes with a question mark. For the scribble see the subentry on De compunctione cordis.

The text of Salisbury 131 also belongs to Pattie’s English family. The headings, incipits, and explicits are as follows (information from Thomas N. Hall):

fols. 1r–15v: Incipit liber .i. beati Effrem diaconi. Dolor me compellit dicere et iniquitas mea comminiatur mihi . . . Omnes in divina misericordia gaudeant, nullus de suis uiribus presumat. Explicit liber .i. sancti Effrem diaconi.

fols. 15v–19r: Incipit liber .ii. eiusdem de die iudicii et de resurrectione [sic] Domini et de regno celorum. Gloria omnipotenti Deo, qui os nostrum semper mutum aperuit ... / ... impit autem infirmabuntur in eis. Gloria Patri et Filio et Spiritu Sancto et nunc et semper et in secula seculorum. Amen. Explicit liber .ii. sancti Effrem diaconi. [The bottom half of fol. 16v is left blank, but there is no loss of text.]

fols. 19r–21r: Incipit liber secundus [sic]. Beatus qui hodio [sic] habuerit hune mundum et sollicitudo ... / ... qui desiderauerunt ad Patrem luminum peruenire. Amen. Explicit liber .iii.
fols. 21r–23v: Incipit liber quartus sancti Effrem diaconi. Dominus noster Iesus Christus descendit de sinu patris ... / ... precibus omnium sanctorum tuorum qui tibi a seculo placuerunt quoniam tibi debetur omnis laus et gloria in secula seculorum. Amen. [Fol. 24 is blank, with no loss of text.]

fols. 25r–27r: In luctaminibus huius seculi nullus sine agone et certamine coronabitur ... / ... ut delitus paradisi perfruens cum sanctis omnibus dicam: Gloria Patri immortali, gloria Filio immortali, gloria Spiritu sancto immortali in secula seculorum. Amen. Explicit liber .v. sancti Effrem.

fols. 27r–29v: Incipit liber .vi. de die iudicii. Venite, dilectissimi fratres, exhortationem meam suscipite ... / ... ut omnes anima quę hic meditatur trahatur ad uitam aeternam. Amen.

Other than these two manuscripts there are only late (eleventh-century) English copies of excerpts from De die iudicii (5b) and of parts of book 1 of De compunctione cordis (see the separate subentries below).

Gameson in his inventory of manuscripts from Early Norman England (1999) lists two other manuscripts (both with the order 6, 1–5) that date from the early twelfth century (both belong to Pattie’s English family): London, BL, Royal 5.E.iii, fol. 3–82 (Gameson p 113, no. 497), which may be French rather than English; and Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 63 (SC 2402) (Gameson p 127, no. 629).

Lists

Medieval booklists that include writings attributed to Ephraem are listed by Siegmund (1949 pp 68–69; see also Becker 1885 and Lesne 1938), supplemented by Hemmerdinger-Iliadou (DS 4/1.18). No pre-Conquest English booklist references works attributed to Ephraem. A Fulda inventory of ca. 800 associated with the English missions to the Continent includes an entry Liber sancti Effrem (ed. Lapidge, ASL p 152). Dorfbauer (2019 pp 84–86) identifies this with a Liber Effrem abbatis mentioned in three sixteenth-century Fulda book lists, one of which indicates that the manuscript also contained a rare sermon “Doctrina populorum” (CPPM IA.2360). Dorfbauer further notes that this sermon is transmitted along with the first two chapters of Ephraem, De beatitudine animae, in Munich, BSB, Clm 14380 (saec. ix1/3, Bavaria; Bischoff, Katalog 2:254, no. 3163), fol. 73–75v <https://daten.digitalsammlungen.de/~db/0003/bsb00031763/images/>. The Fulda manuscript presumably contained the same extracts, if not other material from the Paruum corpus. Bestul (1981 p 14) mentions an entry for De die iudicii in an inventory of 831 (ed. Becker 1885 p 27) from the monastery of St. Riquier (Picardy), but only on the general grounds of that monastery’s ties to England.

Quots/Cits

Certain or probable quotations from specific sermons are detailed in the relevant subentries below. Here are gathered more general or more dubious claims for early English use of
Ephraem's writings, mainly in OE poetry, as well as cases in which the sermons have been cited as antecedent sources or notable analogues.

According to Bullough (1991 p 213 n 29), “That Alcuin knew the Latin corpus Ephraemi is highly probable but not conclusively proved.” Driscoll (1998 p 43 n 21) suggests on very general grounds that “the content and form of Alcuin’s writings on compunction and penance would suggest an acquaintance with Ephrem.” To date, however, no Alcuinian quotations from Ephraem’s writings have been identified, but see the subentry for De paenitentia for possible indirect influence via Bede. See also the subentry on De compunctione cordis for the transmission in Alcuinian circles of prayers attributed to Ephraem.

Bestul (1981) challenges claims by Grau (1908) that Ephraem was a major source for descriptions of Doomsday in OE poetic texts, especially Christ III (ChristA, A3.1; ed. ASPR 3). As Bestul notes, the specific parallels cited by Grau (also by Cook 1909 pp 188–90), usually involving commonplaces about the Last Judgment, are not compelling, and Grau often invokes Ephraemic writings for which there is no evidence of transmission in Latin. Close comparison, however, has been hampered by Grau’s citation of the seventeenth-century Latin translation by Vossius, instead of the early Latin translations as printed by Fischer that could possibly have been available to OE poets (Assemani printed the early Latin translations only of De die iudicii et resurrectione and De luctamine spirituali). After examining a couple of representative parallels claimed by Grau for Ælæne (El, A2.6) and Guthlac A (GuthA, A3.2), Bestul concludes that “Ephraim’s works are remote analogues only, with little question of direct influence” (p 20; cf. also pp 22 and 24). Stevenson (1998 p 272) is more receptive to the possibility the OE poets might have been familiar with Ephraemic writings, but she does not discuss any concrete parallels, only asserting that “It is not ... impossible that some part of the education the poet in question received had derived, perhaps at second or third hand, from Ephraim.” Caie (1976 p 86) accepts Cook’s identification of Ephraem as an ultimate source for Christ III, but without close investigation of any specific parallels (Cook cites only a few). Biggs (1986), who was not able to consult Fischer’s print, did sift carefully all of Grau’s parallels for Christ III from Vossius’s Latin translations, finding none sufficient to demonstrate the poet’s knowledge of any Ephraemic text (pp 2–3). Biggs assesses specific cases as either “not convincing” or at best only “generally relevant”; for passages from the sermons in the Paruum corpus, see Biggs (pp 6, 7, 14–15, 17–18, 20, 24–30).

Caie (2000 p 68) cites a passage in De die iudicii (wrongly identified as from De compunctione cordis) from the English translation by Calder and Allen (1976 p 87 = Fischer, fol. 16v/34–42) as an analogue for the OE poem Judgment Day II, lines 10–17 (JDayII, A17, ed. ASPR 6.58; Caie p 84), on the fear and spiritual anguish prompted by thinking of one’s sins and their potential punishment; the idea is of course commonplace and there are no close verbal parallels. Another passage from De die iudicii cited by Caie (p 69) on the spiritual benefit of tears (trans. Calder and Allen p 92 = Fischer, fol. 17v/42–48) as an analogue for Judgment Day II, lines 26–50 (ed. ASPR 6.59; Caie p 86) is more pertinent, since the conjunction of the tears of penitence as medicine for the wounds of sin with the image of Christ as a doctor is more distinctive and occurs in Ephraem’s De paenitentia, which may have influenced the OE poem’s main Latin source, the Versus de die iudicii attributed to Bede (see the subentry on De paenitentia).
Stevenson (1998 p 269) and Torabi (2020) posit Ephraemic influence on the OE poems *Soul and Body I* and *Soul and Body II* (for details see **EPHRAEM SYRUS**, and also for Ephraem as an antecedent source for the “Visit to the Tomb” motif).

For Ephraemic writings as antecedent sources for the “thought, word, and deed” triad, see Sims-Williams (1978: 80–81, citing examples from *De die iudicii* and *De die iudicii et resurrectione*) and the separate entry on **EPHRAEM SYRUS**. For Ephraemic writings as antecedent sources for the *ubi sunt* motif, see Di Sciacca (2008 pp 107–108) and **EPHRAEM SYRUS**.

**OE Vers and Refs**

In Defensor’s *Liber scintillarum* (*CPL* 1302 and 1151; *RGAEL* 1.444 [DEF]) multiple quotations from *De die iudicii* and *De compunctione cordis* are included with attribution to Ephraem (by name, not by title). See Kirchmeyer and Hemmerdinger-Iliadou (1958) and Ganz (1999 pp 38–39). These quotations (save for one batch lost in a lacuna) are translated in the Old English interlinear gloss to Defensor (LibSc [C15]; ed. Getty 1969), so these glosses constitute OE micro-versions of, and *nominatim* references to, these Ephraemic sermons. Since, however, they are derived indirectly from Defensor, they are not included as *Quots/Cits* in the headnotes to those texts, but instead are listed in the body of each entry. The main references to the *Liber Scintillarum* are to Rochais 1961–62, with the corresponding passages in his 1957 *CCSL* edition in brackets. References to Assemani are given for citations that are closer to the Greek (as noted by Kirchmeyer and Hemmerdinger-Iliadou). For Defensor’s quotations from the *Dicta Sancti Effrem* as well as unidentified quotations he attributes to Ephraem, see **PSEUDO-EPHRAEM**.

**Ephraem Latinus**, Paruum corpus sermonum, 1. *De die iudicii et resurrectione* [**EPHRAEM.LAT.serm.res.**] (*CPL* 1142i; *CPG* 4080; *RGAEL* 1.462 [**EPH res**]).

ed. Fischer, fols. 10vb/9–12rb/30.

**MSS**
1. Cambridge, University Library, Ee.1.23 (*ASM* 2.8).

**Lists–Refs**
none.

The Latin text of *De die iudicii et resurrectione*—the only one of the six sermons in the *Paruum corpus* that is apparently not based on a Greek original—is also printed by Assemani 3.553–57, from Vatican City, BAV, Vat. lat. 5051 (saec. xi, Nonantola), with variants from an unspecified Monte Cassino manuscript. The sermon describes the signs of Doomsday and Christ’s coming to Judgment, referring to the book of deeds and the revelation of everyone’s thoughts, words, and deeds (see Sim-Williams 1978 p 81, who quotes the passage containing this triad from Menchusius). Ephraem urges his *fratres* to contemplate the example of the sufferings of the saints, to scorn temporal things, and to weep for their sins. He describes the torments of hell and
the rewards of heaven, the latter highlighted with two anaphoric sequences of clauses each beginning with “illī.”

**Ephraem Latinus**, Paruum corpus sermonum, 2. De beatitudine animae [EPHRAEM.LAT.serm.beat.] (CPL 1143ii; CPG 3935/2a; RGAEL 1.461 [EPH bea]).

Ed. Fischer, fols. 12rb/37–13va/5.

**MSS**
1. Cambridge, University Library, Ee.1.23 (ASM 2.8).

**Lists–Vers**
none.

**Quots/Cits**

**Refs**
none.

The corresponding Greek text of *De beatitudine animae* is in Assemani 1:292–98b. The sermon begins with nineteen beatitudes modelled on those of the Sermon on the Mount. The nineteenth beatitude, “Blessed is the one who finds confidence in that hour of his departure when the soul is separated from the body,” is elaborated with an account of particular judgment when each soul is confronted with its personified deeds (see **Quots/Cits** 1). Ephraem then elaborates on the first beatitude of hating the world, describing the holy way of life as wings that enable the soul to escape the traps of the devil. He warns against sudden death and the coming judgment (the signs of which have already come to pass: compare the subentry on *De compunctione cordis*, **Quots/Cits** 5). The sermon concludes with the image of life as a long journey to heavenly dwellings (*mansiones*) accomplished by persevering in the virtues that comprise each day’s journeys or stations (*mansiones*).

**Quots/Cits** 1. Sims-Williams (1985 pp 207–08 n 15 and pp 238–39; see also Sims-Williams 1990 pp 258–59) states that the motif of personified deeds that reproach the monk of Wenlock in the vision recounted by **BONIFACE, EPISTOLA** 10 (ed. **MGH ES** 1) finds its closest parallel and possible source in *De beatitudine animae*. Sims-Williams quotes the passage from London, BL, Harley 3060 (saec. xex, ?France: cf. Pattie 1987 p 3), fol. 129. (This passage is incorporated into a pseudo-Augustinian sermon [*CPPM* 1A.3345] in Munich, BSB, Clm 14470 [saec. viii(ix, Bavaria; *CLA* 9.1300; Bischoff, *Katalog* 2.258, no. 3212], fol. 104rv). As Sim-Williams (pp 258 and 259 n 64) notes, the motif of personified deeds has antecedents in the Bible (Rom 2:15–16), in apocryphal sources (4 Ezra 7:35; **APOCALYPSE OF PETER**; **APOCALYPSE OF PAUL**: see **APOCRYPHA**), and elsewhere. In these analogues, however, the deeds do not actually speak as they do in both Boniface and Ephraem. Nonetheless, there are no verbal parallels between the
speeches in the two texts, and the motif is elaborated in fundamentally different ways. In Ephraem, the deeds (both good and bad as one) say only: “Tu nos egistis. Tua opera sumus. Tecum semper ibimus, tecumque pergemus ad Deum” (ed. Sims-Williams). In Boniface, there are two extended sets of speeches, one by a series of individual sins, and another by a series of individual virtues. In each case each deed identifies itself, saying “Ego ...” or “Ego sum ...”, usually with a brief characterization of the sin or the virtue in question. However rare it may be for personified deeds to speak, De beatitudine animae affords only a distant analogue for the vision of the monk at Wenlock.

**Ephraem Latinus**, Paruum corpus sermonum, 3. De paenitentia [EPHRAEM.Lat.serm.paen.] (CPL 1143iii; CPG 3915; RGAEL 1.462 [EPH pae]).

Ed. Fischer, fol. 13va/15–14vb/19.

**MSS**
1. Cambridge, University Library, Ee.1.23 (ASM 2.8).

**Lists**
none.

**Vers1**

**Quots/Cits**
4. EPHRAEM.LAT.serm.paen., fol. 14rb/19–21: HomS 44 (B3.2.44; Bazire-Cross 3), 115–18 = HomS 33 (Först; B2.2.33), 135[119].15–18.

**Refs**
none.

In the manuscripts De paenitentia—not to be confused with Pseudo-Ephraem, Liber de paenitentia (CPL 1143a; CPG 4092)—is sometimes titled De patientia. The Greek text is in Assemani 1.148–153. Pattie (1987) compares the Latin text with its Greek source, citing variants from a number of Latin manuscripts and providing a composite English translation of the sermon. Pattie (1990) considers in addition the Slavonic and Arabic versions.
The sermon begins with the image of Christ as a doctor who with only a word cures those who will reveal to him their hidden wounds and apply the medicine of tears. Ephraem warns his auditors not to do the will of the devil or to delay approaching God for healing, and to weep while there is time, because tears will be of no account in the next world. After the extended “Hic ... ibi” sequence (see OE Vers 1) Ephraem continues to urge tears and repentance, saying that gold and silver will not avail one in the next world, nor will kin help one another (on this motif see pp 14–15 below). He then contrasts the saints who despised the world with people who seek earthly things and act like beasts. After invoking the image of the Bridegroom who rejects those who arrive at the wedding without a lamp and wedding garment, he beseeches his auditors to rise and see the heavenly king and to receive what he has prepared for them when the saints and the just will be snatched up into the clouds. At the end Ephraem begs that he will not be found unworthy of God’s mercies and that his prayer will be accepted.

OE Vers 1. Wright (2002) shows that the largely overlapping introductions of HomU 55 (the so-called “Macarius homily,” ed. Sauer 1978 pp 411–16) and HomU 9 (Vercelli Homily 4, ed. Scragg 1992 pp 90–100) translate much of the central section of De paenitentia, including the series of contrasts between this world and the next in the form “Hic ... ibi ...”. Wright prints the overlapping OE passages in parallel columns with the corresponding text from Fischer’s print of De paenitentia. The parallels indicate that the Macarius homily is a direct translation from the Latin, whereas HomU 9 is a composite homily that borrowed this passage from a lost earlier copy of HomU 55 (*HomU 55). The source discovery thus reversed scholarly assumptions that HomU 55 was an abbreviated version of HomU 9. The author of HomU 55 translates additional material from Ephraem that was not taken over in HomU 9. The Vercelli homilist, for his part, expanded on what he did take over from *HomU 55 by adding further contrasts of his own in the form “her bið ... þær bið,” as well as short elaborative clauses to several of the contrasts derived indirectly from Ephraem via *HomU 55. (Scragg 1999, following up on an earlier conference paper by Wright, pursues the stylistic implications of this source discovery, focusing on the Vercelli homilist’s use of doublets.) One brief sequence in HomU 9 that is paralleled in Ephraem but not in HomU 55 must therefore have accidentally dropped out in the late surviving copy of HomU 55, since, as Pattie (1987 p 7) says of the Latin, “the frequency of rhetorical repetition, especially in lines 142–46 [referring to the “Hic ... ibi” sequence] makes the text particularly vulnerable to omission by haplography.” Ironically, in Wright 2002, after the proofs had been passed by the author, seven lines of explanation concerning this omission (along with an associated footnote) were omitted at the top of p 229 by a gremlin with a metadiscursive sense of humor. That page should begin:

makes the text challenging to copy intact without omission. Rather than indicating some independent knowledge of the Latin source by the Vercelli homilist, then, these readings are consistent with the assumption that the Vercelli homilist was working with an earlier version of the Macarius homily which preserved a slightly fuller text than the one which survives in the late Corpus Christi manuscript.44

Footnote 44 should read:
Sauer (*Theodulfi Capitula*, p 468) suggests that the reading *widnode* in the Macarius homily (line 12) may be a corruption of *geniðerode*. Or does *widnode* (for *witrirode*) reflect a Latin version that agreed with a Greek variant noted by Pattie, “punishment” for “the unsleeping worm” (“Ephrem’s ‘On Repentance’,” p. 179)?

Although a corrected printing was belatedly issued, its copyright page was not changed and the electronic version of the book subsequently issued <https://hdl.handle.net/2027/heb.08908> was of the uncorrected printing.

Wright (p 230) notes two readings in which the manuscript of *De paenitentia* used by the author of *HomU* 55 appears to have been related to the common ancestor of the English family of manuscripts and of London, BL, Harley 3068 and Munich, BSB, Clm 11349. At lines 46–47, the sentence “Arisað, and geseoð þone micclan and þone andrisnlican cyning!” translates a sentence lacking in Fischer’s text but found in the English family as well as in BL Harley 3068 and Munich Clm 11349 (“Surgite, uidete regem magnum et mirabilem”). At line 9, “syngale” corresponds to “iugis” in Harley 3068 and Clm 11349 (as well as in Fischer’s text), a reading omitted in the English family. Now that more early manuscripts of *De paenitentia* (though not CUL Ee.1.23) have been digitized, it may be possible to reconstruct more closely the textual form of the Latin source that the OE homilist was translating.

The author of *HomU* 55 left untranslated the opening section of *De paenitentia* with its extended imagery of Christ as a doctor to whom the sinner must reveal his wounds and apply the remedy of tears (a passage that seems to have influenced Bede, see Quots/Cits 1 below). He also left untranslated the conclusion of the sermon with its description of the saints being snatched up into the clouds and into heaven and Ephraem’s first-person prayer for forgiveness. Within the central section of the sermon that he does translate, the homilist skips over a number of sentences and a couple of longer passages. In general he omits passages involving first-person address or extended metaphor, such as the allusion to the parable of the talents and the need to repay the soul’s debts, as well as the description of the wedding invitation, from which he retains only a brief allusion to Christ as a bridegroom. Otherwise, what he does translate is for the most part rendered rather closely, with occasional minor compression (a few short “Hic ... ibi” contrasts are skipped over) or expansion (at lines 23–24, for example, the homilist introduces references to almsgiving that are lacking in Ephraem). At lines 38–42, just after a transposed clause (based on Ephraem, but moved forward) stating that “our gold and silver will not assist us,” the homilist expands on what Ephraem says gold and silver won’t assist with (the unextinguishable fire), elaborating on the image of the “undying worm” with several clauses that are not present in Fischer’s text of Ephraem.

At lines 27–29, the homilist adapts Ephraem’s formulation of the popular motif “no aid from kin”:

> Ne mæg þær þonne gefultmian se fæder þæm suna, ne se suna þæm fæder, ac sceal þonne anra gehwilc æfter his agenum gewyrhtum beon demed.
Non liberat frater proprium fratrem, nec iterum pater filium suum, sed unusquisque stabit in ordine suo tam in vita quam in incendio (ed. Fischer, fol. 14rb/19–21).

In relation to the motif’s multiple OE reflexes (first analyzed by Lendinara 2002), P. S. Langeslag (2014 and 2015) defines it as “(1) one kinsman being unable or unwilling to help another in (2) an eschatological setting referenced by way of (3) a deictic word or phrase [such as] the locative adverb per” (2015 p 1; for Middle High German examples see Langeslag 2014 pp 45–47). As Langeslag (2014 pp 39–42; see also Lendinara p 73) shows, HomU 55 blends Ephraem’s formulation with a variant found in PSEUDO-ISIDORE, HOMILIAE 3 (CPPM IB.5306): “Ibi non adjuvat pater ad filium, nec filius ad patrem; ibi non invenitur amicus qui redimat amicum, neque frater qui succurrat fratri” (ed. PL 83.1224B; Langeslag also quotes variant texts of the sermon from manuscript sources). Langeslag notes that the OE verb (ne mæg ...) gefultumian in HomU 55 (as well as helpan in Vercelli 4) corresponds to Pseudo-Isidore’s adjuvat rather than to Ephraem’s liberabit (another analogue in PSEUDO-AUGUSTINE, SERMONES AD FRATRES IN EREMO 68 [CPPM IA.1195; ed. PL 40.1355] uses liberabit and fidejubebit). Langeslag further notes that HomU 55 echoes Pseudo-Isidore in its chiastic father/son—son/father pairs without a brother/brother pair. Pseudo-Isidore also affords parallels for some material in HomU 55 that closely follows the passage derived from Ephraem (see Langeslag 2014 pp 41–42). Langeslag concludes that the author of HomU 55 must have consulted manuscript copies of both De paenitentia and Pseudo-Isidore Homily 3. The homilist also departs from Ephraem’s wording in the second clause by echoing biblical verses such as Rom 2:6 (“qui reddet unicuique secundum opera eius”; see Lendinara p 68 n 3).

A group of OE homilies that derive the “no aid from kin” from HomU 55 are discussed below under Quots/Cits, and Quots/Cits 3–4 will therefore be taken up before the unrelated Quots/Cits 1–2.

Quots/Cits. Langeslag (2015 pp 4–10) identifies a “Macarius group” of OE homilies that all depend (directly or indirectly) on *HomU 55, and thus ultimately on Ephraem, for the “no aid from kin” motif. In addition to Vercelli 4 (HomU 9, with its variant text in Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 41), which depends directly on *HomU 55 for the extended introductory passage, two further OE homilies depend on an ancestor of the CCCC 41 variant of HomU 9, through an ancestor of HomU 27 (B3.4.27, Napier Homily XXX): HomS 41 (B3.2.41, Bazire-Cross Homily 7; ed. Bazire and Cross 1982, p 95, lines 25–28); and HomU 27 (ed. Napier 1883 p 149, lines 127–31). Another, HomM 8 (B3.5.8, Fadda Homily VII; ed. Luiselli Fadda 1977 p 149, lines 58–62), depends on the same ancestor of HomU 27, but also draws on elements from Pseudo-Isidore Homily 3 (Langeslag 2015 pp 11–12). Because the dependence on De paenitentia in these last three OE homilies is mediated through other OE homilies and limited to the “no aid from kin” motif, they have not been included in the headnote as Quots/Cits.

Quots/Cits 3–4. A fifth homily of the Macarius group, Bazire-Cross 3 (ed. Bazire and Cross 1982 pp 47–54), is included in the headnote because Langeslag (2015 pp 8–10) argues that the homilist was familiar with Ephraem’s De paenitentia as well as with an ancestor of HomU 27. Both HomS 44 and HomS 33 are copies of Bazire-Cross Homily 3: Bazire and Cross edited it using HomS 44 as their base text, with variants from HomS 33, while Förster (1913 pp 128–37 [= pp 112–21 of the Sonderabdruck]) edited HomS 33 separately. In Bazire-Cross 3 the “no aid
from kin” motif occurs twice. In the first passage (Quot/Cits 3), the homilist draws from Ephraem the brother/brother pair and also echoes Ephraem’s statement that “gold and silver” will not aid anyone in his statement that “treasure” and “worldly possessions” will not aid anyone. In the second passage (Quots/Cits 4), the homilist follows the formulation of the Macarius group closely but echoes Ephraem by placing it in an infernal context (the Macarius group and almost all other OE attestations place it in a Doomsday context). Indirectly dependent upon Bazire-Cross 3 are several homilies by WULFSTAN: WHom 3 (B2.1.3; ed. Bethurum 1957 p 125, lines 54–55); WHom 5 (B2.1.5, ed. Bethurum p 140, lines 98–100); and WHom 20.1 (Sermo Lupi) (B2.4.2A, ed. Bethurum p 257, lines 56–61), as well as two anonymous homilies based on Sermo Lupi: HomU 25 (B3.4.25, Napier Homily XXVII; ed. Napier 1883 p 128, lines 10–13) and HomU 49 (B.3.4.49, Napier Homily LX; ed. Napier p 310, lines 7–9). For these see Langeslag (2015 pp 12–13).

The fact that Bazire-Cross 3 also draws on some form of De die iudicii (see that subentry, Quots/Cits 1–2) suggests that the homilist may have had access to a manuscript containing the Ephraemic Paruum corpus as a group. If so, these sermons were available at an Anglian center sometime in the first half of the tenth century, the probable date of the homily (see Langeslag 2015 p 7; for the Anglian dialect features see Fulk 2008 pp 86 and 90, who analyzes HomS 44 and HomS 33 separately). It is possible, however, that the homilist was translating a Latin homily that had already combined the material from Ephraem.

Quots/Cits 1. Lendinara (2001 pp 320–21) suggests that the Versus de die iudicii attributed to Bede draws on Ephraem’s De paenitentia for the metaphor of Christ as doctor (medicus) and the healing power of tears against the wounds of sin. (For the Latin poem see now the edition by Lapidge 2019, who supports Bede’s authorship, as well as the discussion by G. Brown and Biggs 2017 pp 207–16.) Lendinara contrasts Ephraem’s image of Christ as a compassionate doctor whom the sinner need not fear, and whose cures do not cause pain, with the way the Christus medicus image is articulated in most Western sources (for which she cites Arbesmann 1954; cf. Sims-Williams 1985 pp 213–14). Lendinara does not compare specific passages, but the most pertinent lines (23–25 and 33, ed. Lapidge pp 160/162) in Versus de die iudicii read:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{uulnera cum lacrimis medico reserare superno,} \\
\text{qui solet allisos sanare et soluere uinctos ...} \\
\text{Cur, rogo, mens, tardas medico te pandere totam?}
\end{align*}
\]

These lines occur within a larger sequence in which the speaker implores sinners to weep for their sins. What is distinctive is not simply the combination of the image of Christus medicus with the cure of tears, but the idea that the cure can be effected only if the sinner will reveal his wounds to the doctor, as Ephraem (fol. 13va/24–26) states:

\[
\text{Quare tu de occultis negligis et incuriosus existis, nolens ostendere medico uulnera tua ut sanat ea?}
\]

While there are no specific verbal parallels beyond the key words uulnera, medicus, and the verb sanare (as well as the synonymous terms ostendere and pandere), the image in Ephraem also occurs in conjunction with exhortations to tears as cure for the wounds. The similarity of idea is
therefore sufficiently complex and sufficiently distinctive to regard Ephraem’s *De paenitentia* as a likely source for the Latin poem, perhaps at one or more removes. Lapidge, however, references Lendinara’s essay but suggests (p 161, note to line 23) an alternative source

**PAULINUS OF NOLA, CARMINA** 20.268–69, which refers to faith as medicine and Christ as doctor, but not to tears and revealing wounds. As Di Sciacca (2008 p 164) points out, the image of *Christus medicus* does occur in conjunction with exhortations to penitential tears in Isidore of Seville’s *Synonyma*, though Isidore does not stress the necessity of revealing one’s wounds. If the *Versus de die iudicii* is indeed by Bede, and if this imagery is indeed drawn from Ephraem’s *De paenitentia*, then that work was already in circulation in England by the early eighth century, and the most likely avenue for its transmission at that early date would have been Theodore’s Canterbury school (see p 4 above).

Lendinara (2001 pp 316–19) also suggests that **ALCUIN** was influenced by Bede’s *Versus de die iudicii* in letters that employ the image of a *medicus* and urge penitential tears (**EPISTOLAE**, ed. **MGH ECA** 1: *Epist.* 131, 195.23–27 and 198.5–6; *Epist.* 138, 217.1–4, 28–29; and *Epist.* 293, 450.34–35). In Alcuin’s letters, however, the *medicus* is the confessor, to whom those spiritually sick should reveal their wounds, and confession itself is the medicine, though Alcuin does also refer to the tears of penitence. This may well be an Alcuinian adaptation of the Ephraem image of *Christus medicus* as mediated by the *Versus de die iudicii*.

*Versus de die iudicii* is also the immediate source for the image of Christ as doctor and the imperative of tears as a cure for sins in the OE poem *Judgment Day II* (see pp 8–9 above). Any Ephraemian influence, however, was again presumably mediated through Bede’s Latin poem.

**Quots/Cits** 2. Sims-Williams (1985 pp 224–26; see also Sims-Williams 1990 pp 303–04) identifies a prayer in the **HARLEY PRAYERBOOK** (London, BL, Harley 7653 [saec. viii/x or ixin, Mercia]; **CLA** 2.204; **ASM** 443: see **LITURGY: PRAYERS; Trial Version** p 139) as an extract from the conclusion of *De paenitentia*, which is another pattern prayer that employs a characteristically Ephraemic honorific for God as “solus sine peccato.” Sims-Williams (1985 p 225) quotes the relevant passage from BL Harley 3060, fol. 135r. The same prayer is transmitted as the first of nine prayers attributed to Ephraem in the Tours prayerbook (Troyes, Bibliothèque Municipale, 1742, ca. 805; Bischoff, *Katalog* 3.386, no. 6276) and in several other Continental prayerbooks (see Sims-Williams p 225 and n 87). In the Harley Prayerbook it has been imperfectly converted for use by a woman (see also M. Brown 1996 p 58). As with Cerne Prayer 45 (see below, p 31), whether this prayer was extracted in England or imported there is unknown, so it too is listed in the headnote with a question mark.

**Ephraem Latinus**, Paruum corpus sermonum, 4. *De luctamine spirituali* [**EPHRAEM.LAT.serm.luct.**] (**CPL** 1143iv; **CPG** 4081 [Latin text]; 3920, 3935/2b, 4002 [Greek texts]; **RGAEL** 1.461 [**EPH** luct]).

Ed. Fischer, fols. 14vb/29–16ra/47.

**MSS**
1. Cambridge, University Library, Ee.1.23 (**ASM** 2.8).
The sermon is sometimes titled De luctaminibus. It begins with the image of the world as an athletic arena (scamma) in which we must fight spiritually in order to be crowned. Ephraem admonishes his brethren to avoid drunkenness, citing the examples of Noah and Lot, and to keep the temple of the body clean. He exhorts them to follow the example of the saints, to cultivate prayer and continence. The gate of Paradise and “our mother Jerusalem” both beckon to them with brief speeches. Christ’s free gifts to humanity, reversing its sinful condition, are described in an extended series. After a warning against detraction, the sermon concludes with a lengthy pattern prayer.

The following three subentries cover De die iudicii and two distinct manuscript versions of the work.

**Ephraem Latinus**, Paruum corpus sermonum, 5. De die iudicii [EPHRAEM.LAT.serm.iud.]. (CPL 1143v; CPG 3940; RGAEL 1.461 [EPH iud]).

Ed. Fischer, fols. 16rb/50.

**MSS**

1. Cambridge, University Library, Ee.1.23 (ASM 2.8).
3. Salisbury, Cathedral Library, 9 (excerpted version 5a: see separate subentry below).
4. ?Vatican City, BAV, Pal. lat. 556 (abbreviated version 5b: see separate subentry below).

**Lists**

none.

**Vers**

LibSc (C15): see below.

**Quots/Cits**

1. EPHRAEM.LAT.serm.iud., fol. 16rb/50–16va/11: HomS 33/44 (B3.2.33 and B3.2.44, Bazire-Cross Homily 3), 102–07 and 110–11, 113: see below.
2. EPHRAEM.LAT.serm.iud., fol. 16va/13–16: HomS 33/44 (B3.2.33 and B3.2.44, Bazire-Cross Homily 3), 86–88: see below.

**Refs**

LibSc (C15): see below.
The corresponding Greek text is in Assemani 2.50–55f (CPG 3940). Iliadiou (1975–76 pp 362–63) edits part of the Latin sermon from St. Omer, Bibliothèque de l’agglomération, 33bis [saec. ix¹/₄, Northern France; Bischoff, Katalog 3.285, no. 5397] <https://bibliotheque-numerique.bibliotheque-agglo-stomer.fr/viewer/18360>. Haines (1998 p 267) edits the passage with the Doomsday speech of Christ from Salisbury 9 and Salisbury 131 (for the latter manuscript, see p 6 above). For an English translation of Fischer’s text see Calder and Allen (1976 pp 86–93). See the following subentries for abbreviated Latin versions and excerpts (5a and 5b). Two passages from De die iudicii (including the speech of Christ, see below) are incorporated in PSEUDO-EPHRAEM, DICTA SANCTI EFFREM I (CPG 4090a; CPL 1145; RGAEL 1.462 [PS-EPH di]). See O’Sullivan (2011 p 47 n 173, p 188 n 86, and p 331), who refers to the abbreviated version of De die iudicii in Pal. lat. 556, for which see the following subentry. The corresponding passages in Fischer are as follows:


In De die iudicii “Effrem” names himself as a sinner and beseeches his fratres to heed his counsel about the Day of Judgment, when everyone’s thoughts, words, and deeds will be revealed (the Latin passage is quoted by Sims-Williams 1978 p 81). He then describes the procession of different classes of persons who will bear the metaphorical “fruits” of their deeds before Christ, beginning with martyrs and ending with sinners, whose fruit is rotten and withered (see Quots/Cits 1). In a dramatic monologue, Christ reproaches humanity, reminding them of all that he suffered for them and asking what they have suffered for him in return (on this speech, an early example of the Improperia tradition and similar to the Ego te, homo speech of Christ in CAESARIUS OF ARLES, SERMO 57, see Haines 1998 pp 136–40 and 268; O’Sullivan 2011 p 188). Ephraem then leads the brethren in a lengthy pattern prayer asking for forgiveness and illumination. Next he addresses the auditor or reader as “man,” bidding him to pray and weep, and describing the sweetness of God’s love, a “soft chain” that cannot be cut with a two-edged sword. Addressing the brethren once again, he warns of the Last Judgment and commends to them the spiritual benefits of compunction and of tears, which water the fruitful trees of the soul’s virtues. He closes by castigating himself as a sinner without compunction and afraid of Judgment, asking the brethren to pray for him.

OE Vers and Refs. The quotations from De die iudicii in Defensor’s Liber scintillarum and the OE glossed version (see p 9 above) are as follows:

2. EPHRAEM.LAT.serm.iud., ed. Assemani 2.55de, 3.581b col. 2; cf. Fischer, fol. 7vb/20–22 > DEFENSOR.Lib.scint. VI.vii [attributed to Augustine], ed. Rochais 1.120, 1–2 [= CCSL 117.25, 18–19]: LibSc 52.21–22–53.2.
3. ?DEFENSOR.Lib.scint. VI.viii [attributed to Augustine], ed. Rochais 1.120, lines 3–4 [= CCSL 117.25, 20–21]: LibSc 53.1–4. [Unidentified.]

Quots/Cits 1. J. E. Cross (Preface to Bazire and Cross 1989 p viii) suggests that a passage in the Rogationtide homily Bazire-Cross Homily 3 (HomS 33/44, ed. Bazire and Cross 1988 pp 47–54) derives ultimately from Ephraem’s De die iudicii. The passage also occurs in the abbreviated version in Vatican Pal. lat. 556; it is skipped over in the second abbreviated version in Salisbury 9 (see the following two subentries). Since Cross does not compare the OE and Latin passages in detail, they are reproduced below, with Fischer’s text of De die iudicii as well as a divergent text in Vatican City, BAV, Pal. lat. 430 (saec. ix 2/2, Southern Germany; Bischoff, Katalog 3.413, no. 6530), fol. 182v <https://digi.vatlib.it/view/MSS_Pal.lat.430>. Verbal equivalents are highlighted in bold font; two readings in which Bazire-Cross 3 agrees more closely with the text in Pal. lat. 430 are highlighted in bold italics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bazire-Cross 3</th>
<th>Ephraem, De die iudicii (ed. Fischer)</th>
<th>Vatican City, BAV, Pal. lat. 430, fol. 182v</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Þonne sófaste and gecorene men fordóðærð heora wurca hysumnysse</td>
<td>Sic in die illa terribili omnes homines quecumque in hoc seculo quasi in tempore suo occulte intrinsicus siue bona siue mala gesserunt, ibi quasi fructus proprio ante tribunal Domini proferent.</td>
<td>Sic et in illa die terribile producent singula corpora perfectum hominem, et omnia que egit bona aut mala portant singuli in conspectu throni terribilis et iusti iudicis Christi, opera sicut fructus et uerba que locuti sunt sicut folia. Iusti offerunt bonum fructum et delectabilem. Sancti baiolant fructum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunc iusti bonos et iucundos proferent fructus. Sancti similiter fructus suauissimos,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and Drihtnes halige martyres heora brawungas and þæra carcerenas, and manige earfoðu þe hi adrugon for Drihtnes naman.

Munecas bærað heora hyrsumynses and forwyrnedynes þyssa worulddícra þinga and heora þa singalan waeccan and þa drihtenlican bebodu and heora þa gastlican þeowdomes.

Læwede men, þa ðe her on worulde rihtlice heora lif libbað, hi bærað heora ælmysdæda and hlutter lif and claene on ansyne þæs heahstan Scyppendes; and þonne cwýð se eca Cyning to ðam godum, “Cume ge geblètsode.” [Mt. 25:34]

Þonne þa arleasan and þa synfullan hi bærað nearowne wæstm and sceandfulne on ansyne þæs hehstan Scyppendes; þonne cwýð se heofena Cyning, “Fare ge fram me, awyrgede, on þæs æcan susle hellegrundes.” [Mt. 25:41]

And hi þonne ahwyrfæð fram haligra manna dreame and swiðe heofigende hellewitu secæda ...
from St. Omer 33bis, fol. 92v, but there are no significant variants.) The parallels in Bazire-Cross 3 specifically with Pal. lat. 430 are slight, but do indicate that some of the divergences from Fischer’s text of De die iudicii in the Old English reflect variations in Latin transmission of the sermon. In default of a critical edition, only an extensive collation with other Latin manuscripts of the sermon might clarify to what extent the apparent modifications are due to the vernacular homilist.

Bullough (2002 p 76 n 18) cites this same passage as a possible model for a passage in ALCUIN’s EPISTOLA 39 (ed. MGH ECA 1, p 113, lines 20–22) that refers to eternal life as the “harvest of blossoms” (florum fructus), a metaphor for a person’s virtues. The image seems too general, however, to tie specifically to Ephraem’s description of classes of individuals bearing the “fruits” of their virtues.

Quot/Cits 2. A closely following passage in Die die iudicii (included in the abbreviated version in Salisbury 9) is also a possible source for an earlier list in Bazire-Cross 3 of the hosts standing by Christ at the Last Judgment (see Wright, forthcoming):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bazire-Cross 3</th>
<th>Ephraem, De die iudicii (ed. Fischer)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Þær ætstandað þusend þusend engla</td>
<td>Ibi assistunt [adstant, Pal. lat. 430] mília mília et decies dena mília angelorum, [+ et archangelorum, Vat. lat. 556; et innumerabilis multitudo archangelorum, Pal. lat. 430] Cherubin et Seraphin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and micel mægen heahengla</td>
<td>Et ibi iustorum chori circumstant, patriarcharum, prophetarum, apostolorum, et martyrum, et omnium omnino sanctorum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and ealle halige</td>
<td>Ibi assistunt [adstant, Pal. lat. 430] mília mília et decies dena mília angelorum, [+ et archangelorum, Vat. lat. 556; et innumerabilis multitudo archangelorum, Pal. lat. 430] Cherubin et Seraphin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and soðfæste Godes witegan and heahfæderas apostolas.</td>
<td>Et ibi iustorum chori circumstant, patriarcharum, prophetarum, apostolorum, et martyrum, et omnium omnino sanctorum.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is commonplace for Christ to be described as coming to Judgment accompanied not only by angels (Mt. 16:27 par.), but also by other orders of holy persons (the twenty-four elders of Apoc 4:4 were usually understood to be the twelve apostles and twelve prophets or patriarchs). Ultimate biblical source for both passages are Dan 7:10 (“milia milium ministrabant ei et decies
milies centena milia adsistebant ei”) and Apoc 5:11 (“et vidi et audivi vocem angelorum multorum in circuitu throni et animalium et seniorum et erat numerus eorum milia milium”). Nonetheless, the full cast as credited in Bazire-Cross 3 agrees with Ephraem particularly closely, except for Ephraem’s specification of Cherubin and Seraphim and his inclusion of martyrs. (Fischer’s text omits the words et archangelorum, but the abbreviated version of De die iudicii in Vat. lat. 556 as well as the antiphon version cited below both include them.) The Latin suggests that sodfäste (= iustorum chori) should be followed by a comma and taken substantively, parallel with halige (the punctuation in Bazire and Cross implies that it is an adjective modifying Godes witegan). Since the homilist also seems to have drawn on Ephraem’s sermon for his description of different groups bearing their deeds before God, it seems likely that Ephraem is also his source for this passage, although in this case the passage in question was excerpted in an antiphon, CAO 2042 (“Cum venerimus ante conspectum Domini in die iudicii ubi assistunt milia millium et decies centena milia angelorum, archangelorum, cherubim et seraphim, ibi sanctorum chori circumsanctant, patriarcharum, prophetarum, apostolorum et martyrum, et omnia agmina sanctorum ...”; ed. Hesbert 1963–79 3.128). CAO 2042 is attested for use in Letania and Ad processionem; the nearly identical antiphon CAO 233 is attested for use at Rogationtide (Ad reliquias portandas) in a Continental manuscript, Angers, Bibliothèque Municipale 91 (83) (s. x, ?St-Pierre d’Angers), fol. 149v; see the digital facsimile at Bibliothèque virtuelle des manuscrits médiévaux <https://bvmm.irht.cnrs.fr/iiif/1058/canvas/canvas-370534/view>. The English Cosin Gradual (Durham, University Library, Cosin V.v.6 [saec. xi\textsuperscript{e}, Durham]; see LITURGY: GRADUALS; Hartzell 1995 pp 36–37) and the St. Alban’s Processional (Oxford, Bodleian Library, Laud Misc. 4 [saec. xii\textsuperscript{3/4}] both rubricate “Cum venerimus” as a processional antiphon for the period from Epiphany to Septuagesima (see Hartzell 2006 pp 179 and 467 respectively). The homilist might therefore have known it as part of the liturgy for Rogationtide, or simply as a processional antiphon. The passage also occurs in closely similar form in Recension 2 of the APOCALYPSE OF PSEUDO-METHODIUS (ed. Prinz 1985 pp 16–17): see APOCRYPHA.

**Ephraem Latinus**, Paruum corpus sermonum, 5a. De die iudicii, versio abbreuiata [EPHRAEM.LAT.serm.iud.abbreu.(Pal.lat.556)] (cf. CPL 1143v; CPG 4089; RGAEL 1.462 [EPH iud]).


**MSS**

1. ?Vatican City, BAV, Pal. lat. 556: see below.

For the primary recension of De die iudicii see the preceding subentry. This abbreviated version (inc.: “Obsecro uos fratres charissimi”) omits the following passages in Fischer:

1. fol. 16rb/12–24 (“Venite dilectissimi fratres ... sua salute facere noluerunt”).
2. fol. 16vb/36–43 (“Hoc ipsum gratie sue doctus sum ... lumine incomprehensiibile”).
3. fols. 16vb/47–17ra/5 (“Assimilata est enim mens nostra ... predicaret et crederet”).
4. fol. 17ra/8–12 (“Nam si procul est ... accesserit fuerit purior”).
5. fol. 17rb/6–9 (“Si quis itaque sincere diligit ... charitate Dei perfruitur”).
The text of *De die iudicii* that Pal. lat. 556 does include agrees rather closely with Fischer’s text. For the passages also found in the *Dicta Sancti Effrem I*, see the preceding subentry.

*MSS* 1. Pal. lat. 556 (<https://bibliotheca-laureshamensis-digital.de/bav/bav_pal_lat_556>) was written in Insular script in the early ninth century in a “German-Anglo-Saxon area” according to Bischoff (1989 pp 57, 82, and 124–25; *Katalog* 3.414, no. 6540). Spilling (1982 p 170; see also Hoffmann 2001 p 32 n 101) identifies the main hand as that of the Fulda scholar Brun Candidus (d. 845). The manuscript transmits a florilegium including copies of rare material that must have been available in early medieval England. Close parallels with Old English and early Middle English vernacular homilies have been cited by Bazire and Cross (1989 p viii: *HomS* 31 [B3.2.31, Bazire-Cross Homily 3]); by Wack and Wright (1991 pp 196–99: *HomM* 5 [B3.5.5, Fadda Homily I], see ECHOE 336.06); by Wright (2010: *HomM*5); and by Pelle (2014 pp 50–52: Lambeth Homily III). See also O’Sullivan (2011 pp 35–46) for material shared with another florilegium deriving from the Continental English missions, surviving in Vatican City, BAV, Pal. lat. 220 (saec. ix¹, middle or upper Rhine region; Bischoff, *Katalog* 3.410, no. 6493; digital facsimile at <https://bibliotheca-laureshamensis-digital.de/bav/bav_pal_lat_220>) and two other manuscripts (see also Hawk 2018 pp 40–47).

**Ephraem Latinus, Paruum corpus sermonum, 5b. De die iudicii, uersio excerpta**

[EPHRAEM.LAT.serm.iud.excerp.(Salisb.9)] (cf. *CPL* 1143v; *CPG* 3940; *RGAEL* 1.462 [EPH iud]).

*MSS*


*List—Refs*

none.

*MSS* 1. Salisbury 9, dating from the end of the eleventh century, has only a brief set of excerpts (written continuously) from *De die iudicii* (not listed among the contents in *ASM*; cf. T. Webber 1992 p 161). The excerpts are as follows (information from Thomas N. Hall):

fol. 72r/1–9 (“Dicta beati Effrem diaconi de die iudicii. Venite benedicti atque dilectissimi fratres exhortationem meam suscepite ... facere nolerunt”) = Fischer, fol. 16rb/1–24;

fol. 72r/10–17 (“Nec qu(id)qua(m) nobis prodest [sic: prodesse Fischer] potest ... et tenebris gesta sunt”) [= Fischer, fol. 16rb/29–42, with omission of the words “contremiscat et lamentetur ac,” fol. 16rb/27–28];
fol. 72r/17–38: (“Tremendum est O dilectissi[mi] fratres ... uoluntatem uestram solummodo quesu[i]”) = Fischer, fol. 16va/11–16 [ll. 17–20 are an added chapter heading], 21–49;

fol. 72r/38–72v/4: (“Di(cit[e mihi peccatores] / et mortales ... luctus et tenebre”) = Fischer, fol. 16va/50–16vb/6 [ll. 7–9 are an added chapter heading];

fol. 72v/4–7: (“Venite ergo dilectissimi adoremus ... sumus ingrati”) = Fischer, fol. 16vb/11–15;

fol. 72v/7–10: (“Adtende ti´bi´metipsi frater ... ingrediaris in paradisum celeste”) = Fischer, fol. 17r/23–28;

fol. 72v/10–12 (“Quod [.....] prestare dignetur ... in omnia secula seculorum amen”). [Added benediction, not in Fischer].

**Ephraem Latinus**, Paruum corpus sermonum, 6. De compunctione cordis

[EPHRAEM.LAT.serm.cor.] (*CPL* 1143vi; *CPG* 3909, 39681; *RGAEL* 1.461 [EPH cor]).

Ed. Fischer, fols. 2ra/9–10va/50.

**MSS**
1. Cambridge, University Library, Ee.1.23 (*ASM* 2.8).

**Lists**
none.

**Vers**
1. EPHRAEM.Lat.serm.cor., fol. 2ra/9–12: OccGl 64 (Ker); C64, 341.16–18.
2. EPHRAEM.Lat.serm.cor., fol. 5ra/6–7: OccGl 64 (Ker); C64, 341.20–21.
3. ?EPHRAEM.Lat.serm.cor.: Scrib 3.45 (Ker); B27.3.45, NRK p 577.
4. LibSc (C15): see below.

**Quots/Cits**
5. ?EPHRAEM.LAT.serm.cor., fol. 3ra/43–46: HomS 46 (Blickling Homily 11), 117.31–34: see below.

Refs
LibSc (C15): see below.

In the manuscripts De compunctione cordis was often divided into two books, the first ending “Exaudi Domine orationem serui tui qui es super omnia benedictus in secula seculorum, Amen [= Fischer, fol. 9ra/15], the second beginning “Veni charissimi mihi” [= Fischer, fol. 9ra/25]. In modern scholarship De compunctione cordis is sometimes called “Sermo Asceticus” (Assemani’s editorial title; in the present subentry this title will be used only to refer to the Greek text). In manuscripts the titles Ammonitio, Monita, and Institutio ad monachos also occur for book 2. An addition to book 2 in Berlin, Staatsbibliothek Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Theol. fol. 355 (saec. ix 2/3, France; Bischoff, Katalog 1,97, no. 459), fols. 32r–35r, edited by D. Hemmerdinger-Iliadou and P. L. Bailly in PLS 4.641–48, is a cento from GREGORY THE GREAT, HOMILIAE IN EVANGELIA (CPL 1151a; for other manuscripts see the Mirabile Database <https://www.mirabileweb.it/title/cento-ex-sancti-gregorii-homilis-in-evangelia-title/170122>). The first book sometimes circulated separately, as in Lambeth Palace 204 (partial) and Rouen BM 1385 (see MSS below).

The Greek text of book 1 (Recension B) is in Assemani 1.40b/1–66a/2 (= CPG 3909; doubles are itemized in Hemmerdinger-Iliadou 1958 p 372); book 2 is in Assemani 2.370–73b + 1.67d/5–68f/3 + 2.374e/6–375f/4 (= CPG 3968 + 3909 + 3968). Suh (2000 pp 452–515) provides a study of the Sermo Asceticus and a critical text of Recension A. Because Suh judges the second part of the Sermo Asceticus called “Admonition to a Monk” to be a later addition, he excludes it from his text. According to Suh (pp 230–31), the Sermo Asceticus makes brief use of only two authentic (Syriac) Ephraemic sermons “On Reproof” as well as two Syriac hymns that are no longer regarded as authentic. For the sermons see Beck 1970 1.1–12 (Sermon 1–1), with German translation at 2.1–17; and 1.12–49 (Sermon 1–2), with German translation at 2.17–65; for English translations of both sermons see Scott (2020 pp 139–263). Suh (pp 299–300) dates the Sermo Asceticus to the early sixth century; it was translated into Latin sometime in the same century, as a copy of the Latin version survives in a manuscript dating to the late sixth or early seventh century.

Pena (2001) provides a detailed textual study of De compunctione cordis, focusing on its techniques of translation from the Greek. He distinguishes two main families among the manuscripts he collated (pp 79 and 82), but these do not include any of the manuscripts listed in the headnote. For the early manuscript Paris, BnF lat. 13440 (before 816, prov. Corbie; Bischoff, Katalog 3.210, no. 4926) see Schmitz (2012; reference from David Ganz).
De compunctione cordis is too long and diffuse to summarize concisely, but several characteristically “Ephraemic” themes recur, including exhortations to tears, descriptions of the Last Judgment, and imagery of the wedding feast, along with a wealth of other metaphors. Specifically monastic virtues and the monastic way of life are extolled, especially in the second book, which includes a lengthy list of the “glories” of the monk. The deity is frequently addressed as amator hominum (benignissime).

MSS 3. Lambeth Palace 204, dating from the first half of the eleventh century, has only the first six chapters of book 1 (fol. 119v/12–129v/19, cf. Sims-Williams 1985 p 224; the reference to Assemani’s text in Bremmer and Dekker [ASMMF 21 p 106] implies that the text is complete). The correspondences with Fischer are as follows: begins “Dolor me compellit dicere ...” [= Fischer, fol. 2ra/9]; ends “et inferno sortem ex eis pro suis meritis susceperunt” [= Fischer, fol. 5va/46]. As Bremmer and Dekker (ASMMF 21 p 101) point out, this (partial) copy of De compunctione is “the only text attributed to Ephraem the Syrian appearing in an A-S manuscript before the Conquest.” In the manuscript the text is headed “LIBER BEATI EFREM DIACONI QUI PRIMUS SEDIT IN LIBRO GERENTICON.” Bremmer and Dekker identify this as a reference to the LIBER GERONTECUM DE OCTO PRINCIPALIBUS VITIS by Paschasius of Duma (BHL 6531 = VITAS PATRUM book 7). It is unclear what this heading means, but presumably the two works were combined in an exemplar. The manuscript’s provenance is Ely, but its place of origin seems to have been Christ Church, Canterbury. For the brief OE glosses to the text, see OE Vers 1 below.

MSS 4. The Nürnberg manuscript was written ca. 800 in Anglo-Saxon script “presumably in Germany” (CLA), in the Main region according to Bernhard Bischoff, as reported by Hilg (1983 p 91). The contents are listed as an unidentified homiliarium by Lapidge (ASL p 161, no. 58), but as books 1–2 of De compunctione cordis by Ganz (1999 p 44). The manuscript, a fragment of eight folios, contains only parts of book 1 and the opening paragraphs of book 2 (beginning “Beatus ille qui cum gustauerit” [= Fischer, fol. 4v/26]; ending “Adtendite uobis ne quis emenda[tiorem] ...” [= Fischer, fol. 9r/6]). The precise contents by folios (which are out of order) are analyzed by Hilg (p 92). There is a complete digital facsimile at the Germanisches Museum Digital Bibliothek <http://dlib.gnm.de/item/Hs7152>.

Bestul (1981 p 14) states that the addition of an “incomplete text of De compunctione cordis” in the first part of the composite manuscript Rouen, Bibliothèque Municipale, 1385 (U.107) (ASM 925; ASMMF 18.444, see p 111 for the Ephraem text) “may have been made on the Continent.” In fact there seems to be no evidence that this first part of the manuscript (fol. 1–19) or the second were ever in England, but were added in the eleventh century on the Continent. The other two parts date from the late tenth century and are from Winchester or Worcester (ASM 926) and Winchester, Old Minster (ASM 927), respectively.

Bullough (1991 p 213 n 29) also refers to the sententia sancti Effremi in Angers, Bibliothèque Municipale 279 (270) (saec. ix2/4, Western France; Bischoff, Katalog 1.20–21, no. 65), fol. 72rv, where it accompanies Alcuin’s two treatises on the Trinity. This sententia has been critically edited by Cancela Cilleruelo 2018b, who identifies it as an extract from De compunctione cordis (= Fischer, fol. 9vb/2–15, 21–39 [“Sicut adstans quis ante regem ... quasi frenum a uento transfertur”]; lines 16–20 are an added chapter heading in Fischer). The extract includes the
popular “Gloriatio monachi” sequence that was also excerpted by Smaragdus and Pseudo-Macarius (see p 2 above). Cancela Cilleruelo identifies two further manuscripts of this extract: an early one from Corbie (Düsseldorf, Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek, B.3 [saec. ix\(^{1/2}\); Bischoff, Katalog 1.229, no. 1062], fol. 293rv <http://digital.ub.uni-duesseldorf.de/ms/content/titleinfo/4506064>), and a late one from Germany (Vatican City, BAV, Ross. lat. 350 [saec. xv\(^{2/2}\)]; see Cancela Cilleruelo 2018a). There seems to be no basis for associating this extract with Alcuin.

OE Vers 1–2. The text of De compunctione cordis in Lambeth Palace 204 has two brief OE interlinear glosses by the same hand. See Scrugg (2012 p 62, Hand no. 770); DigiPal <http://www.digipal.eu/digipal/hands/910/); The Production and Use of English Manuscripts 1060 to 1220 <https://www.le.ac.uk/english/em1060to1220/mss/EM.Lamb.204.htm>. The first translates the incipit of the text (with the variant “Dolore me proloqui” for Fischer’s “Terrores me proloqui”); the second translates a brief phrase. Both are ed. by Ker (NRK), and by Bremmer and Dekker (ASMMF 21 p 106).

OE Vers 3. In the early twelfth-century manuscript Salisbury, Cathedral Library, 131 (see p 0 above), the OE scribble “ofer þæt oðer hus” occurs in the right margin of fol. 3r of De compunctione cordis. See also The Production and Use of English Manuscripts 1060 to 1220 <https://www.le.ac.uk/english/em1060to1220/mss/EM.SCL.131.htm> (where the text of the scribble is quoted inaccurately). Ker (1976 p 129) states that the scribble “has no relation to the text.” However, the text on that page does develop a metaphor of life as a journey from our earthly dwelling to the heavenly mansio (= Fischer, fol. 3rb/21–34), so it is possible that the scribble relates to this image.

OE Vers and Refs. The quotations from De compunctione cordis in Defensor’s Liber scintillarum and the OE glossed version (LibSc, ed. Getty 1969; see p 9 above) are as follows:

1. EPHRAEM.LAT.serm.cor., cf. Assemani 1.46c; Fischer, fol. 3va/50–51 > DEFENSOR.Lib.scint. XV.xxviii, ed. Rochais 1.246, 1–2 [= CCSL 117.72, 22–23]: LibSc 152.7–10.

Extracts 2–6 in Defensor are lacking in the OE version due to a lacuna in the manuscript:

[2. EPHRAEM.LAT.serm.cor., fol. 9va/26–28 > DEFENSOR.Lib.scint. XL.xxxvi, ed. Rochais 2.58, 5–7 [= CCSL 117.152, 7–9].

3. EPHRAEM.LAT.serm.cor., fol. 9va/30–33 > DEFENSOR.Lib.scint. XL.xxxvii, ed. Rochais 2.58, 8–10 [= CCSL 117.152, 10–12].

4. EPHRAEM.LAT.serm.cor., fol. 9vb/6–8 > DEFENSOR.Lib.scint. XL.xxxviii, ed. Rochais 2.58, 11–12 [= CCSL 117.152, 13–14].

5. EPHRAEM.LAT.serm.cor., fol. 9va/40–41 > DEFENSOR.Lib.scint. XL.xxxix, ed. Rochais 2.58, 13–14 [= CCSL 117.152, 15–16].

6. EPHRAEM.LAT.serm.cor., fol. 9va/41–43 > DEFENSOR.Lib.scint. XL.xi, ed. Rochais 2.58, 15–16 [= CCSL 117.152, 17–18].]

Quots/Cits 1. The incipit of PSEUDO-EGBERT, PENITENTIAL (ed. Schmitz 1883–1898), whose prologue was integrated into the Penitential of Pseudo-Bede (see Frantzen 1983) draws on two sentences in De compunctione cordis:

pseudo-Egbert:

Institutio illa sancta quae fiebat in diebus patrum nostrorum rectas vias numquam deseruit ...

De compunctione:

Nam institutio illa que fiebat in diebus patrum nostrorum qui in uniuerza terra quasi quedam luminaria refulerunt hec erat. ... Nostra autem institutio rectas deferens uias per prurupta et aspera incedit / itinera.

Murano (2008 p 90) notes the near identity of the pseudo-Egbert incipit with the first bolded phrase in De compunctione cordis in order to correct a misattribution to Egbert in a modern manuscript catalogue of a copy of the Ephraemic Paruum corpus in Arezzo, Biblioteca della Città di Arezzo, 312 (saec. xi3/4), whose text of De compunctione cordis begins with these words.

The English origin of the pseudo-Egbert penitential, which dates to the second half of the eighth century, is disputed. Its manuscript tradition is Continental, and Haggenmüller (1991 p 298 and 1992) argues that it was compiled at Lorsch. The earliest manuscript, Vatican City. BAV, Pal. lat. 554, fol. 5–13 (saec. viii(ix: CLA 1.95; ASM 911.5; ASL p 155; digital facsimile at <https://bibliotheca-laureshamensis-digital.de/bav/bav_pal_lat_554/>) may have been written in England or at Lorsch. There was a volume of works by “Effrem” (possibly the Paruum corpus) at Lorsch by 830x840, the date of the Lorsch library catalogue B (ed. Häse 2002 p 134 no. 162; cf. p 318). However, the surviving Lorsch manuscript Vatican City, BAV, Pal. lat. 186 (saec. viii(ix: Bischoff, Katalog 3.408, no. 6473) contains only the De paenitentia, followed by a lengthy pseudo-Ephraemic sermon (using material paralleled in Turin, Biblioteca Nazionale, G V 7 [saec. ix1, France; Bischoff, Katalog 3.389, no. 6301]; information from Stephen Pelle). See the description and facsimile at Bibliotheca Laureshamensis digital <https://www.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/digi-pdf-katalogisate/sammlung51/werk/pdf/bav_pal_lat_186.pdf>. Frantzen (1983 pp 584–86 and 591) and Meens (2014 pp 96–100) assert the possibility that the penitential was compiled in England. If so, the quotation from Ephraem would prove that De compunctione cordis, if not the entire Paruum corpus, was available in England by about the middle of the
eighth century. Even if the pseudo-Egbert penitential is Continental, the fact that its main sources—the Canones Theodori (see Canon Law Collections) and the Penitential of Cummean (see Penitentials)—are Insular suggests that the quotation from De compunctione cordis may also derive from an English source, conceivably from the school of Theodore.

Quots/Cits 2–3. Sims-Williams (1985 pp 210–24) shows that Ephraem’s De compunctione cordis is “the direct source” (p 224) for Prayer 45 (“Domine Deus meus et saluator meus”) in the Book of Cerne (Cambridge, University Library, Ll.1.10 [ca. 820x840, Mercia; ASM 28; ASMMF 7.107]; see Liturgy: Prayers; Trial Version pp 139–40). Indeed, almost the entire prayer is compiled from two separate passages in Ephraem. For consistency, in the headnote the two passages are itemized from Fischer’s print; but Sims-Williams edits both separately from Paris, BnF, lat. 12634, with variants from London, BL, Harley 3060 (Quots/Cits 2 = Sims-Williams p 223, lines 12–17; Quots/Cits 3 = Sims-Williams p 224, lines 1–6). Sims-Williams’s edition of Prayer 45 supplies a brief lacuna from other copies (in Kuypers’s edition of the Book of Cerne, Prayer 45 is at p 45, line 11–p 142, line 6). As Sims-Williams shows, the first part of Prayer 45 is taken from a “pattern prayer” that Ephraem recommends to penitents. Comparison of the texts reveals that significantly more readings in Prayer 45 agree with BL Harley 3064 as against Paris lat. 12634 and Fischer than vice versa (and Fischer has a significant omission [of “et salua me peccatorum quia tu solus”] in its text of Quots/Cits 3); but no broader conclusions about the textual affiliations of Prayer 45 can be drawn on the basis of just these two manuscripts and Fischer’s print. Prayer 45 replaces the last two sentences in Ephraem’s prayer with a doxology (“per te christe iesu”).

In the manuscript, Prayer 44 instead of Prayer 45 is actually attributed to Ephraem, but Sims-Williams suggests (p 210) that the rubric of Prayer 46, “Incipit oratio ad dominum sancti effrems,” should be emended to “Explicit oratio ad dominum sancti effrems.” Prayer 45 corresponds to prayers attributed to Ephraem in the Officia per Ferias (Paris, BnF, lat. 1153 [saec. ix12, Pariss region; Bischoff, Katalog 3.31, no. 4005]: PL 101.606), the Fleury Prayerbook (Orléans, Bibliotheque Municipale, 184 [saec ix10, Mondsee region; Bischoff, Katalog 2.345, no. 3718]: PL 101.1386), and the Psalter of Odbert (Boulogne-sur-Mer, Bibliothèque Municipale, 20 [a. 999, St.-Omer]: ed. Leroquais 1940–41 1.98). As Sims-Williams notes (p 211), Prayer 45 probably also occurred in the Book of Nunaminster (see Liturgy: Prayers; Trial Version pp 138–39), in which several words corresponding to that prayer’s incipit occur just before a missing leaf.

In view of its transmission in Cerne and in Continental prayerbooks showing Insular influence (see Sims-Williams pp 211–12), Prayer 45 may be an English compilation; but as Sims-Williams cautions, “It is impossible to say whether the excerpting was done in England” (p 224), though he dismisses Edmund Bishop’s arguments that the prayer originated in Spain (see also Di Sciacca 2008 p 174). Stevenson (1988 pp 267–68) points out that “the context of this prayer in [the Book of Cerne] is late-eighth century, and specifically English: it precedes two prayers attributed to Alchfrith the anchorite. This would seem to suggest that it when [sic] it was copied into Cerne, it had already circulated for some time in England.” In view of the uncertainty as to its origins, Prayer 45 has been included with a question mark in the headnote.
Bullough (1991 p 169 and 213 n 30) refers to the prayers attributed to Ephraem in the Tours prayerbook and (without attribution to Ephraem) “in later collections whose contents derive directly or indirectly from Tours” as possible evidence for Alcuin’s role in the transmission of. Sims-Williams (1985 p 225 n 87), however, considers their dissemination from Tours uncertain.

Quots/Cits 4. Sims-Williams (1985 p 226; 1990 p 312) notes the distinctively Ephraemic expression “Amator hominum, benignissime Deus,” is employed in the K-section of “Altus auctor omnium creaturarum” (ed. Kuypers 1902 pp 213–17), an abecedarian, “peculiarly English prayer on the life of Christ” in the Royal Prayerbook (London, BL, Royal 2.A.xx [saec. viii2 or ix1/4, Mercia; CLA 2.915; ASM 450; ASMMF 1.283]: see LITURGY: PRAYERS; Trial Version p 138. The expression occurs multiple times in De compunctione cordis (fols. 5vb/22, 8va/20–21, 51, 10va/24, 44). It also occurs in Cerne Prayer 45 (see Quots/Cits 3) as well as in the Irish FLORILEGIUM FRISINGENSE (see HIBERNO-LATIN, no. *40; ed. CCSL 108D.39, lines 26–27; for the context cf. pp xxx–xxiii), where it is part of a sentence taken from De compunctione cordis (ed. Fischer, fol. 5vb/22–24) that also supplied the expression in Cerne Prayer 45. The expression “Amator hominum” (for the Greek equivalents see Sims-Williams pp 222–23) occurs by itself in both De compunctione cordis (fol. 10va/3) and also in De die iudicii (fol. 16vb/14) as well as in other prayerbooks, including in one case with the addition “benignissme” (see Sims-Williams p 215 n 44). In the prayer “Altus auctor” there seems to be no further close verbal echo of Ephraem’s sermons, though the author does invoke several themes that recur in the sermons, including the well of tears (p 213b, line 31), Christus medicus (p 216a, line 47–p 216b, line 1), and the eschatological wedding chamber (p 217b, lines 29–30).

In addition to the prayers discussed above under Quots/Cits 2–4, another prayer derived from De compunctione cordis occurs in the Insular-influenced Fleury Prayerbook (PL 101.607); see Sims-Williams (1985 p 212 and n 32), who prints the corresponding text in Ephraem from Paris, BnF, lat. 12634.

Quots/Cits 5. Pelle (2012a p 80 n 10) cites De compunctione cordis as a possible source for a passage in Blickling Homily 11 (ed. Morris 1874–80 pp 115–31) that states that the signs of Doomsday have all come to pass for the advent of the Antichrist: “ealla þa tacno ond þa forebeacno þa þer ure Drihten ær toweard sæge, þæt ær domes dæge geweortan sceoldan, ealle þa syndon agangen, buton þæm anum þæt se awerigda cuma Anticrist nu get hider on middangeard ne com.” Pelle quotes the Latin parallel not from Fischer but from Lambeth Palace 204, fol. 123r, which is closer in wording: “Scripture enim completa sunt et signa quae praedicta sunt iam consummata sunt et non est quod reliquum sit nisi aduersarii nostri anticristi aduentus horribilis.” Pelle further compares PSEUDO-EPHRAEM, SERMO DE FINE MUNDI (PLS 4.609), which is similar in idea but not as close in formulation: “Debemus itaque, fratres mei, intellegere, quid inminet uel incumbat. Iam facta sunt fames et pestilentiae, commotiones gentium et signa, quae a Domino praedicta sunt, iam consummata sunt, et non est aliud, quod superest, nisi aduentus mali in expletione regni Romani.” A similar statement occurs in De beatitudine animae (fol. 13ra/51–13rb/2). See further Wright (forthcoming), who discusses other examples of the “Apocalypse now” topos in OE homilies, including HomS 26 (B3.2.26, Blickling Homily 7; ed. Morris p 107, line 21–p 109, line 8), Bazine-Cross 3 (ed. Bazire and Cross 1989 p 49, lines 53–54), and Ælfric, Catholic Homilies 1.40 (B1.1.42, ECHom I, 40, ed. Clemoes 1997 p 525, lines 32–35). Wright cites as a general analogue GREGORY THE GREAT, HOMILIAE IN
Evangelia I.i.9 (ed. CCSL 141.6, 13–27). The passage from De compunctione, however, affords a close verbal parallel for the formulation of the topos in Blickling 7, and may well be a direct or indirect source.

Quots/Cits 6. Pelle (2012b p 12 n 31) also cites De compunctione cordis as an analogue for theme of the “spiritual merchant” in Vercelli Homily 11 (ed. Scrugg 1992 pp 221–25: “We sculan, la, geþencan þæt we syndon gastelice cy pamię.” The Vercelli homilist’s immediate source is Caesarius of Arles, Sermo 207 (“Scitis enim, fraters, quia omnes negotiatores”; ed. CCSL 104.857, line 20). Still, Ephraem’s statement “negotiatores sumus spiritaes” (quoted by Pelle from Lambeth Palace 204, fol. 123v; the phrase occurs twice in De compunctione cordis) is virtually equivalent to the Vercelli homilist’s phrasing, which could represent a memorial blend of Ephraem and Caesarius.

Charles D. Wright
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