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ABSTRACT

No major review of the textual history and development of the main group of medieval Latin abbreviated versions, or redactions, of the Visio Pauli has been published since Theodore Silverstein's fundamental studies in 1935 and 1959. However, twenty-eight further witnesses of this group have come to notice since then, but have not been studied in detail.

This thesis examines each of the new texts in the context of the redaction to which they belong or are related, and their implications for the filiation established by Silverstein. In the case of Redaction IV this has required the classification of all the witnesses of that redaction for the first time, and in the case of the composite redactions drawn from several individual redactions, this has enabled a more precise identification of their components. In the case of Redaction IX one of the new texts supplies the section presently missing from the published edition.

A separate volume of Appendices contains transcriptions from the mss. of the texts examined in the thesis, together with other reference material.
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I acknowledge with deep gratitude the major debt of this thesis to the late Professor Theodore Silverstein who generously made available, some years before its publication, a list of manuscripts containing unstudied versions of the *Visio Pauli* which he had compiled. This was the genesis of the present study and permitted work to begin early on the preparation of material for the project which Professor Silverstein followed with kindly interest and support over the years.

My thanks are due too to my supervisors: to Professor R. M Thomson for his scholarly and practical advice and help, to Professor M. J. Bennett for his assistance, and to both for their patience and forbearance.

I am grateful to the University of New England for its support of the research for this thesis by way of grants of leave and access to its resources and staff.

I wish to thank also Dr Diana Modesto of Sydney University for practical and efficient assistance and support in many and various ways over the years, always readily and generously offered and gratefully appreciated.
## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PART I</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter I Redaction I</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 2 Redaction BR and the Göttingen <em>Visio Pauli</em></td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 3 Redaction III</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PART II REDACTION IV</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 4 Redaction IV and its Witnesses</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 5 The Classification of Redaction IV Texts (1)</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 6 The Classification of Redaction IV Texts (2)</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 7 Family Interrelationship and a Base Text for Redaction IV</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PART III THE COMPOSITE REDACTIONS</strong></td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 8 The III/IV Redactions V and X, and Two Further III/IV Texts</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 9 Redaction VII</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 10 Redaction VIII and Two Other Combined Texts</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 11 Redaction IX</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliography</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INTRODUCTION

For its longevity and the vast geographical and linguistic breadth of its diffusion, the Visio Pauli or Apocalypse of Paul was an extraordinary text. It was one of the early Christian apocrypha and belongs to the more ancient tradition of Apocalypses and Otherworld journeys.\(^1\) Abundant evidence remains - and continues to emerge - that it was known, cited and copied for well over 1,000 years from its composition in the mid 3rd century, having spread into an area ranging from Egypt, where it was written, to Scandinavia and Russia in the north and from Ireland to Armenia in the west and east, either in the original Greek or translated, in full or abbreviated versions, into Latin, Coptic, Syriac, Arabic, the Slavic languages including Old Russian, Armenian\(^2\) and nearly all the vernacular languages of the regions of its diffusion over time.\(^3\)

The earlier versions of the Apocalypse purported to be the Apostle's own words (although the account later changed to a third person narrative) which described first the complaints made by creation - the sun, the moon & stars, the earth and all the waters- against the iniquity of man and God's patient rejection of their plea to unleash their apocalyptic power in retribution; this was followed by an account of how the angels reported daily on the deeds of men. An angel then took Paul on a journey to the Otherworld during which he witnessed the going-out from the body of good and wicked souls at death and how they were met and escorted by holy and evil angels to judgement before the throne of God. He then visited the realms assigned to the righteous and unrighteous after death and, in supplication with the angels and the suffering souls, he obtained from Christ some respite for these souls from their pain; his journey concluded with a second visit to Paradise. A preface describing the miraculous discovery of this work in Tarsus was added at the beginning of the 5th century and over its long history the text was both abbreviated and

\(^{1}\) See e.g. Yabro Collins 1979, pp. 61-69 & 85-86, and Collins 1979, pp. 6-9 & 12-15; cf. also Attridge 1979, pp. 159-168.

\(^{2}\) For the texts in the foregoing languages see Silverstein & Hilhorst 1997, pp. 47-58 and Piovanelli 1993, pp. 26-37

\(^{3}\) These include English, French, German, Italian, Provençal, Danish, Welsh etc.; see e.g. Silverstein 1935, p. 16 and notes on pp. 99-101. For a chronological survey of the spread of the Latin abbreviated forms and the vernacular versions see Dinzelbacher 1991, pp. 167-171.
interpolated, the sections on the condition and torment of sinners and the granting of the respite to them surviving most tenaciously.⁴

The reasons for the remarkable and widespread popularity of this account, particularly in western Europe, may now be difficult to discern. Two of the major scholars of the Visio Pauli, Robert Casey and Theodore Silverstein, have noted the defects of its structure and its debt to earlier works, but have pointed to the unique appeal and pertinence of its account of what man must face immediately after death and its vivid manifestation of both the justice and mercy of God as a possible explanation.⁵ Whether its success was due to these or other reasons, the cultural importance of the work is widely recognised; in Casey's judgement "none [of the early Christian apocalypses], except the canonical Revelation, exercised so important an influence on medieval literature and thought as the Apocalypse of Paul,"⁶ and Silverstein observed that "it became one of the chief formative elements in the later legends of Heaven and Hell which culminated in the Divina Commedia of Dante, who seems to have known some form of the Apocalypse at first hand."⁷ The possibility of its direct or indirect influence on Dante stimulated scholarly interest in the work in the 19th century and, in addition to the ongoing study of its textual history in many languages, this interest has continued both for its relevance to the Divine Comedy and other medieval vernacular literature and also to more general studies on the representation of the Otherworld and on the Apocalyptic genre.⁸

---

⁴ For the composition and history of the original Greek Apocalypse and its afterlife see Casey (1933), Silverstein (1935) and Silverstein & Hilhorst (1997); also Rosenstiehl (1990). For the date of the revised version with the preface see Silverstein (1962) and Silverstein & Hilhorst 1997, p. 11 & pp. 18-19, n. 3. For an alternative view of the composition and date of the Greek text see Piovanelli 1993, pp. 37-59.

⁵ See e.g. the summary in Casey, 1933, pp. 31-32, and Silverstein, 1935, p. 5. Cf. also Piovanelli 1993, p. 56: "L'intérêt de cet ouvrage et la raison de son succès résident, en effet, dans sa mise en place d'un au-delà chrétien, centré sur la condition des âmes entre la mort du corps et la résurrection finale. Les âmes ne sont plus dans une attente passive de la récompense ou de la punition après le Jugement universel, mais elles comparaisent tout de suite devant le tribunal divin, avant d'être envoyées dans deux endroits séparés et organisés en fonction du degré des mérites ou des fautes, pour profiter, dès maintenant, d'un traitement 'paradisiaque' ou 'infernal'."

⁶ Casey, 1933, p. 1.

⁷ Silverstein, 1935, p. 3.

⁸ See e.g. the Bibliography in Silverstein & Hilhorst, 1997, pp. 41-47.
The reconstruction of the textual history of the Latin Visio Pauli in its older full form (the Long Latin) and in its abbreviated forms (the Redactions\(^9\)), began in the 19th century with the study and publication of texts by Herman Brandes in 1885 (the Redactions) and M. R. James in 1893 (the Long Latin). Other studies were undertaken by Sepelevic (1891) and Wieber (1904) but the main contours of the history of the Latin text, in both its long and abbreviated forms, were defined in the 20th century by Theodore Silverstein in 1935 (the Long Latin and the Redactions), 1959 (the Redactions) and 1976 (the Long Latin), and by Silverstein and A. Hilhorst in 1997 (the Long Latin). The gradual and continuing discovery of new witnesses has required this regular revision and expansion of the history of the Latin transmission. In the case of the Long Latin, the recent study by Silverstein and Hilhorst (1997) has provided critical texts and a detailed analysis of all the versions now known. In the case of the Redactions, two further contributions have been made since the last major study of them by Silverstein in 1959,\(^{10}\) but there remain a number of witnesses which were either not known, or were only partially examined at the time of previous studies. A list of 19 unstudied texts in manuscript, compiled by Silverstein after 1959, was published in 1997,\(^{11}\) and is reproduced below:

- Brno, Universitätsbibliothek, 99, f. 226rv.
- Bruges, Bibliothèque Publique, lat. 162, ff. 58v-60v.
- Brussels, Bibliothèque Royale, lat. 1367, ff. 120v-122.
- Budapest, National Széchényi Library, lat. 231, ff. 10r-11v.
- Cambridge, Jesus College, 46 (Q.D.4), f. 138r. [fragment]
- Dublin, Trinity College, 218, ff. 133r-134v.
- Dublin, Trinity College, 277, ff. 335-338.
- Dublin, Trinity College, 667, ff. 76-78.
- Erfurt, Stadtbibliothek, Amplon. Fol. 304. f. 102v.
- Göttingen, Universitätsbibliothek, Theol. 140, ff. 270v-271r.
- Graz, Universitätsbibliothek, 731, f. 261r. [fragment]
- London, St Paul's Cathedral, 8, ff. 188-189r.

\(^9\) The term 'redaction' has been used traditionally to refer to the medieval Latin abbreviations of the Long Latin version of the Greek original. The redactions are distinguished by number to indicate the difference between them in original content, additions and/or structure

\(^{10}\) Dwyer (1988) and Brown (1998).

\(^{11}\) Silverstein & Hilhorst 1997, p. 19 n. 4. This list was generously made available to the present writer some years before publication.
Melk, Stiftsbibliothek, 97 [B. 65], ff. 224v-225r.
Prague, Universitätsbibliothek, IX F 4, ff. 73-75.
St Omer, Bibliothèque Municipale, 349, ff. 178-181.
Schlägl (Austria), Stiftsbibliothek, 226, f. 206.
Uppsala, Universitetsbibliotek, C. 77, ff. 91r-93v.
Worcester, Cathedral Library, Q. 27, ff. 154-155.\(^{12}\)

To these a further 9 may now be added:-\(^{13}\)
Hamburg, Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek, Jacobi 1, ff. 132r-133v.
London, British Library, Add. 37787, ff. 18r-23r.
Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, lat. 2310, ff. 191v-192r.
Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, lat. 2831, ff. 85v-88r.
Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, lat. 3343, ff. 154r-155r.
Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, lat. 3528, ff. 14r-16r.
Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, lat. 3529a, ff. 121r-122r.
Uppsala, Universitetsbibliotek, C. 22, ff. 130r-131v.
Venice, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, It I. 6 (5015), ff. 161r-180r.

These texts all belong to the group of medieval Latin redactions descended from a hypothetical antecedent *alpha*, which is described below, and their place and significance in that group will be considered in detail in the following chapters.\(^{14}\)

---

\(^{12}\) Cited ibid. as "foll. 152-153", however the foliation of this ms. has recently been revised.

\(^{13}\) Eight of these texts came to the notice of the present writer in the course of checking the entries in the relevant library mss. catalogues for the texts in Silverstein's new list as well as for those he listed in 1935 (pp. 220-222) and 1959 (pp. 202-203). The Hamburg text was noted in a random check and further texts in European and other libraries may well come to light in the future.

\(^{14}\) Transcriptions were made by the present writer both for the new texts and for those descended from *alpha* in Silverstein's previous lists. Most libraries provided microfilm and/or photocopies of the relevant folios in the mss., however all transcriptions were checked against the originals in the libraries themselves. The privilege of access to the mss. collections in these libraries and the courtesy and assistance of their staff are here gratefully acknowledged.
The Medieval Latin Redactions and Redaction α

Twelve medieval Latin redactions of the *Visio Pauli* have been identified and named as Redactions I - XI and BR.\textsuperscript{15} They are all descended from the Long Latin 1 tradition, the most prolific of the three Long Latin versions identified by Theodore Silverstein.\textsuperscript{16} Translated from the revised Greek Apocalypse of Paul in the second half of the 5th century or the early years of the 6th century, Long Latin 1 had produced two reworkings (VI and XI) by the beginning of the 9th century. While the content of these two reworkings reflects the Apostle's visit to both Heaven and Hell, the ten other reworkings treat only the visit to Hell. These are all descended from a common ancestor \( \alpha \) composed, according to Silverstein, in the 10th century, and eight of them were also influenced, either directly (II and III) or indirectly (IV, V, VII-X), by input from a second hypothetical ancestor, \( \beta \). The development of the *alpha* group of ten is not completely separate from the earlier 9th-century reworkings, however, for the conjectured content of \( \beta \) has been linked to the content of one of those, Redaction XI.\textsuperscript{17}

The interrelationship of the ten redactions descended from \( \alpha \) is shown in Silverstein's 1959 stemma reproduced below and modified to include Redaction XI.\textsuperscript{18} This provides the framework for the present study.\textsuperscript{19}

\textsuperscript{15} The numbering of the Redactions does not reflect the chronology of their composition but rather the order in which they have been progressively identified; I - VI by Brandes in 1885, VII - VIII by Silverstein in 1935, IX - X and BR by Silverstein in 1959 and XI by Dwyer in 1988.

\textsuperscript{16} The best representative of Long Latin 1 is Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, Nuov. acq. lat. 1631, ff. 2v-25v, viii c. or ix c. (= P). It was edited by M. R. James in 1893 and recently by Silverstein & Hilhorst in 1997 with photographic plates of ff. 2v-25v. For other representatives of Long Latin 1, i.e. St Gall (=St G) and Escorial (=Esc), see Silverstein & Hilhorst (1997).

\textsuperscript{17} For the history of the Long Latin versions 1 & 2 see Silverstein 1935, 1976 and, together with Long Latin 3, Silverstein & Hilhorst (1997). The view proposed in those studies that Long Latin 2 was a separate development from the Greek has been queried by Piovanelli (1993, pp. 53-54), and some reservations about the evidence of independent access to the Greek in passages of Long Latin 3 (Silverstein & Hilhorst 1997, pp. 13-16) have been expressed by Zamagni (1999, p. 324). For the texts and analysis of Redactions I - III, V-X & BR see Silverstein (1935 & 1959); for Redaction IV, see Brandes (1885) & Silverstein (1935) and for Redaction XI see Dwyer (1988) and Wright (1990). For Redactions \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \) see Silverstein (1935) in particular the summary on pp. 59-61, and on \( \beta \) also Dwyer 1988, pp. 134-136.

\textsuperscript{18} Silverstein 1959, p. 225, modified in Dwyer 1988, p. 135.

\textsuperscript{19} Piovanelli (1993, p. 55 note 87) has queried Silverstein's subarchetype *lambda*, which represents the omission of the Preface and the second visit to Paradise, but no alternative view is proposed to account for the absence of these passages in the *alpha* group of redactions and redaction VI (also St G). Piovanelli also suggests that the classification of redactions I- X (which are referred to as "Lat. 3-
Of the extant versions, the key redactions are seen in this schema to be I, III and IV, in that they were combined in varying proportions (and with other introduced elements) to form Redactions V, VII, VIII, IX and X. While Redaction IV was cardinal in this process, it was itself a composite redaction, being formed from both α and III. From these α redactions descend nearly all the European vernacular versions of the Visio Pauli.20

Redaction α

The content, structure and linguistic form of Redaction α may be reconstructed conjecturally from evidence in the extant redactions and on the basis of Silverstein's filiation of them, and such a reconstruction allows the developments in the surviving versions to be conveniently mapped. On these two premises, the existing evidence and the Silverstein stemma, the hypothetical Redaction α had three components, namely passages from the Long Latin, interpolated material and an account of the fate of a sinful soul and a virtuous soul immediately after death.

12"; redaction BR is omitted), should be reconsidered in the light of some vernacular versions and "forcément" of redaction XI ("Lat. 13"), apparently rejecting the integration of redaction XI as shown in the modified stemma proposed by the present writer in 1988 and reproduced here. No alternative is indicated, however, and he makes no observation regarding the internal filiation of the group of α redactions established by Silverstein, which is accepted as the starting point here. 20 Exceptions are the Old English version published by di Paolo Healy (1978) and a Spanish version first published in Seville in 1494 (see Silverstein and Hilhorst, 1997, pp. 19-20, note 4 and Piovanelli, 1993, p. 28) which are based directly on Long Latin 1, and the German version published by Brandes (1885) and by Silverstein & Hilhorst (1997), which is based on Long Latin 2. Also, D. D. R. Owen (1958, p. 36) proposes a Long Latin source for part of a 12th-century French poem Li Ver del juïse.
(1) Passages from the Long Latin

Thirty-five passages from Sections 31-44 of the Long Latin\(^{21}\) can be identified in the surviving descendants of Redaction \(\alpha\). These may be seen in their original context in Appendix A, numbered there in the right-hand column for convenience of reference.\(^{22}\) The composer of the redaction appears to have extracted these passages from a Long Latin 1 text, almost verbatim in many cases, and set them down, juxtaposed with minor editorial intervention, to form a narrative which on the whole preserved the order and content of the Long Latin sections.

A major change, however, which must have been made in Redaction \(\alpha\), was the substitution of the Archangel Michael for the unnamed angel guide of the original and other versions of the Apocalypse; also, on the evidence of the extant redactions, some components of the Long Latin were omitted or compressed. As may be seen from the extracts and their context in Appendix A, several groups of sinners were omitted, i.e. the Laodiceans (those who were neither good nor bad), placed in or beside the fiery river,\(^{23}\) and the second group of adulterers together with the sodomites, and the charitable gentiles.\(^{24}\) Also omitted were the priest, deacon and lector from the group of unworthy ecclesiastics, leaving only the negligent bishop.\(^{25}\) Although the Great Worm was included,\(^{26}\) the souls punished in this area are now anonymous, no longer identified as those who denied the Resurrection of Christ and the Resurrection of the Body. Several of the original components too were merged. The Mockers of the Word of God were deleted as a named group,\(^{27}\) and their punishment assigned to the Sorcerers in the following paragraph.\(^{28}\) Similarly, the False Ascetics were no longer identified as a separate group\(^{29}\) and their

---

\(^{21}\) Reference to the Long Latin (LL), unless otherwise stated, is to the James edition (1893), this being the most widely accessible edition of the text. Where relevant, the Silverstein & Hilhorst critical text (1997) will also be cited.

\(^{22}\) These passages will be referred to as LLx 1 etc.

\(^{23}\) See Appendix A, following no. 4.

\(^{24}\) ibid., following no. 19.

\(^{25}\) ibid., following no. 11 and following no. 12.

\(^{26}\) LLx 26.

\(^{27}\) LLx 14.

\(^{28}\) LLx 15.

\(^{29}\) LLx 21.
punishment was transferred to the Infanticides who precede them in the Long Latin.\textsuperscript{30} In addition, Redactions α's identification of the angel guide as the archangel Michael necessitated a telescoping of the first part of the Long Latin section 43, where Michael appears for the first time.\textsuperscript{31} From the following intercession scene the vision of the throne of God was omitted\textsuperscript{32} and the reaction of the demons to the granting of the respite in the Long Latin section 44 was entirely recast with a classical overlay.\textsuperscript{33}

With these changes, the resultant set of passages, i.e. nos. 1 - 13; 14 & 15 (merged); 16 - 19; 20 & 21 (merged); 22 - 35, formed the substance of Redaction α. However, some new elements were also introduced.

(2) Interpolations and Additions

Four additions must have been made to alpha's reduced version of Long Latin sections 31-44. These were a preface, the expansion of the scene of the River of Fire, the interpolation of a hundred-headed monster immediately after this scene, and a conclusion. This new material shows on the one hand religious or biblical influence and on the other, echoes of classical literature.

A. The Preface beginning with the familiar formula of sermons and homilies, \textit{Fratres karissimi, oportet nos......} pointed to the obvious moral of the ensuing account, a salutary fear of Hell's punishments.\textsuperscript{34} It thus "transforms the apocalypse into a homily."\textsuperscript{35}

B. The River of Fire was identified as the classical river Cocytus\textsuperscript{36} and a rain of fire, possibly of Biblical provenance, was added to the landscape.\textsuperscript{37}

\textsuperscript{30} LLx 20. \\
\textsuperscript{31} LLx 28. \\
\textsuperscript{32} see Appendix A, following no. 29. \\
\textsuperscript{33} LLx 35. This episode appears in redactions III & IV (and their derivatives) and thus it is not certain whether the recasting took place in alpha or later. Silverstein (1935, pp. 44 & 51) refers to the new version as an interpolation by red. III, however, its position and content is considered here to be related to the episode of the demons' reaction in the Long Latin. \\
\textsuperscript{34} This is attested by reds. I, BR, II and III. \\
\textsuperscript{35} Silverstein 1935, p. 40. \\
\textsuperscript{36} This is attested with variants of the name by reds. I, II and III. \\
\textsuperscript{37} This is attested by reds. I, BR and II.
C. A Hundred-Headed Dragon devouring the wicked potentates of the world was interpolated between the River of Fire (LLx 3) and the description of those immersed to varying depths in it (LLx 4). 38

D. At or towards the end of the piece, a passage on the impossibility of numbering the pains of Hell, even for a hundred men with tongues of iron, was added. 39 This, like the naming of the River of Fire and the recasting of the demons' reaction, shows the influence of classical literature, identified by Silverstein in this case as Virgilian. 40

(3) The Going-Out of the Souls

An account of the judgement, immediately after death, of one good soul and two wicked souls occurs early in the Long Latin, in sections 11-18, before the first description of Heaven. 41 A much shorter episode lacking the shape, detail and embellishments of the Long Latin, but describing the fate of one wicked and one good soul, also immediately after death, appears in Redaction III and its direct and indirect descendants, inserted between the initial description of the Great Well and its inhabitants (LLx 24-5; Long Latin ss. 41-2), and the appeal of the souls for mercy (LLx 28; Long Latin s. 43). Silverstein traced the transposition of the episode through the hypothetical β, Redaction III's immediate antecedent, to Redaction α. 42 However, in comparison with the abbreviation of Long Latin sections 31-44, these earlier sections of the original have been remodelled and quite drastically reformulated, leaving little trace of the original text. With the exception of the demons' reaction, this is in striking contrast to Redaction α's handling of the later sections of its source.

38 This is attested by reds. I, BR, II, and III.
39 This is attested by reds. I and IV (and derivatives).
40 See Silverstein 1935, pp. 65-6, and also for discussion of this motif, Wright 1993, pp. 146-156.
42 Silverstein 1935, pp. 52 & 60.
Summary

The conjectured structure and content of Redaction α can therefore be summarised as follows, using the numerical and alphabetical designations given to the Long Latin extracts in Appendix A, and to the interpolations and additions above. i.e.-

A; 1-3; B, C; 4-13,
14/15*; 16-19; 20/21*; 22-26;
The Going-Out of the Souls,
27- 35; D.
(* indicates extracts have been merged)

None of the extant redactions descended from alpha, however, preserve this structure intact. Each has added, omitted, compressed or re-ordered material in a characteristic way. The distinctive profile of the various redactions resulting from this will be described in the following chapters.
PART I

Chapter 1

REDACTION I

The text of the *Visio Pauli* in the 14th-century manuscript, Vienna, Nationalbibliothek, 362, ff. 7r-8v, was identified and printed by Herman Brandes in 1885 as Redaction I.¹ This text, however, actually contained two versions of the Apocalypse, Redaction I proper (ff. 7rv)² and a witness to the second Long Latin recension, L 2, known as the "Vienna Fragment" (ff. 7v-8v).³ The text of Redaction I was reprinted by Theodore Silverstein in 1935,⁴ with a study of its contents and its relation to other redactions.⁵ He printed a second text of the redaction in 1959, from the 12th-century manuscript, Barcelona, Archivo Capitular de la Catedral, lat. 28, ff. 118r-119r,⁶ with a comparative study of the two versions. This study showed that Barcelona and Vienna belonged to separate branches (I a & I b) of the original Redaction I.⁷ More recently, a third but incomplete witness of the redaction, a Beneventan text copied in the early 13th century, was identified in the Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Borghese 86, ff. 165v-166v, by Virginia Brown. This text, consisting of paras 1- (5) in Silverstein’s numbering, was published in 1998 together with an analysis which showed that it was related more closely to Barcelona (and thus to I a) than to Vienna but was nevertheless not copied from it.⁸

---

¹ Brandes 1885, pp. 24-25, 66-71 & 95-96.
² ibid., pp. 66-68.
³ ibid., pp. 68-71, & 95-96. On L 2 see Silverstein and Hilhorst 1997, pp. 12-13 & 52-55; also Silverstein 1935, pp. 21 & 38 and Silverstein (1976). The two versions were identified by E. Wieber in 1904.
⁵ ibid., pp. 41-43.
⁶ Silverstein 1959, pp. 226-29. The text alone had previously been published without identification or discussion by José Oliveras Caminal, ‘Texto de la *Visio S. Pauli* según el codice 28 de la Catedral de Barcelona’ in *Scriptorium*, 1 (1946-47), pp. 240-42. Silverstein’s text is based on that transcript (Silverstein 1959, p. 226, note 11a). The original editor said that the 12th-century date was the latest and that internal evidence suggested the 11th century (Caminal 1946-47, p. 240).
⁷ See Silverstein 1959, pp. 204-211.
The text of Redaction I also forms part of the composite Redaction VIII, which Silverstein published in 1935, from the 15th-century manuscript, Berlin, Preussische Staatsbibliothek, lat. 422 [elec. theol. lat. qu. 61], f. 226rv. In 1959, he showed that the text of Redaction I in the Berlin manuscript of Redaction VIII shared a common source with the Vienna Redaction I against the Barcelona version and belonged therefore to I b.

Both in 1935 and 1959, Silverstein also considered the second part of Redaction VII in his study of Redaction I. However, this text will not be included here; it will be considered with Göttingen, Theol. 140, in the following chapter, where the reasons for classifying it as a separate and earlier stage of the redaction will be argued.

The prime characteristic feature of Redaction I, observable in the full versions studied by Silverstein, is the interpolation of a passage on the Limbus Patrum (=F), in which it is identified with the seven-sealed Great Well. But the opening line of this redaction is already distinctive in its reversal of the usual order of the pains of Hell and the delights of Paradise found elsewhere among the redactions. The other major characteristics of Redaction I are:-

1. The addition of three extra rivers to the initial River of Fire scene (=E).

2. Several textual changes and compressions:--
   a) The re-classification of the first of the four groups of souls immersed in the fiery river (LLx 5) as plunderers and high livers (=5a); the addition of falsi testes to the third group (=7a), and

---

10 See Silverstein 1959, pp. 208-211.
11 See Silverstein 1935, pp. 54-55, and 1959, pp. 208-211.
12 See Silverstein 1935, [9], p. 154: 35 - 155: 1 and 1959, [9], p. 228. This section appears to be based on the Descensus Christi ad Inferos in the Gospel of Nicodemus (Silverstein 1935, p. 42 and references, p. 110 n. 7).
13 LLx 24.
14 Red. I: oportet nos amare frates karissimi delicias paradisi et timere penas inferni; reds. BR, II, III: oportet nos timere penas inferni et amare delicias paradisi.
17 ibid., [3], p. 153: 30.
the addition of the detail *fictum animum habent in corde* (=8a)\(^1\) and an extra comment on the fate of the unrepentant sinner to the fourth group (=+).\(^1\)

b) The telescoping of LL extracts 13 and 18, so that the Persecutors of Widows and Orphans with their fire and ice punishment (LLx 18) are relocated to join the Usurers (LLx 13);\(^2\) as a consequence, the intervening groups of Adulterers and of False Virgins (LLx 16 &17) are omitted, and the Sorcerers (LLx 15) are merged with the Infanticides (LLx 20/21*).\(^3\)

3. The absence of the episode of the Going-Out of the Souls.

4. The abbreviation of the Respite episode by the omission of the description of the Descent of Christ, the Reproaches and the Demons’ Rebuke.

5. A short interpolation after the Respite, reporting God’s commissioning of Paul to preach his vision (=G).\(^4\)

6. An additional admonitory conclusion, *Expavescite fratres* ...etc. (=H).\(^5\)

These changes of structure and content made by Redaction I to the conjectured original structure and content of *alpha*, are summarised in the table below (The numbers refer to the Long Latin extracts as set out in Appendix A, and upper case letters refer to the Interpolations listed in Appendix B. The numbers and letters in bold indicate the changes typical of Redaction I)

---

\(^1\) ibid., [3], p. 153: 31.
\(^3\) ibid., [5], p. 154: 17-18.
\(^4\) ibid., [7], p. 154: 26-27.
\(^5\) ibid., [10], p. 155: 15-17.
\(^6\) ibid., [12], p. 155: 21.
Redaction α
A; 1-3; B, C; 4-13,
14/15*; 16-19; 20/21*; 22-26;
The Going-Out of the Souls,
27-35; D.
(*) indicates merged extracts)

Redaction I
A; 1-3; B, E, C; 4, 5a, 6, 7a, 8a, (+),
9-11, 13/18*, 19, 20/21/15*, 22/27*,
23, 24;
Limbus patrum, (F)
25, 28-30, 33, 34; G, D, H.
(omitted = 12, 14, (15), 16, 17, 26,
31, 32, 35.)

Additional Texts of Redaction I

Two further texts of Redaction I proper may now be added to the
evidence of the Barcelona, Vienna and Borghese codices. They are:

Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, lat. 2310, ff. 191v-192r.24
St Omer, Bibliothèque Municipale, 349, ff. 179r-181v.25

Also to be added are the sections containing the text of Redaction I which
form part of two additional texts of Redaction VIII; they are in:

Hamburg, Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek, Jacobi 1, ff. 132r-133v.26
Venice, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, It I. 6 (5015), ff. 161r-180r.27

The relationship of these new texts to the four already studied by Silverstein
and Brown is discussed below, first those of Redaction I proper, and secondly
those integrated into Redaction VIII.

Transcriptions of the new versions and also of those already
published are given in Appendix C;28 for convenience of analysis these have
been divided into sections, referred to hereunder as s. 1 or <1> etc.29

25 Catalogue Général des Manuscrits des Bibliothèques Publiques des Départements, III, (Paris
1861), p. 171. Listed but not classified by Brandes (1885, p. 23), Silverstein (1935, p. 222) and
26 Katalog der Handschriften der Staats und Universitätsbibliothek, Hamburg, IV, (Hamburg
1957), pp. 149-151 at p. 151.
28 The transcription of the text in the Borghese ms. is reproduced from Brown (1998, pp. 85-88). the
others are from the ms. In the latter there are several alternative readings to those in the
published texts, i.e. in Barcelona: 'Seviton' [also silently corrected in Brown's reproduction of the
Caminal/Silverstein transcript] for 'seu Iton' (cf. Silverstein 1959, [1], p. 227: 4, here <5>); '(et)
rane' for 'arane' [twice] (cf. ibid., [2], p. 227: 11 & 12, here <12>); 'satrapas' [also Caminal] for
A. REDACTION I PROPER

The text of the *Visio Pauli* in the 13th-century Paris, B.N. lat. 2310, exhibits all the major characteristics of Redaction I listed above. The 15th-century St Omer manuscript, however, contains a version of Redaction I which has most, but not all, of the characteristics of this redaction. Two sections from the modified version of Redaction IV which forms Redaction IX have been used in St Omer in place of the Redaction I versions of the Fastbreakers (I, s. 33), and the Infanticides (I, ss. 34-5). As a result of this substitution, the inclusion of the Sorcerers with the Infanticides, which is typical of Redaction I, is not found in St Omer. A further extract from Redaction IV/IX, describing the Descent of Christ and the reproaches addressed to the sinners, has been inserted before the Granting of the Respite at s. 50, thus supplying the sections typically omitted by Redaction I. In addition, the sinners immersed to the lips and eyebrows are reversed (ss. 17 & 18), and the text finishes after the command to Paul to preach his vision (s. 53). In consequence of the latter, the last sections on the number of the pains of Hell (s. 53), the men with tongues of iron (s. 54), and the extra Redaction I admonitory conclusion *Expavescite* etc. (s. 55), are lacking. What remains, however, is a substantial version of Redaction I.

Comparison of the two new versions with the texts examined by Silverstein and Brown shows first a pattern of shared omissions allying Paris with Vienna against Barcelona, Borghese (as far as the truncated text can show) and St Omer. In his 1959 study, Silverstein pointed to the significance

'satrapes' (cf. ibid., [2], p. 227: 13, here <13>); 'erat ibi' [also Caminal] for 'erat' (cf. ibid., [4], p. 227: 31. here <20>); 'filius' for 'filium' (cf. ibid., [4], p. 227: 40, here <27>); 'circuitus' [also Caminal] for 'circuitu' (cf. ibid., [5], p. 228: 3, here <29>); 'collos' for 'colles' (cf. ibid., [7], p. 228: 13, here <34>); also 'Michahel' for 'Michael' *passim*, and 'demersis' for 'demersi', 'orfanos' for 'orfanos' & 'supplicia' for 'supplicia' (cf. ibid., [3], p. 227: 24, [5], p. 228: 5 & [8], p. 228: 20-21, here <17>, <30> & <37>).


29 The sections correspond to Silverstein's paragraph numbering as follows:- Silverstein Preface: <1-2>; [1]: <3-5>; [2]: <6-12>; [3]: <13-19>; [4]: <20-27>; [5]: <28-31>; [6]: <32-33>; [7]: <34-35>; [8]: <36-37>; [9]: <38-45>; [10]: <46-52>; [11]: <53-54>; [12]: <55>.

30 See chapter 11 below.
of two features which distinguish Vienna from Barcelona.\textsuperscript{31} Firstly, he noted that Barcelona (\(=\text{Ba}\)) preserved part of a phrase traceable to the Long Latin and present in other redactions, i.e.

\[<2>\text{ostendit illi fundamentum celi atque inferni (Ba)}\]

The phrase is preserved also in Borghese (\(=\text{Borgh}\))\textsuperscript{32} and, with some alteration, in St Omer (\(=\text{O}\)).\textsuperscript{33} However, as Silverstein observed, Vienna (\(=\text{Vi}\)) weakened the concept by omission:

\[<2>\text{ostendit ei celum et terram atque infernum (Vi)}\]

This same omission is found also in the Paris text (\(=\text{P}\)):

\[<2>\text{ostendit ei celum atque infernum (P)}\]

A second omission noted by Silverstein is also shared by Paris and Vienna, i.e. the omission of the last of the particular doctrines denied by the heretics in the Great Well, the Virgin Birth. Both have only:

\[<44>\text{nec crediderunt christum in carne venientem (Vi & P)}\]

However, Barcelona and St Omer give the full list in s. 44, reflecting the Long Latin and other redactions (this part of the text is missing in the Borghese ms.):

\[<44>\text{nec crediderunt christum in carne venisse nec natum ex maria virgine (Ba)}\]
\[\text{nec crediderunt christum in carnem venisse nec natum ex maria virgine (O)}\textsuperscript{34}\]

Three other omissions may also be added to those observed by Silverstein; they are phrases which are again traceable to the Long Latin. Firstly, when the souls appeal to Michael to intercede on their behalf, they say in the Long Latin (LLx 28):

\[\text{quia propter tuas orationes stat terra}\]

In s. 47 of the Redaction I texts, St Omer has:

\[\text{scimus enim quod propter orationes adhuc stat terra}\]

and Barcelona, less precisely:

\[\text{scimus enim quia vestras orationes dei exaudita (Ba)}\textsuperscript{35}\]

\begin{footnotes}
\footnote{\textsuperscript{31} Silverstein 1959, pp. 205 & 207-8.}
\footnote{\textsuperscript{32} Brown 1998, p. 85: 7-8;}
\footnote{\textsuperscript{33} St Omer <2>: et ostendit illi fundamentum celi usque ad infernum; cf. also red. II and red. III, Silverstein 1935, pp. 156 & 160-1.}
\footnote{\textsuperscript{34} Cf. LL.x 25, red. II (Silverstein 1935, p 158: 8), red. III (ibid., pp. 180-1) and red. BR (Silverstein 1959, [12], p. 237).}
\footnote{\textsuperscript{35} (This part of the text is missing in the Borghese ms.) Cf. also the St Gall version of L 1: et propter tuas orationes adhuc terram istam videmus (Silverstein 1935, [43], p. 145: 32); red. II: Scimus omnes quod, propter oraciones vestras factas in terra, redimiemur (ibid., p. 158: 34-5); red. IIIa: Sci enim quia propter tuas preces adhuc stat terra (ibid., [19], p. 188: 8-9); also some mss. of}
\end{footnotes}
however Paris and Vienna omit the phrase entirely from this section. Secondly, to Paul’s lament in s. 36 (ve, ve peccatoribus, ut quid nati sunt), Barcelona adds:-

   Melior illis essent si nati non fuissest (Ba)

and similarly St Omer:-

   Melius fuissest illis si nati non fuissest (O)

This second phrase is not present in Paris or Vienna, however a similar phrase: melius erat nobis si non fuissemus nati, is in a later lament in the Long Latin (LLx 27). The two laments are not merged in any of the other extant redactions. Therefore the addition would seem to have been made either by the original Redaction I with both phrases preserved by Barcelona and St Omer (but the second omitted by Paris and Vienna), or else it was made by a common antecedent of Barcelona and St Omer in a separate development from that of Paris and Vienna.

In the third case, St Omer and Borghese preserve a phrase in s. 25 which must have originated in the Long Latin; part of the phrase survives also in Barcelona but it is omitted in Paris and Vienna. In the Long Latin (LLx 10), the souls cast into the abyss hardly reach the bottom after falling for 500 years:-

   vix post quingentos annos perveniunt in profundum.

This is rendered in Redaction I proper <25> as:-

   et vix pertingunt usque ad xl annos (O)
   .. vix pertingat ad octoginta annis (Borgh)
                   usque ad octoginta annos (Ba)

As the phrase occurs in some form in other redactions, it must have been present in the original Redaction I, but it is omitted in s. 25 of both Vienna and Paris.

While this set of omissions is common to both Paris and Vienna, the latter is not directly descended from the earlier manuscript. The errors present in Paris are not repeated in Vienna, e.g.-

   <4> superbia (P) / suspiria (Vi)

red. IV, family D, <55>, e.g.: Scimus enim quia per vestras orationes adhuc nobis miserebitur deus (see chapter 6 below and IV Apparatus in Appendix F, ad loc.).

36 The phrase is not exclusive to the Visio Pauli, however, and could have been introduced independently of it; cf. e.g. Matthew xxvi. 24: bonum erat ei si natus non fuissest homo ille.
37 Cf. red. Illa: vix perveniasset usque ad quinquaginta annorum in profunditatem (Silverstein 1935, [6], pp. 170: 12 - 171:1); red. BR: vix profundum eius contingunt usque ad quinquaginta annos (Silverstein 1939, [4], p. 236).
Nor does Vienna share the omission by Paris of *aque* in s. 3 and *tenebre* in s. 4, both attested by the Long Latin (LLx 2) and by Barcelona and Borghese,\(^{38}\) and it does not repeat the addition by Paris of *qui calcaria regis portant* in s. 12, which is not found elsewhere. The relationship of the two manuscripts, evidenced in the pattern of shared omissions, is thus indirect through a common source which was intermediate between them and the archetype.

The affiliation of St Omer, however, is with the other branch of the Silverstein stemma, I a, represented in 1959 by Barcelona and now also by Borghese. The alliance of the latter with Barcelona against Vienna (and thus its place in I a) was argued by Brown in 1998, and to the examples of shared Ba/Borgh variants adduced by her in support of this,\(^{39}\) i.e.:-

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{<1> ostendita, <3> ozennus; [girat],}^\text{40} & \text{ <5> erat, <10> Parimot(h), <18> fincto(s) animo(s), <29> in hoc,} \\
\text{the following may also be added:-} \\
\text{<3> dixit illi, <4> vidit illum locum; in illo loco; ut ignis fervens; fluctibus, <5> influunt; mons magnus ignis, <11> scorpiones, <12> iniquitates, <13> supercilium, <22> fili dei, <25> tenebit; octoginta, <27> tempus penitendi.}
\end{align*}
\]

All of the above readings not only distinguish Barcelona and Borghese from Vienna but also from Paris.

Although Barcelona and the Borghese ms. were both written in the Beneventan region of Southern Italy,\(^{41}\) Brown showed that the latter was not copied from the earlier Barcelona ms., since it shares readings with

---

\(^{38}\) Cf. also red. III (Silverstein 1935, [1], pp. 160-161:13 and 162-163: 2).  
\(^{39}\) Brown 1998, p. 82.  
\(^{40}\) The phrase 'super ... sidera' is not omitted in Vienna as indicated by Brown, (cf. Silverstein 1935, [1], p. 153: 6-7, 'super quem girant sidera celi'), but the verb in that phrase in Vienna (and also in Paris) is the plural, 'girant' against the Ba/Borgh 'girat'.  
\(^{41}\) A southern Italian origin for Barcelona was noted by José Oliveras Caminal (1946-47, p. 240). The location was confirmed more precisely as the Beneventan zone by Brown, who proposed the monastery of San Salvatore at Telese as its place of origin (Brown 1998, pp. 83-84); the date of the ms. is given as 'saec. XII' or 'saec. XII med.' (ibid., p. 73 & p. 83). For the early 13th-century Borghese ms., she identified the Beneventan region or Benevento, only 28 km from San Salvatore, as the place of origin (ibid., p. 76 & p. 84).
Vienna\(^{42}\) or the Long Latin\(^{43}\) which are not present in Barcelona. The Borgh/ Vi and the Borgh/ LL readings noted by Brown are to be found with, for the most part, only some small variation also in Paris.\(^{44}\) Several other readings in Borghese may be added to Brown's examples, i.e. *in mundo* in s. 1, *habet* (for *habent*) & *annuent* in s. 18 and *dimisit* in s. 27; these too are present in Vienna and Paris but not in Barcelona.\(^{45}\) The two Italian mss. are therefore related through an antecedent which contained their shared variants and the readings they have, singly or together, in common with Vienna and/or Paris.

The version of Redaction I in St Omer should also be located in the I a branch, since it contains variants which relate it to Barcelona and Borghese rather than to Paris and Vienna. Some of these appear to be errors on the evidence of Paris and Vienna and also of other redactions. In s. 22 St Omer has *fili dei* like both the Italian mss., whereas Paris and Vienna, supported by redactions II, III and VII, have *fili david*.\(^{46}\) Similarly, the singular *iniquitatem* in Paris and Vienna s. 12 is supported by Redactions II, BR and VII against the plural *iniquitates* in Barcelona, Borghese and St Omer.\(^{47}\) The latter three all have *supercilium* in s. 13 instead of the usual *supercilia* found in Paris and Vienna and elsewhere,\(^{48}\) and they have *tempus*

\(^{42}\) The following are listed by Brown (1998, p. 82):- ut leo <7>, et ad ecclesia(m) non venerunt <15>, unusquisque hominis <19>, trecenta <21>.

\(^{43}\) The following readings are indicated by italics in Brown's transcription (at pp. 87-8): gementes et flentes <22>, qui sunt hi domine <22>, mittantur anime illuc <25>, unumquemque propria voluntate <27>. All but the third of these are also in Vi (the fourth with some variation).

\(^{44}\) The variations are: <19> unusquisque hominis (Borgh), unusquisque homo (Vi), omnis homo (P), multii homines (Ba); <21> trecenta milia cubitorum (Borgh, Vi), tricentum milia cubitorum (P), omitted (Ba); <22> qui sunt hii domine (Borgh, Vi), domine qui sunt hii (P), omitted (Ba); <25> mittantur anime illuc (Borgh), mittuntur anime illic (LLx 10), mittuntur anime illic (P), omitted (Vi, Ba); unumquemque propria voluntate (Borgh, LLx 11), unicuique propriam voluntatem (Vi), unumquemque proprie voluntati (P), unicuique liberam potestatem (Ba).

\(^{45}\) Barcelona: <1> omitted; <18> habuerunt & annuerunt; <27> dedit.


penitendi in s. 27, rather than tempus penitencie.49 Although not precisely the same, St Omer’s reading unum locum is close to the Ba/Borgh variant illum locum in s. 4 instead of the widely attested P/Vi ibi locum.50 Both Barcelona and St Omer omit from s. 51 the phrase, based on the Long Latin,52 which is found in Paris, plus est nobis refrigerium quam omne tempus vite nostre quam sumpsimus super terram, and, somewhat shortened, also in Vienna;53 versions of the phrase appear also in Redactions III and IV.54 On the other hand the Ba/Borgh/O reading in s. 4, in illo loco, is supported against P and Vi by other redactions.55

For some other variants which associate St Omer with either Barcelona and Borghese, or with Barcelona alone in the second part of the text which is missing in Borghese, there is no external evidence to support one reading over the other since they occur in passages peculiar to Redaction I. For example, in the description of the Limbus Patrum, St Omer shares several readings with Barcelona and St Omer against Paris and Vienna, i.e.:-

<41> {ad inferiorem partem (Ba & O)}
{ad infernum hunc (P), ad hunc infernum (Vi),}
and the transposition in s. 43 which somewhat alters the sense of the phrase:-

<43> {usque in die iudicii et (Ba), usque ad diem iudicii et (O)}
{et in die iudicii (P & Vi).}56

In an earlier passage, following mensuram non habet in the description of the Abyss (LLx 10) in s. 24, Barcelona, Borghese and St Omer have similar, although not identical, readings:-

<25> {quicumque intraverit in hunc locum ferventem tenentur ab illo (Ba)}

49 Cf. Red. BR, (Silverstein 1959, [4], p. 236: 88) and Red. III - except IIIb which has penitendi (Silverstein 1935, [6], pp. 172-73).
51 Barcelona (but not St Omer) also rephrases the first part of the section (Silverstein 1959, [10], p. 229: 6-7). This part of the text is not in the Borghese ms.
52 Cf. Ll 34: melius est enim nobis refrigerium die unius super omne tempus vite nostre quod fuimus super terram.
56 Other instances are in a phrase added to <45> by Redaction I, where Ba and O have perpetuo (Ba) in perpetuo (O), and in <52> where Paul is commanded ut annunciaret; neither of these readings is found in P or Vi, and they may or may not be in the archetype. Cf. also <5> influent(O), influunt (Ba & Borgh)/confluunt (P & Vi).
qui cum introisset in hunc locum fervente tenebit (Borgh)
quicunque intrabunt in hunc locum ferventem non exibunt (O).

Paris however has:-
quiique introierit in hunc locum fervet ut ereum vas (P)

and Vienna:-
quicunque veniunt in locum istum eternum habent supplicium (Vi).

This part of the description is already problematic in the Long Latin mss., but
a phrase similar to 'fervet sicut eneum' is conjectured to have followed
'mensuram non habet' originally. The archetype of Redaction I would
appear to have inserted the phrase quicumque ... locum after non habet and
before fervet etc., since all the extant versions of the redaction have this, but
only Paris has retained anything like the second phrase of the Long Latin. In
Barcelona, Borghese and St Omer, fervet has been changed to ferventem,
and in the first two mss., ut ereum has been corrupted to a form of tenere
(i.e. tenentur or tenebit), giving a new meaning which St Omer's non
exibunt appears to paraphrase. The outcome was different in Vienna,
however, with fervet omitted and ut ereum corrupted to eternum.

The evidence adduced above allying St Omer with Barcelona and
Borghese, indicates a common source for these three which was different
from the antecedent of Paris and Vienna. However, this source was not the
immediate antecedent of the two Italian mss. because St Omer does not
share all the Ba/Borgh readings which that antecedent must have contained.
St Omer does not add scorpiones to the list of creatures issuing from the
mouth of the draco in s. 11, nor does it have the variants ostendita <1>, girat
<3>, fluctibus <4>, erat <5>, fincto(s) animo(s) <18>, in hoc <29>. It does not
omit the last phrase of s. 19 sicut isti fecerunt, and the name of the draco in s.
10, Prothimoth, is closer to Parthimoth in Paris than to Parimot (Ba) or
Parimoth (Borgh).

If, in the absence of the second part in Borghese, the version of it in
Barcelona may be taken as indicative of the Ba/Borgh antecedent, then that
antecedent contained variants which are not repeated in St Omer. In the

hoc etiam subsussecuta est enim eum <qui> subsus fuerit); Long Latin 1 (St Gall): fervet etiam
58 'p(ro)thimoth' in the ms.
passage describing the sealing of the Great Well after the harrowing of Hell, St Omer has, like Paris and Vienna, signavit sigillis septem in s. 42, where Barcelona has simply clausit illum. Similarly, in s. 43 St Omer agrees with Paris and Vienna that no soul afterwards descendit into that place, where Barcelona has ascensure sunt. The phrase hoc est in orientem partem, which follows a septentrionem in Barcelona s. 38, is not reflected in St Omer,59 nor is Barcelona’s paraphrase of the acclamation of the souls after the granting of the Respite in s. 51:-(Ba) et dederunt gloriam deo et filio eius domino ihesu christo; St Omer instead closely parallels Paris and Vienna here:- (O) benedictus es fili dei qui dedisti nobis refrigetum diebus istis et noctibus. Also, as noted above, St Omer has the more authentic Long Latin wording adhuc stat terra in s. 47 where Barcelona has deus exaudit.

On the above argument therefore, the five manuscripts of Redaction I proper would derive from two hyparchetypes here designated I (i) and I (ii). Thus:-

On the question of the name of the draco, the above stemma would seem to support the form Parthimoth in the original Redaction I [Paris: parthimoth; St Omer: p(ro)thimoth; Ba/ Borgh: parimot(h)], and the form Parthemon in Vienna would therefore reflect a change of the final consonant from 'th' to 'n'.60 However, Silverstein has noted "there is reason to regard Vienna 362’s Parthemon as the best and original reading."61 If this is so and if the form in Vienna is inherited from the original Redaction I through I (ii), then the reverse change from the final 'n' to 'th' must have occurred independently in Paris and I (i). A change from 'th' to 'n', however, would seem more likely.

---

59 This phrase is not found in any of the other red. I witnesses, but rather than a Barcelona variant, Silverstein argued it was in the original red. I; see Silverstein 1959, p. 211 and n. 59.
60 This change would seem more significant than the oscillation of i/e.
61 Silverstein 1959, p. 206; for the argument in favour of 'Parthemon' see Silverstein 1935, pp. 66-69.
In another case, i.e. the names of Redaction I's three extra rivers, Vienna also differs from Paris and I (i). In s. 5 of the extant versions of Redaction I proper, the name of the place where the fiery river seethes, is Cogiton, and there are three rivers:-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P.</td>
<td>que confluunt Sunton et graviton et cogiton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vi.</td>
<td>que confluunt secum stix flegeton et acheron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ba.</td>
<td>et influunt in eum Seuiton et cogiton et ograviton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borgh.</td>
<td>que influunt Seviten et Cogiton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O.</td>
<td>quoque influent in eum Semiatien Conchion et gravituron</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The classical names given in Vienna appear to have been accepted by Silverstein as the correct forms. However, in the light of the affiliation of the witnesses proposed above, the similarity between the versions of the names given by manuscripts of both branches of the stemma would suggest that these forms are closer to the names in the archetype than are those in Vienna, and it would seem, therefore, that the copyist of Vienna, faced with strange and possibly garbled names in his exemplar, emended them by drawing on his classical knowledge. In this case it does not seem possible that the variants could have occurred independently.

B. REDACTION I IN REDACTION VIII

Redaction VIII, as identified by Silverstein in 1935 from the single text known at the time, Berlin, Preussische Staatsbibliothek, lat. 422 [elec. theol. qu.61], f. 226 rv, (= Be), is a composite redaction formed by alternating sections of Redaction I and Redaction IV. When extracted from the composite text in the Berlin manuscript, the sections of Redaction I make up a complete version of the redaction except for the substitution of the Redaction IV version of the Fastbreakers, and the specific duration of the Respite which is added in from the same source.

Two further manuscripts contain a version of the *Visio Pauli* which alternates these two redactions. The structure of the first in Hamburg,

---

62 Silverstein 1935, p. 65. See also his comment that Barcelona "barbarizes" the names (1959, p. 205).

63 The composition of Redaction VIII is discussed in detail in chapter 10 below.
Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek, Jacobi 1, ff. 132r-133v, is the same as that of Silverstein’s Berlin codex, and a complete text of Redaction I, with the same Redaction IV version of the Fastbreakers, may be extracted from it. However, the sections of Redaction I used in Venice, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, It I. 6 (5015), ff. 161r-180r, do not make up a full version of the redaction. The proportion of Redaction IV is significantly larger in this composite text; for example, it also replaces the Redaction I version of the episode of the sinners immersed in the fiery river (I, ss. 13-19) and the Respite (I, ss. 46-51). Several passages from the Visio Esdrae have also been interpolated. The sections of Redaction I which are used here, however, are:-

1, 2, 3-12, (13), (16), (17), 23-24, 26-27, 30, 36, 40-43, 52

The text of Redaction I in the Berlin manuscript was linked by Silverstein to the Vienna version of the redaction against Barcelona, not directly, however, but through a common source. The new version in the Hamburg Redaction VIII shows a strong affiliation to Vienna and Berlin, and thus to I (ii), while the text in the Venice manuscript belongs to the other branch of Redaction I, represented by Barcelona, Borghese and St Omer.

(1) Hamburg, Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek, Jacobi 1, ff. 132r-133v. (=H)

The presence of the quotation from Ecclesiasticus, xxxiv, 24:-

unde et salemon qui offert inquit sacrificium de rapina pauperum tamquam filium in conspectu patris sui,

---

64 The Hamburg text does not insert the duration of the Respite into <50>, however. It also contains a full version of the extra admonitory conclusion where the Berlin text has only the first word.
65 However, three phrases from red. I, <13>, <16> and <17>, are inserted into the red. IV version; they are from <13> in flumine igneo, from <16> postquam corpus et sanguinem domini nostri Ihesu Christi superant (sic), and from <18> falsi testes.
66 The form of the Venice version and its implications for red. VIII are discussed in chapter 10 below.
67 <30> appears in the text before <23>.
68 The phrase angurias (sic) et divinationes fecerunt from red. I, is inserted towards the end of the red. IV version of the Infanticides.
69 Silverstein 1959, pp. 208-11.
in the Redaction I sections of the Hamburg text indicates its affiliation with Vienna and the Redaction I sections of the Berlin Redaction VIII. This occurs at the end of s. 12 and is unique to these manuscripts, for the quotation is not found in either Paris or the manuscripts of the other branch of Redaction I. In addition to the characteristics of the I (ii) branch, which are shared with both Paris and Vienna/Berlin (e.g. the omission of fundamentum in s. 2 and the Virgin Birth in s. 44), Hamburg also shares two further omissions characteristic of Vienna and Berlin, but not of Paris, i.e. stillancia is dropped from s. 5, and milia is omitted from the number of the pains of Hell in s. 53.70 Other variants common to these three texts are the homoeoteleuton in s. 11,71 the error ascendens for ardens in s. 28, and the omission of the casting of infants into the river in s. 35. Hamburg, Berlin and Vienna represent therefore a separate development from Paris, although sharing its source.

Of the three manuscripts thus affiliated, Hamburg is the oldest. The section of Cod. Jacobi I in which Redaction VIII occurs is dated to the 13th century72 and thus precedes the Vienna (14th-c.) and Berlin (15th-c.) manuscripts. However Hamburg is not the source for either Vienna or Berlin, although Berlin's text is strikingly parallel. In particular, Berlin shares with Hamburg a significant number of variants peculiar to themselves against all the other versions of Redaction I. Both have the same additions, for example: se...ad nubes et in s. 4, et ita perduraverunt in s. 16, in illud flumen vel/et and quos vidisti in s. 19, predicationem respuerunt in s. 45, michael cum gemitu dixit in s. 47, pro peccatis hominum et animarum in s. 50, and agere in s. 52.73 Both omit et auguria from s. 35 and in carne venientem from s. 44,74 and they make the same transposition of et usque in diem iudicii in s. 43.75 Also they both have the same

70 These were noted by Silverstein for Vi and Be (Silverstein 1959, p. 210).
71 <11> ab eo procedunt | omnes serpentes et rane et cum expuit in terram ab eo procedunt | copie ranarum etc.
72 Katalog der Handschriften der Staats und Universitätsbibliothek, Hamburg (Hamburg 1957), vol. IV, pp. 149-151; see: 'e) 64-133', at p. 149.
73 Other additions: <7> erat; <10> autem; <22> quos ut vidit; <30> et qui; <31> glacies...alteram; <37> quam prius viderat (videbat); <39> prius visas; <47> sancte.
74 Other omissions: <5> flumina; <6> erat, eius; <16> respondit angelus; <22> et fleuit paulus et dixit; <26> et flevit; <41> hunc.
75 Also <17> dei verbum; <22> flentes et gementes; <30> misericordes non sunt;
alternative readings which are unsupported elsewhere in the tradition, e.g. *cercere mundi* instead of *cercere in (hoc) mundo* in s. 1, *terrarenum* instead of *terre* in s. 3, *et ideo ad genua dimersi sunt* instead of *ad ecclesiam non venerunt* in s. 15, *sine fine ardebunt* in s. 25 where the other mss. have different readings, *maior es illi(s) filius dei (hominis) venit* instead of *maior es misericordes filio dei qui venit* in s. 27, and *passionem* instead of *adventum* in s. 41.76

Vienna does not share any of these, and thus does not descend from Hamburg. Nor, however, does Berlin descend directly from the earlier manuscript, despite the close and numerous similarities between them. Where Hamburg has *annuntiant* in s. 18, Berlin has the better reading *annuunt* (which Vienna and Paris also have).77 Berlin does not have Hamburg’s erroneous figure *clxiiii* instead of *cxliii* for the number of the pains of Hell in s. 53, and it does not repeat Hamburg’s omission of *fidem* from s. 18:-

(H) dum habent contra eos
(Be) dum habent fidē contra eos,

nor the omission of the verb in the second clause of the Ecclesiasticus quotation in s. 12:-

(H) tamquam filium in conspectu patris sui,
(Be) tamquam qui maculat filium in conspectu patris,
(Vi) tamquam qui filium in conspectu matris mortificet.79

On this evidence, therefore, Hamburg must share a common source with Berlin and both share an antecedent source with Vienna. To this latter source Hamburg and Berlin were the more faithful, as may be seen in the significant number of cases when Vienna deviates, but they agree with Paris in superior readings, e.g. they have the text omitted by Vienna in ss. 4, 6, 26,

76 Also the following variants against (=/) the usual readings: <5> et / velut; <14> dixit / suspiravit; <23> desperaverunt / non speraverunt; in deum / in illo; <28> vidi / vidit; <36> peccatores / peccatoribus; <37> adhuc videbis / nondum vidisti; <38> duxit / tuit; ad puteum / ad septentrionem; recede de puteo / vade longe (etc); <52> sanctum / beatum; predicare (predicari) / predicaret; etc.
77 Cf. LLx 8: qui innuunt sibi.
78 In the ms.: fidē.
35, and 37, and the more authentic form when Vienna either paraphrases in ss. 48, 50, and 55 or gives an alternative, e.g. in ss. 9 and 43. This source of Hamburg, Berlin and Vienna, as has been shown above, was a separate development from the source of Paris. The interrelationship of the manuscripts of the second branch of the redaction is thus:

```
Red. I
  (ii) P
  (ii)a Vi
  (ii)b Be
  H
```

In the hypothetical b above, the name of the *draco* appears to have been Parthemmon since both Hamburg and Vienna have this form; in Berlin the name is corrupted to Pantemam. The names for Redaction I's extra rivers in that antecedent, however, would appear to be close to those of Hamburg and Berlin. Only two names are given in s. 5 by these two mss.:

- H. *que confluunt secum ynton et graviton*
- Be. *que confluunt sicut inton*\(^{81}\) et graviori,

and these forms obviously reflect the names and perhaps also the word order of Paris:

- P. *que confluunt Sunton et graviton et cogiton.\(^{82}\)*

This would support the view that either they or the Paris forms appeared in the conjectured b of the stemma above, and that the classical names in Vienna were an emendation.

(2) Venice, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, It I. 6 (5015), ff. 161r-180r. (= Ve)

The version of Redaction I in the Venice text of Redaction VIII appears to belong to the other branch of the redaction. Although a complete text cannot be reassembled from the sections used in the Venice manuscript, there is nevertheless sufficient evidence on the whole to class it with Barcelona, Borghese and St Omer. Like them, Venice retains original

---

\(^{80}\) However Be omits all but the first word of <55>.

\(^{81}\) Written as a single word with abbreviation in the ms., i.e. 'into(n)', but the 't' is not certain. Silverstein (1935, p. 210: 3) reads 'in eom' in the ms., emended in his text to 'in eum'.

\(^{82}\) Cf. <5> (Vi) *que confluunt secum stix flegeton et acheron*; (Ba) *et influunt in eum Seuiton et cogiton et ograviton*; (Borgh) *que influunt Seviton et Cogiton*; (O) *quoque influebant in eum Semiaton Conchion et gravituton*. 
features which Paris, Vienna, Hamburg and Berlin lack, i.e. *fundamentum* in s. 2 (related, however, to *abissy* (sic) not *celi*) and in s. 36 *melius fuisset illis si nati non fuissent*. In addition, it shares variants which, on the evidence above, can be ascribed to the hyparchetype I (i), i.e. *in loco illo* in s. 4, the plural *iniquitates* in s. 12 and *tempus penitendi* rather than *tempus penitencie* in s. 27.

However, in the case of the *draco’s* name in s. 5, Venice may seem to differ from the other I (i) texts. It has been suggested above that the form *Parthimoth* lies behind the forms of the name in those texts,\(^83\) but the name in Venice, *Partemio*, which is not found elsewhere in the redactions, might seem closer to the alternative name *Parthemon*, in which case there would be a split in the I (i) branch as there is in the I (ii) branch.\(^84\) However, it could be argued that, in the absence of a final consonant and allowing for the oscillation of *e/i*, *Partemio* could derive from either *Parthimoth* or *Parthemon*, and thus that its significance as a variant is ambiguous. Other distinguishing characteristics and variants of I (i) cannot be identified in a number of cases because the sections in which they appear are not used in Venice. Nevertheless, what there is would appear to justify the placement of Venice with Barcelona, Borghese and St Omer in the I (i) branch of the redaction.

There is also sufficient evidence to establish that Venice is not directly dependent on either the antecedent of Barcelona and Borghese, I (i)a, or on the contemporary St Omer. In the second part of the redaction where I (i)a is represented by default by Barcelona alone, Venice contains text which has been paraphrased or omitted in that copy, but which is attested elsewhere, e.g. in s. 42: *sigillavit (illum puteum) sigillis septem* (cf. O and P, Vi, H & Be)\(^85\) and in s. 52: *Tunc benedixit ...... terram* (cf. O and P, Vi, H & Be),\(^86\) and *et predicaret* (cf. O and variants in P, Vi, H & Be).\(^87\) In other instances

---

\(^83\) O: p(ro)thimoth; Ba/Borgh: parimot(h).
\(^84\) P: parthimoth; Vi/H: parthemon.
\(^85\) Ba: clausit illum.
\(^86\) Ba: omitted.
\(^87\) Ba: omitted.
where Ba/Borgh, or Ba alone after s. 29, has a variant reading, Venice is supported by the other witnesses, e.g.:-

<1> (Ba/Borgh) ostendita / (Ve) ostensa (cf. O and P, Vi, H & Be)
<3> (Ba/Borgh) girat / (Ve) girant (cf. O and P, Vi, H & Be)
<4> (Ba/Borgh) fluctibus / (Ve) fluctus (cf. O, P, Be.)
<11> (Ba/Borgh) scorpiones / (Ve) omitted (cf. O and P, Vi, H & Be)
<36> (Ba) melior illis essent / (Ve) melius esset illis (cf. O)
<43> (Ba) ascensure sunt / (Ve) descenderunt (cf. O and P, H & Be)

On the other hand, Venice does not share St Orner's displacement of the *tenebre* phrase to follow the river of fire s. 4, and in its text are authentic phrases which have been omitted in St Omer, e.g. in s. 23: *qui non speraverunt ... habuerunt* (cf. Ba, Borgh, P, Vi), in s. 41: *patriarche prophete* (cf. all) and in s. 42 the adjectives *pius* and *misericors* (cf. Ba & P). The names of the extra rivers in s. 5 in Venice which are closer to those in Barcelona and Borghese (and arguably the best of the I (i) versions), could not have been copied from St Omer:-

(Ve) sebiton coyton et graviton
(Ba) Seviton et cogiton et graviton
(Borgh) Seviton et Cogiton
(O) Semiaton Conchion et gravituton

Nor does Venice follow St Omer in a number of errors, e.g.:-

<4> (O) luctus / (Ve) mestucies [for 'mesticie'] (cf. all)
<5> (O) vel / (Ve) velud (cf. Ba, Borgh, P, Vi)
(O) mors / (Ve) mons (cf. all)
<8> (O) acus / (Ve) gladii acuti (cf. all )
<9> (O) ad devorandum / (Ve) ut absorbatur (cf. Ba, Borgh, H, Be)
<12> (O) satrape / (Ve) satrapes terre (cf. Ba, Borgh, P, H, Be)
<13> (O) a flumine ignis / (Ve) in flumine [sic] ingneo (cf. Ba, Borgh, P, H, Be).

In these instances Venice is supported by other manuscripts and thus does not depend directly on St Omer. However, neither does St Omer depend on Venice. It does not transfer the lion simile from s. 7 to s. 9 as Venice does, and it also contains well-supported text omitted by its companion, for example the whole of section 25. Further, it has, in its turn, better-founded readings for a number of Venice variants, e.g.

<5> (Ve) exsunt et fluant ex eo / (O) influebant in eum (cf. Ba, Borgh; confluunt (secum): P, Vi, H, Be)
(Ve) et stillans / (O) et erant stillicidia stillantia (cf. Ba, Borgh, P)

88 Cf. the I (ii) versions: (P) Sunton et graviton et cogiton; (H) ynton et graviton; (Be) inton et graviori.
<6> (Ve) omitted / (O) intrinsecus loculi [for 'intrinsecus loci'] (cf. Ba, Borgh, P, Vi, H, Be)
<11> (Ve) et spoma in terra / (O) cum expuisset in terra (cf. Ba, Borgh, P)
(Ve) rane / (O) copie ranarum (cf. P, Vi, H, Be)
<52> (Ve) ne per ignorantiam intrent / (O) ut non intrent (cf. Ba, P, Vi, H, Be).

It is clear therefore that in these circumstances there is no direct relationship between Venice and any of the I (i) manuscripts. However, whether or not there is any indirect relationship cannot be decisively demonstrated. In the limited number of sections which can be compared because of Venice's omissions, most of the unsupported variants which suggest such a relationship are small details, being mostly omissions or slight expansions. The following are examples of such variants linking Venice and St Omer (the more usual readings are in Barcelona and Borghese):-

<6> (Ve & O) magnus igneus / (Ba & Borgh) ingens
<8> (Ve & O) omitted / (Ba & Borgh) et erant oculi eius
<9> (Ve & O) ore aperto stabat / (Ba & Borgh) ore aperto
(Ve & O) animas peccatorum / (Ba & Borgh) animas
<12> (Ve & O) et in / (Ba & Borgh) in
(Ve & O) omitted / (Ba & Borgh) omnes
<24> (Ve & O) respondit / (Ba and Borgh) dixit.

These, individually, could easily have occurred independently, although a cluster of them might be indicative. One of them, however, may be more noteworthy. Venice and St Omer describe the 100-headed monster in s. 6 as *magnus* *i(n)gneus*, while Barcelona and Borghese describe it as *ingens*. In the other branch of the redaction, Paris has *igneus*, Vienna omits the phrase, and Hamburg and Berlin have *ingens*. Elsewhere both *ingens* (*magnus*) and *igneus* have support: Redaction Br has *magnus*, and Redaction II *igneus*; the Redaction III manuscripts are divided, but slightly more in favour of *ingens*.\(^{89}\) One of the latter only, i.e. S1 in IIIc,\(^{90}\) has the double form which Venice and St Omer have, and probably for the same reason. It would seem on the evidence that *ingens* was the original form which could easily slip into *i(n)gneus* in some cases. In other cases, its more common alternative *magnus* either replaced it or was incorporated via a correction, and the original adjective then read as *i(n)gneus*, thus producing


\(^{90}\) Silverstein 1935, [4], p. 165: 8 (note).
the double form. Thus, while this double form is found in Venice and St Omer, and would seem to link them against the original adjective preserved in Barcelona and Borghese, the fact that the same change has taken place in Redaction IIIc, St1, suggests that this could occur independently. Nevertheless, taken in conjunction with the other variations, it could suggest an intermediate source for Venice and St Omer, not shared by Barcelona/ Borghese.

On the other hand, Venice describes the river in s. 4 as *igneum ferventem*, whereas St Omer reflects a Ba/Borgh variant which appears to be an error:

(Ba/ Borgh) flumen ut ignis fervens
(O) fulmen [sic] magnum atque ignis fervens
(Ve) flumen ingneum ferventem

The form *igneum fervens* is the more strongly supported among the redactions;\(^91\) it is found in the other branch of Redaction I (i.e. in Hamburg & Berlin; Paris has *magnum fervens* and Venice omits), and in Redactions BR, II and most of III.\(^92\) However, the Ba/Borgh and St Omer versions of the whole phrase are perhaps not close enough to argue a decisive connection. Later, in s. 13, St Omer has *flumine ignis* where the other Redaction I manuscripts, including Venice, have *igneo*,\(^93\) as do Redactions BR, II and III,\(^94\) so there would seem to be a preference in St Omer for the more dramatic noun form over the duller adjective. Conversely, the Barcelona/Borghese antecedent weakens, if it does not alter, the idea of the river of fire by inserting *ut*. These could therefore be separate deviations.

The two versions of Redaction I in Venice and St Omer may, therefore, either derive separately from the hyparchetype I (i), or, if some weight is allowed to the small cluster of minor variants which they have in common, the texts may share an intermediate antecedent. What is clear in either case is that St Omer and Venice are at times better representatives of

\(^91\) Cf. LLx 3 and the Long Latin versions in Silverstein & Hilhorst 1997, pp: 136-137: 18, i.e. fluvium ignis ferventem (L1: P), flumen ygneo ferbentem (L1: Esc), flumen ingneum ferventem (L3).
\(^93\) Except Vi: ignito.
the hyparchetype and, indeed, on occasion also of the archetype. This may be illustrated by the diffracted state of section 52 in all the manuscripts of Redaction I, except in St Omer which appears to have the full version, and in Venice which has only one omission (ut emendarent).

ST OMER<52> tunc benedixit dominus beatum paulum apostolum et misit eum in terram et precepit ei ut annunciaret humano generi et predicaret eis ut se emendarent per ueram penitenciam et ueram confessionem ut non intrent in illas penas pessimas

VENICE<52> tunc benedixit dominus beatum paulum et misit eum in terra et precepit ei ut adnuntiaret hoc generi humano et predicaret eis veram confessionem et ueram penitentiam ne per ingnorantiam intrent in penam illam pessimam quam beatus paulus uidit.

In relation to these versions, Barcelona has three omissions, namely the first phrase (tunc...terra), et predicaret after humani generi and veram confessionem after penitenciam. The manuscripts of the other branch, I (ii), have between them all the elements of the passage except ut annunciaret (which all the manuscripts of the I (i) have), but these are reordered with some change and omission, e.g. Vienna omits misit in terram and changes precept to dixit.

BARCELONA<52> et precepit beato Paulo Dominus Ihesus Christus ut annunciasset humano generi ut emendaret se per ueram penitentiam ut non intraret in illas pessimas penas.

HAMBURG<52> tunc benedixit dominus sanctum paulum et misit eum in terra et precepit ei predicaret generi humano agere semper ueram confessionem et penitentiam ut non intrent in illas penas quas uidit paulus.

BERLIN<52> tunc dominus sanctum paulum et misit eum in terram, et precepit ei hec omnia humano generi predicari, et agere semper ueram penitenciam et confessionem, ut non intrarent in illas penas quas uidit sanctus paulus.

PARIS<52> tunc benedixit dominus paulum beatum, et misit eum in terram ut predicaret et emendaret genus humanum et semper ueram confessionem et ueram penitenciam donaret ut non intrarent in illas penas pessimas.

VIENNA<52> tunc benedixit dominus Paulum beatum, et dixit ad eum ut predicaret omni populo ueram confessionem et ueram penitenciam, ne intrarent in illas penas.
Conclusion

Allowing for the possibility of a link between St Omer and Venice, the interrelationship of the eight witnesses of Redaction I is thus:
Chapter 2  
REDACTION BR and the GÖTTINGEN VISIO PAULI

Of all the redactions, the closest in structure to Redaction $\alpha$ is the version of the Visio Pauli identified by T. Silverstein in the 12th-century Brussels manuscript, Bibl. Roy. lat. 364 [5576-5604], ff. 132-132 bis, and published as Redaction BR in 1959. In his discussion of this text, Silverstein showed that it shared many features with the other redactions descended from Redaction $\alpha$, but that, nevertheless, it was independent of them. Indeed its especial importance, in his view, is that it gives "separate, perhaps direct, access to $\alpha". It has, he found, none of the characteristic interpolations of Redactions I, II, III, IV or their derivatives. It does not have the modifications to the original Long Latin text which are evident in Redaction I (the reclassification of the sinners immersed up to their knees in the fiery river, or the compression of the two separate groups of the usurers and the injurers of widows and orphans (LLx 13 and 18) into one), nor does it share the "abbreviation and occasional embroidery" of Redaction II, or Redaction III's omission of some original phrases. It does, however, omit the episode of the negligent bishop, but, significantly, it preserves the description of the vermem inquietem in the icy depths of the Great Well (LLx 26), a passage which has been either deleted or diluted in the other redactions. The close verbal link here to the original Long Latin through Redaction $\alpha$, Silverstein concluded, "sets the seal to BR's unique distinction among the abbreviated Latin texts."

From the perspective of the hypothetical Redaction $\alpha$, the structure of this redaction is, up to LLx 28, the least affected by interpolation and reshaping of all the redactions descended from $\alpha$. Although omitting the episode of the negligent bishop (LLx 12), and Paul's lament (LLx 27), the sequence of Redaction BR follows uninterruptedly the order of the extracted Long Latin text, as shown in Appendix A. But only as far as LLx 28. After

---

1 Silverstein 1959, pp. 234-238.  
2 ibid., pp. 214-218.  
3 e.g. the interpolated draco. See also the notes to Silverstein's text.  
4 ibid., p. 217.  
5 ibid., [13], p. 237.  
6 ibid., p. 218.
the appeal of the souls on seeing the two visitants, the momentous events of the subsequent sections are reduced in BR to a few lines:-

Et oraverunt Michael et Paulus ad deum pro illis. Et pro illorum oratione et misericordia omnipotentis dei optinuerunt refrigerium noctis et diei dominice,

in which only the briefest reference to the intercession and granting of the Respite is made (LLx 30 and 33). No trace remains of the Long Latin Descent of Christ, the Reproaches, the Souls' Acclamation and the Demons' reaction, nor of Redaction α's conclusion on the number of the Pains of Hell and the Men with Tongues of Iron. Instead, a new conclusion (= I) is added, describing the itinerary and judgement of the soul immediately after death - this is not however the episode of the Going-Out of the Souls, found in Redactions III and IV and their derivatives. The BR version differs from those not only in content, but also in position since the episode occurs earlier in the other redactions, i.e. before the appeal of the souls (LLx 28). Nevertheless, in spite of the abbreviated and changed ending, Redaction BR in its structure, is both the validation of, and the best witness to, the structure of the common source of the other redactions, Redaction α.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Redaction α</th>
<th>Redaction BR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A; 1-3; B, C; 4-13,</td>
<td>A, 1-3; B, C; 4-11, 13,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14/15*, 16-19, 20/21*,</td>
<td>14/15*, (16)-19, 20/21*,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-26; The Going-Out of</td>
<td>22, 24-26,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the Souls, 27-35; D.</td>
<td>28, (30), (33); I.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(* indicates merged extracts) (omitted = 12, (16), 23, 27, 31, 32, 34-35.)

If the structure mirrors faithfully, on the whole, sections 1-28 of Redaction α, the same cannot be said for the language of BR. A comparison with matching sections in the other redactions shows that BR has consistently "enhanced" the text with individual touches and additions, as well as omitting some distinctive features of the original material. Some of the omissions are noted by Silverstein in his footnotes to the text; they include the oceanus section from LLx 1, the name of the Land of Sorrow,

---

7 ibid., [13], p. 238: 3-5.
8 LLx 31, 32, 34, 35 and interpolation D.
9 Silverstein (1959, pp. 217 & 238, n. 204), however, saw a link with the Long Latin also in the BR conclusion.
and the draco's name.\textsuperscript{10} Other omissions may also be noted, e.g. the measurement of Deep Pit in LLx 9, a phrase from the description of the Abyss (LLx 10) and the summons by the angel from LLx 23.\textsuperscript{11} However, counterbalancing the abbreviation by omission is the tendency to heighten the text with substitutions or additions. For example, the eyes of the draco are not quasi gladii acuti but ardentes velut clibanus ignis, and those who fornicate after receiving the sacrament are here instead, qui fornicantur cum adulteris et cum alterius viri muliere et cum scorto;\textsuperscript{12} also, extra details are added to those who deceived their unsuspecting neighbours, et illis nescientibus dolos semper concinnant, and to those who did not trust in God invocantes eum ore et abnegantes opere.\textsuperscript{13} Thus while BR is the best surviving example of the original structure, it is - notwithstanding such passages as the vermem inquietem - only partially representative of the original language.

ADDITIONAL TEXTS

(1) Brussels, Bibl. Roy., lat. 1367 ff. 120v-121v.

A second text of Redaction BR is the last item in this 13th-century manuscript.\textsuperscript{14} It has all of the features noted for Brussels 364, matching the earlier text in all respects, including the mistake which is transcribed in the sixth line of [3] in the printed text.\textsuperscript{15} Both manuscripts have iussis for, presumably, iustis, in a phrase which is one of BR's additions, malum in omnibus iussis diffamant. This and two other words, also in [3], are queried

\textsuperscript{10} See footnotes 181, 183, 184, 193, 195, 198 & 199, ibid., pp. 235-237.
\textsuperscript{14} Catalogue des MSS de la Bibliothèque Royale de Belgique, Vol II, Brussels 1902, pp. 300-301. For the date, however, cf. Catalogus Codicum Hagiographicorum Bibliothecae Regiae Bruxellensis, Vol I, Brussels 1886, p. 464, "exaratus exeunte seculo XII".
\textsuperscript{15} Silverstein 1959, p. 235.
in Silverstein's edition, i.e. inmittunt and innuunt in the fifth and tenth lines respectively of [3] in the printed text. The second Brussels manuscript verifies these conjectures. Several apparent variants between MS 1367 and the published edition are not such in fact; durus in [12], line 3, and inquietem in [13], line 1, are editorial emendations in the published text for dirus and inquietum which appear in both manuscripts. Also, eveniunt in [14], line 5, of the published text, is conveniunt in both manuscripts.

Two other variants in MS 1367, however, are due to scribal error or correction. Firstly, alii in f. 121r, col. 1 line 20, appears to have been corrected to the nominative (to make a second group of sinners) from alis which the scribe had originally copied, the s being still faintly perceptible. MS 364 has alis. Secondly, numquid for nunquam in MS 1367, f. 121v, col. 2 line 6, changes into a question the original statement nunquam fiet commemoracio eius in conspectu domini/dei, as found in MS 364 and the other redactions. Other variations between the two Brussels manuscripts are orthographic. But there are also several additions in MS 1367, notably the phrase at the end of the list of heretics, potius huius fidei affligebant cultores. Further, some text is now missing in line 4 of f. 121v. The upper edges of the pages of MS 1367 have been damaged by fire, rendering illegible, in the case of the Visio Pauli, the words or parts of words at the end of lines 1-4 of col. 2 of f. 121r, and at the beginning of lines 1-4 of col. 1 of f. 121v. The number of missing letter spaces here is quite consistent with the matching text in MS 364, except in the case of line 4 of f. 121v. At this point of the

---

16 MS 1367, f. 121r, col. 1, line 19 & line 27. The words are clear in MS 364 itself, although obviously not so in the microfilm or photographic copy on which the published text was based.
17 Silverstein 1959, p. 237.
18 MS 1367, f. 121v, col. 2, lines 4 and 13.
19 Silverstein 1959, p. 238, and MS 1367, f. 122r, col. 1, line 1. The acute accent abbreviation mark over c is clear in MS 364, but must have been indistinct in the microfilm or copy; the same abbreviation is resolved as con elsewhere in the published text, i.e. contentiones in [3], line 8 and concinnant in [3], line 11, both at p. 235.

---

20 See the published text, [3] line 5.
22 e.g. velut (f. 121r, col. 1 line 3) for velut (BR [1] line 7); malefici (f. 121v, col. 1 line 2) for mallefici (BR [6] line 3); surexit (f. 121v, col. 2 line 3) for surrexit (BR [12] line 3); filii (f. 121v, col. 2 line 17) for fili (BR [13] line 4). Bethlehem in the published text, BR [14], is bethleem in both manuscripts (cf. MS 1367, f. 121v, col. 2 lines 25-6).
Visio, MS 364 reads: Postea vidit viros nigros etc.\textsuperscript{24} and MS 1367: Postea vidit [damaged space of about 7 or 8 letters] vidit viros nigros etc. It is not possible to ascertain from other versions whether the missing text here (presuming it was not deleted as a mistake by the scribe), and the added phrase, potius ... culturaes, were in the exemplar or were scribal additions.\textsuperscript{25} If, in the absence of evidence to the contrary, the latter is assumed to be the case, MS 1367 would appear to be a copy of the earlier MS 364, and it would only be significant as evidence that Redaction BR did not remain a single isolated re-working of Redaction $\alpha$.

(2) Göttingen, Universitätsbibliothek, Theol. 140, ff. 270v-271r.\textsuperscript{26}

The text of the Visio Pauli in this 15th-century manuscript replicates closely the structure of Redaction BR. Like the latter (with the exception of its new ending), Göttingen has only those interpolations which can be ascribed to Redaction $\alpha$, and shows none of the later additions and structural modifications of the other redactions. It too omits the episode of the negligent bishop, but unlike BR it also omits the sorcerers (LLx 15) and does not identify the usurers (LLx 13). In neither version does the episode of the Going-Out of the Souls appear before the appeal to the Archangel and St Paul. The Göttingen Visio breaks off after this appeal, finishing three and a half lines from the bottom of column 1 of f. 271r; the second column and the verso of the folio, which is the last of the codex, are left blank. It was also at this point of the Visio, i.e. LLx. 28, that Redaction BR abandoned the original structure and replaced the last sections with a brief summary and new conclusion. What, if anything, would have followed in the Göttingen manuscript, can only be conjectured. But up to this point, the two texts are, on the whole, parallel in structure.

\textsuperscript{24} BR [7].

\textsuperscript{25} Nor can this be ascertained in the case of the other extra words and the transposition of acuti gladii (BR [2] line 2). With reference to the latter, however, the MS 1367 order of gladii acuti (f. 121r, col. 1 line 6) is found in all the other redactions which have this description of the draco.

\textsuperscript{26} Die Handschriften in Göttingen 2 Universitäts-Bibliothek, Berlin 1893, pp. 375-376.
In language, however, Göttingen and BR differ substantially. They are printed synoptically in Appendix D and reference hereafter to both texts will be to the numbered sections of this appendix.\(^{27}\) Göttingen has none of BR's distinctive changes and decoration noted above; rather it preserves the phrasing and detail which, on the evidence of the other redactions, must have been in Redaction α. For example:-

\[\text{BR <16>: qui fornicantur cum adulteris et cum alterius viri muliere et cum scorto,} \]

\[\text{Göt. <16>: qui fornicantur postquam sumpserunt corpus et sanguinem Christi,} \]

\[\text{LLx 6: qui cum sumpserunt corpus et sanguinem Christi eunt et fornicant,} \]

\[\text{IIIA [5]: qui fornicantur postquam sumpserunt corpus domini et sanguinem,} \]

and:-

\[\text{BR <23>: et dimisit unumquemque proprae voluntati et tempus penitentiae et} \]

\[\text{predicatores dedit illis et non penituerunt. Ideo venire ibi meruerunt,} \]

\[\text{Göt. <23>: et dimisit unumquemque proprae voluntati et tempus penitentiae habuerunt et} \]

\[\text{non penituerunt,} \]

\[\text{LL 11: dimittens unum quemque propria voluntate facere in tempore quo inabitat} \]

\[\text{super terram,} \]

\[\text{IIIA [6]: et dimisitunicuique propriam voluntatem et tempus penitencie et neglexerunt} \]

\[\text{se et non egerunt penitenciam.} \]

Nor is the Göttingen text abbreviated by the series of omissions, either intended or by homoeoteleuton,\(^{30}\) which characterises BR. Where, within

---

\(^{27}\) The sections are indicated also by pointed brackets.


\(^{29}\) ibid., p. 172: 6-9.

\(^{30}\) See <10> rane et [ -  ranarum et] omnia, <35> supplicia [ -  supplicia], <36> illum [ -  illum]. In <28-29>, the scribe of Göt. has made the same mistake as BR, i.e. 'mulieres [ -  mulieres] Et vidit ibi puellas nigras', but has then crossed out 'Et ... nigras' and returned to the text of <28>. Cf. MS. Theol 140, f. 271r, col. 1, lines 2-3.
the section, BR omits, Göttingen gives a version of the full text originating in the Long Latin and reflected also in the other redactions. For example:

BR <2>: et tulit illum Mychael archangelus in spiritu in celum et ostendit ei locum terribilem,

Gött. <2>: et tulit eum michael angelus in spiritu in celum et ostendit ei fundamenta celi et misit eum super flumen aque magnum. Et interrogavit paulus quis esset fluvius et dixit angelus occeanus vocatur super quem girat spera celi et circuit orbem terre. Et ibi terribilem locum vidit,

LLx 1: et post aec duxit me super oceanum qui portat fundamenta celi...et tulit me...super flumine aque magno et interrogavi Quis est hic fluvius aque. Et dixit mihi Hic est oceanus qui circuit omnem terram,

II [1]: tulit illum Michael in spiritu in celum et ostendit ei fundamentum celi super flumen magnum. Tunc interrogavit quid hoc esset. Tunc respondit angelus Oceanus, qui circumierat omne mundum. Et vidit ibi Paulus locum terribilem.

and:-

BR <19>: Et vidit alium locum viris ac mulieribus plenum et gemitibus et fletibus. Et dixit Paulus Qui sunt hi domine,

Gött. <19>: Et vidit ibi locum plenum virorum ac mulierum. Et fornax alta profunditate locus plenus animabus ura super unam. Et erat profunditas quasi ccctorum milia cubitorum. Gementes dicens Miserere nobis fili david. Et flevit paulus et dixit Qui sunt hi domine,

LLx 9: Conspexi autem et vidi foveas in profundo valde et in eas animas plurimas in unum et erat profunditas loci illius quasi tria milia cubitorum et vidi eas gementes et flentes et dicentes Miserere nobis domine et nemo misertus est eis. Et interrogavi angelum et dixi Qui sunt domine,


In two instances, however, the situation is reversed. At the end of s. 17, BR has alios qui audire volentes non permitentes which Göttingen

31 In addition to the examples below, see the following for other authentic material with external support present in Göt. but omitted in BR: <4> et...cogiton (cf. red. II: Silverstein 1935, [1], p.156: 8); <9> nomen ...partimocht [sic] (cf. red. IIIa: ibid., [4], p. 166: 1); <10> eos expuit...ranarum (cf. red. IIIa: ibid., [4], p. 166: 1-4); <20> et dixit paulus...habet (cf. red. IIIc: ibid., [6], p. 171: 5-7); <22> super humanum genus (cf. red. IIIa: ibid., [6], p. 172: 4 ); <28> hii sunt ...mulieres (cf. red. IIIa: ibid., [9], p. 174: 12-15); <29> et quatuor...manibus (cf. red. IIIa: ibid., [10], p. 174: 17-19); <29> in...parentibus (cf. LLx 17); <30> de medio ...frigebant (cf. red. IIIa: Silverstein 1935, [12], p. 176: 13-14); <31> super...aque (cf. red. IIIa: ibid., [11], p. 176: 6); <35> sequere...supplicia (cf. red. IIIc: ibid., [14], p. 179: 13-14); <36> ad...statuit (cf. red. II: ibid., [12], p. 158: 1); <37> et muros...parte (cf. red. IIIa: ibid., [15], p. 180: 4-5).

32 Silverstein 1935, p. 156: 3-5.

omits, but which is supported by Redaction IIIc, and from ss. 26-27 a substantial passage is lacking in Göttingen, i.e. the identification of the usurers in s. 26 and the whole of s. 27 describing the sorcerers, both of which passages are present in BR and reflected in other redactions. Besides these, the important *vermem inquietum* passage in BR is only partially and defectively preserved in Göttingen:

BR <41> : Et postea vidit in illo loco vermem inquietum animas absorbentem
Gött. <41> : Et postea vidit in loco vernum absorbentes

There is also a lacuna of about thirteen letter spaces in s. 21 of Göttingen:

comittentur anime ille cum vix ............... usque ad xi annos.

The passage itself is derived from LLx 10:-

cum enim mittantur illic anime, vix post quingentos annos perveniunt in profundum, and here, as in the case of the *vermem inquietem*, BR is more faithful to the original text:

<21> cum inmittuntur anime in eo vix profundum eius contingunt usque ad quinquaginta annos.

Both err in the number of years, but BR's *quinquaginta annos* is closer to the Long Latin *quingentos* than Göttingen's *xi annos*, and since *quinquaginta* appears also in Redaction IIIa, it may well have appeared, already so altered, in Redaction α. Similarly BR has the recognisably original reading in s. 36: *Sta longius ut possis sustinere fetorem loci,* where Göttingen gives a different sense: *Istius non lange pates sustinere fetorem loci.* As well as the corruption of the first part of the sentence in Göttingen, the final clause of the Long Latin (*ut valeas*) and BR (*ut possis*) is changed there into a statement of fact, [non] *potes.*

Notwithstanding these defects, however, Göttingen is still overall the better representative of the linguistic form of Redaction α. Its fidelity to the original structure is slightly less than BR's, but on the grounds of structure and language combined, Göttingen overall reflects more comprehensively

---

34 nec alios audire permittunt: ibid., [5], p. 169: 7-8.
36 MS. Theol 140, f. 270v, col. 2, line 38.
39 In another case, i.e. Gött. <38>: *quicumque venerit* and BR <38>: *Si quis mittatur*, BR is again supported by LLx 25 and red. IIIa (Silverstein 1935, [15], p. 180: 6-7).
the common source of the alpha redactions. Its relationship to BR is through their shared store of material inherited from Redaction α. No feature peculiar to BR is repeated in Göttingen, and thus the two are independent of each other. However, several features of the Göttingen version link it to the second part of Redaction VII.

GÖTTINGEN and REDACTION VII, part 2.

Redaction VII was identified by Silverstein and published in 1935 from the 11th-century manuscript, Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, lat. 2851, ff. 34-38v.\(^\text{40}\) The first part of this version is related to Redaction IV,\(^\text{41}\) and the second part to Redaction I.\(^\text{42}\) In his 1935 study, Silverstein classified the second part as an "independent witness to the lost Redaction α", but related to Redaction I which at that time was known only in the Vienna 362 version.\(^\text{43}\) He revised this view in 1959 in the light of the Barcelona 28 version of Redaction I and included the second part of Redaction VII in his study of Redaction I,\(^\text{44}\) relating it to the branch of Redaction I he designated 1a, which also produced, separately, Barcelona 28; he distinguished this branch from the other branch, designated 1b, from which descended Vienna 362 and Redaction VIII, as shown in his figure:\(^\text{45}\)

\[ 
\text{I} \quad \text{IIa} \quad \text{IIb} \quad \text{Bar} \quad \text{VII} \quad \text{VIII} \quad \text{Vi} \quad \text{362} \]

However, the second part of Redaction VII does not have the compression into one group of the two originally separate groups of the usurers (LLx 13) and the injurers of widows and orphans (LLx 18), which Silverstein identified as characteristic of Redaction I.\(^\text{46}\) In Redaction VII the injurers of

---

\(^\text{40}\) For the text see Silverstein 1935, pp. 204-208. The manuscript was listed by Silverstein in 1935 at p. 221 as xii c, but corrected by him in 1959 at p. 205 in n. 16.
\(^\text{41}\) This section is discussed below in chapter 9.
\(^\text{42}\) Silverstein refers to only two parts in red. VII. However, the last passage in his edition, i.e. from p. 207: 16 to the end, is not found in any version of red. I; it may be argued therefore that a more precise division of red. VII would be: part 1 from p. 204 to 205: 22, part 2 from p. 205: 23 to p. 207: 16 and part 3 from p. 207: 16 to the end. Parts 1 & 3 are discussed in chapter 9 below.
\(^\text{43}\) Silverstein 1935, pp. 54-55.
\(^\text{44}\) Silverstein 1959, pp. 208-211.
\(^\text{45}\) ibid., p. 225.
\(^\text{46}\) ibid., pp. 216-217.
widows and orphans remain a separate group. Further, this redaction does not have Redaction I's reclassification of the sinners immersed up to the knees, or the details added by that redaction to the identification of the other groups in the fiery river. But, as observed by Silverstein, it does have another notable characteristic of Redaction I, the interpolation and naming of the extra rivers of Hell. Thus, while it cannot be related to any version of the Visio descended from the original Redaction I (which contained the LLx 13/18 compression and the reclassification), Redaction VII part 2 must share with Redaction I a common ancestor (=B) which had the extra named rivers of Hell, and thus:

\[ B \quad \text{or} \quad \text{VII} \]

The names of the extra rivers in VII are Flegeton, Coccitton and Rapion. The third of these could be a version of the Redaction I name Graviton and, if so, this would suggest that the strange names found in most of the Redaction I witnesses were also in VII's exemplar (and therefore in B), and that the first, Seviton, was replaced with the classical Flegeton, in a similar emendation to that in the Vienna text of Redaction I where, however, classical names replace all three (including Cochiton/ Cogiton).

Göttingen has neither the extra rivers, the 13/18 compression nor the reclassification, and therefore it does not depend on B or the original Redaction I in the figure above. Nevertheless it does share several features with VII. The first is the reference to a lion in the description of the 100-headed monster; Göttingen has \textit{et leo in unoquoque dente} and VII has \textit{et leonem in unoquoque dente}. This feature also occurs in the description of

---

47 See the published text, Silverstein 1935, p. 206: 34 ff. The usurers are omitted in red. VII due to what appears to be a sort of homoeoteleuton; after the initial description of the usurers' group (ibid., p. 206: 23-25), the text jumps to the identification of the following group, the sorcerers (ibid., p. 206: 25-6). This can be seen by comparing e.g. red. BR, ss. 25-27 in Appendix D.

48 ibid. p. 206: 1-11, and cf. chapter 1 above. Not all of the characteristic features of red. I can be compared in part 2 of red. VII because of the merging with part 1; e.g. the episode of the Infanticides appears in that part and is omitted in part 2.

49 ibid., p. 55.

50 ibid., p. 205: 29-30.

51 See Appendix C, <5>.

the *draco* in Redaction I, but not elsewhere in the tradition (i.e. in Redactions BR, II or III and derivatives). In Redaction I, s. 7, it appears thus:-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paris</td>
<td>ut leo unusquisque dens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vienna</td>
<td>ut leo unusquisque dens ardebat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamburg</td>
<td>ut leo erat unusquisque dens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berlin</td>
<td>ut leo erat unusquisque dens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barcelona</td>
<td>[et erant capita eius quasi capita leonum] et dentes eius sicut dentes leonum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borghese</td>
<td>ut leo unicuique denti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Omer</td>
<td>dentes ut leonis et unusquisque dens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venice</td>
<td>omitted; &lt;7&gt; semper stabat ore aperto sicut leo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Despite its variant forms, it is clear from the *leo* reference that the Göttingen *Visio* must share a common source with VII and Redaction I, but, since Göttingen does not include the additional named rivers which link VII to Redaction I, that source is not the same as the common link between VII and Redaction I. Hence:-

```
     A
    /\  
   /  
  Göt B
     \  
      
red. I  Red. VII
```

On this basis, the form of the *leo* reference in the description of the *draco* in A and B would appear to be that found in Göttingen and VII, i.e. *et leo(nem)* etc. This would then have been changed to *ut leo* etc. by the original Redaction I, thus giving rise to the variant versions observable in the Redaction I mss. If, however, the Redaction I versions are closer to the original form in A, then Göttingen and VII made the same independent emendation.

Another instance of an affinity between Göttingen and VII may be seen in the description of the world-encircling river, Oceanus. The Long Latin identifies it thus:-

```
Hic est oceanus qui circuit omnem terram (LLx 1).
```

53 The variant in Borgh appears to confirm that *ut leo unusquisque dens* was probably the form in the original red. I. Silverstein's discussion of the phrase in 1935 (pp. 66-67) was influenced by the form in the Vienna ms., but his reference to the locusts in Apoc., ix 8: 'their teeth were as the teeth of lions' (and cf. Joel 1. 6), would explain the emendations of Barcelona and St Omer.

In Göttingen, s. 2, the phrase is amplified by the insertion of an additional clause:-

Oceanus vocatur super quem girat spera celi et circuit orbem terre

Similarly Redaction VII:-

Hic fluvius dicitur Oceanum super quem girat supera celi et circuit orbem terre.\textsuperscript{55}

and Redaction I, s. 3:-

Hic est oceanus super quem girant sydera celi et circuit orbem terre.\textsuperscript{56}

The insertion does not appear in the Oceanus description in Redaction II:-

Oceanus qui circumierat omne mundum,\textsuperscript{37}

and the whole phrase has been omitted in BR and in Redaction III.\textsuperscript{58} (This part of the Long Latin is not included in Redaction IV).

The additional clause itself must have been present in A since it is in

Göttingen, Redaction VII, part 2, and Redaction I, and, as far as can be judged

by its absence in the extant versions of the other redactions, may well have

originated there. The phrase orbem terre must also have been in A, being

common to all of its descendants. However there is a divergence between

spera in Göttingen and sup(er)a in VII on the one hand, and sydera/sidera

in Redaction I on the other. To account for this, it may be argued that some

form of 'sphaera' or 'spaera'\textsuperscript{59} was in A, and that this is maintained in

Göttingen's spera. The abbreviation for this-\textsuperscript{60} could then have been

resolved in B as 'supera', which in turn gave rise on the one hand to

sup(er)a in VII, and to sydera in Redaction I on the other. The alternative,

that A (and B) had 'sydera', would require Göttingen and VII to have again

made a similar change independently, in this case from 'yd' to 'p'.\textsuperscript{61}

In their versions of the passage describing the Abyss (LLx 10), the

transmission of which appears to have been quite problematic, there is a

possible affinity between Göttingen and Redaction VII but also a divergence.

\textsuperscript{55} This transcription differs from the published edition of red. VII (Silverstein 1935, p. 205: 25-6) which reads: 'super quem girant sidera celi.' The ms. however has 'supa celi'.

\textsuperscript{56} Barcelona and Borghese have 'girat'; Pa, Vi, Ham, Be & Ve have 'sidera'; St Omer has 'super quem deus girant [sic] sidera celi'.

\textsuperscript{37} Silverstein 1935, p. 157: 5.


\textsuperscript{60} See Cappelli 1990, p. 357, col, 2, for sphaera.

\textsuperscript{61} However, although the loss of the abbreviation stroke was common, the persistence of the singular 'girat' might support an originally singular subject.
It was noted above that the scribe of the Göttingen manuscript left a space of about 13 letters, presumably for a word unclear in his copy of A. This may have been *contingunt* as in BR, or *peringunt* which, since it is in Redaction I, St Omer, and reflected in VII's *pertingi*, must have been in B and could have been in A.

Gött <21>: cum vix .......... usque ad xl annos.
BR <21>: vix profundum eius contingunt usque ad quinquaginta annos
I (O) <26>: et vix pertingunt usque ad xl annos.
VII: que vix pertingi potest per annum.62

Neither Göttingen, VII or any of the Redaction I witnesses retain any trace of BR's *profundum eius*, but this must have been in Redaction α since it was in the Long Latin:-

LLx 10: vix post quingentos annos perveniunt in profundum,63
and survives in various forms in Redaction III, e.g. IIIa [6]:-
vix perverriet usque ad quinquaginta annorum in profunditatem.64

It was thus presumably omitted in A.

There is a divergence, however, between Göttingen and VII in a phrase describing the Abyss preceding the above passage. It is described in Göttingen <20> as *fervens ut eneum* while VII has simply *ut ereum*.65 The latter form must have been present in B as the Paris ms. of Redaction I - the only one of that redaction to retain the phrase - has *fervens ut ereum* in s. 25.66 However Göttingen's *fervens ut eneum* would appear to have been the phrase in A because, on the evidence of the Long Latin,67 it could have been in redaction α and it appears also in BR, although not in the section describing the Abyss; rather it is applied, shortly after that section, to the river68 in s. 24:-

---

63 Cf. L I, St Gall: vix post quingentis annis pertingunt in profundum (Silverstein & Hilhorst 1997, p. 138).
64 Silverstein 1935, [6], p. 170: 13 - 172: 1. For variants 'tangit'/‘attingit' see ibid., p. 171: 10 and note.
65 The published edition has 'ut et...eum' (Silverstein, 1935 p. 206: 16), however the place in the ms. indicated by the editor's dots (see the note to line 16, ibid.), is a hole in the folio, before which the scribe has written the first letters of the word and the remainder after; in this position on the other side of the folio he has written 'interrogavi' before the hole and 'quis' after, without any omission.
66 This section is discussed in chapter 1 above.
68 This river is described by all the descendants of A as 'ardens ad septentrionem'.
BR: Post hunc vidit locum terribilem angustum et in eo flumen fervens ut eneum.\textsuperscript{69}

The position of the phrase in the A descendants, however, would seem to be the original one as Redaction III’s description of the Abyss retains the phrase, although partly corrupted, in this position also, e.g. IIIc:

\textit{Abyssus est non habens mensuram et fervens omnibus diebus.}\textsuperscript{70}

Another divergence between Göttingen and VII may be seen in the name of the \textit{draco} which is 'Partimocht' in Göttingen \textsuperscript{<9>} and 'Parphimon' in VII.\textsuperscript{71} Neither can cast light on the form in A (or B) because the same division is repeated, albeit with variations, in Redaction I, e.g. 'Parthimoth' and 'Parthemon', as discussed in chapter I above.

In two other instances Göttingen shares with one or more Redaction I witnesses a particular feature which is either omitted or corrupted in VII. In the Long Latin St Paul is warned about the stench of the Great Well:-

\textit{LLx 24:} Longe sta ut valeas sustinere fetorem loci istius, 

and this is reflected in Redactions BR, II and IV.\textsuperscript{72} In the Göttingen \textit{Visio} however, as noted earlier, the final clause with \textit{ut} is lost in s. 36:-

\textit{Gött.:} Istius non longe potes sustinere fetorem loci.

This has also occurred in Redaction I, s. 38:-

\textit{Paris:} esci longe foras \textit{non} possis sustinere fetorem loci huius  
\textit{Vienne:} vade longe si \textit{non} possis sustinere fetorem loci  
\textit{Hamburg:} recede de puteo fetorem loci sustinere \textit{non} potes  
\textit{Berlin:} recede de puteo quia fetorem eius \textit{nullus} sustinere potest  
\textit{Barcelona:} vade longe \textit{non} potueris sustinere fetorem loci istius  
\textit{St Omer:} sta a longe \textit{non} possis enim sustinere fetorem illius loci.\textsuperscript{73}

The whole phrase is omitted in Redaction VII\textsuperscript{74} but, on the evidence above, the change of \textit{non} for \textit{ut} would seem to have been made in A. As a consequence, Göttingen corrected the subjunctive \textit{possis} to the indicative \textit{potes}, but B and the original Redaction I retained the now ungrammatical verb form \textit{possis/posses}; as in Göttingen, this was subsequently corrected to the indicative in several of their descendants.

\textsuperscript{69} Silverstein 1959, [5], p. 236: 11  
\textsuperscript{70} Silverstein 1935, [6], p. 171: 6-8; cf. also IIIb & IIId, ibid.  
\textsuperscript{71} ibid., p. 205: 33.  
\textsuperscript{72} BR <36>: Sta longius ut possis sustinere fetorem loci (Silverstein 1959, p. 217 [12]); red. II: Sta longius ut possis sustinere fetorem (Silverstein 1935, p. 149: 2-3); red. IV: Sta longe ut possis sustinere fetorem hunc (Brandes 1885, p. 77: 27).  
\textsuperscript{73} For this section Venice has used redaction IV. The text of Borgh finishes at <29>.  
\textsuperscript{74} Silverstein 1935, p. 207: 6-7.
Göttingen and one version of Redaction I also share the alteration of the number of years used to measure the depth of the Abyss. In the Long Latin the souls cast into the Abyss would scarcely reach the bottom *post quingentos annos* (LLx 10). As has already been observed, the number is changed to *quinquaginta* in Redactions BR\(^75\) and IIIa\(^76\) (and thus presumably also in \(\alpha\)). It appears, however, as *xl annos* in Göttingen <21> and in the St Omer version of Redaction I <26>; elsewhere in Redaction I it is either *octoginta annos* (Ba/Borgh) or omitted, and in VII it is corrupted to *per annum*\(^77\). In the light of the stemma proposed for these mss. above, the evidence of Göttingen and St Omer would suggest that the change to *xl annos* occurred in A.

Other differences between Göttingen and Redaction VII part 2 may be observed in a detailed comparison of the two texts printed synoptically in Appendix D, reference to which here will be by the Göttingen section numbering. It will be seen there that VII has a number of omissions where the text in Göttingen is supported by the other redactions including BR and I. Some of these omissions reflect an abbreviating tendency in VII, e.g. in the description of the *draco*, <8-12>,\(^78\) or are possibly the result of homoeoteleuton, e.g. in <20>.\(^79\) In some cases VII rephrases the substance of the text, e.g. the section on the injurers of widows and orphans, <30>,\(^80\) or makes additions, e.g. the extra phrases in <2>, *quod est orbis cardo*,\(^81\) and in <29>, *quasi...ducebantur*,\(^82\) and the extra groups immersed to the chest and to the throat in <17>. Part of the passage describing the punishment of the fastbreakers is corrupt in VII. In Göttingen <31> they are *super canale aque* which reflects the Long Latin *super canela aque* (LLx 19)\(^83\) and therefore \(\alpha\) and A, but VII has substituted *super ripam aquarum*. It may be that B was corrupt here, since Redaction I Barcelona has *super prata virentia*, while

\(^{75}\) Silverstein 1959, [4], p 236: 5.
\(^{77}\) Silverstein 1935, p. 206: 16.
\(^{78}\) Cf. red. I: Appendix C, <6-12>.
\(^{80}\) Cf. red. BR <30> and red. III, Silverstein 1935, [12], p. 176. Also the relevant parts of red. I <30-31>.
\(^{81}\) Cf. red. I <2>.
\(^{82}\) Cf. red. III, Silverstein 1935, [10], pp. 174-177.
Paris and Vienna omit the phrase, and the others interpolate a Redaction IV version of the section.\textsuperscript{84}

On the other hand, VII part 2 has the better reading \textit{innuunt} where Göttingen has \textit{inferunt} in <18>,\textsuperscript{85} and \textit{qui precioso sanguine suo illud redimere venit} where Göttingen has \textit{qui venit in isto carne et sanguine} in <22>.\textsuperscript{86} Göttingen has also omitted the \textit{vermes} in <25>\textsuperscript{87} and the whole of <27>, part of which section survives in VII.\textsuperscript{88} In the main, however, Göttingen reflects more faithfully what on the evidence of the other redactions must have been the language and content of Redaction \(\alpha\) and of A and B.

\textbf{Conclusion}

The 15th-century Göttingen \textit{Visio} is thus not only the best overall extant witness to the 10th-century Redaction \(\alpha\), but, through its shared features with the second part of Redaction VII and Redaction I, it provides evidence for an intermediary (A) between itself and \(\alpha\), which, through a second intermediary (B), was also the source for the second part of Redaction VII and Redaction I, both of which are extant in manuscripts of the 11th century.
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\textsuperscript{84} Red. I, Appendix C <32>. Re Hamburg, Berlin & Venice see chapter 10 below; re St Omer see chapter 11.
\textsuperscript{85} Cf. LLx 8 and red. BR <18> (also red. I, Appendix C <18>: annuunt).
\textsuperscript{86} Cf. red. III, Silverstein 1935, [6], p. 171: 12-13, also red. BR <22> and red. I, Appendix C <27>.
\textsuperscript{87} Cf. red. BR <25> and red. I, Appendix C <29>.
\textsuperscript{88} Göttingen also mistakenly has \textit{fornax} for \textit{fovea} in <19>, and an addition \textit{Quid ploras... genus} in <20>.
Chapter 3
REDACTION III

Redaction III reflects closely the presumed structure and content of Redaction α. It is more complete than any of Redactions I, BR and Göttingen, in that it preserves all three episodes of the Respite section, namely the Appearance of Christ, the Reproaches and the Granting of Respite; Redaction I omits the Reproaches, BR omits the Appearance of Christ as well as the Reproaches, and Göttingen lacks all three. Redaction III also contains material not present in any of those, i.e.:-

- a new introductory sentence (Interrogandum etc.) precedes the Oportet preface, attributing the granting of the respite to the intercession of Paul (=J),
- a description of souls hanging from burning trees and suffering in a fiery furnace is interpolated before the description of the draco (= K and L),
- the Respite section is preceded by an account of the going-out and judgement of a wicked and a just soul (B),
- the duration of the respite is specified more precisely (de hora nona etc.) (=M),
- a brief statement of the chagrin of a new figure, the ostiarius inferni, at the granting of the respite, replaces the demons’ chiding of the souls in the Long Latin (LLx 35) and presumably also in Redaction α,¹ and
- a concluding sentence on Sunday observance is added (Beati qui custodiunt etc.) (=N).

On the other hand, in the extant versions of Redaction III the Oceanus is omitted from the opening section (LLx 1), and the sections on the negligent bishop (LLx 12) and the number of the pains of Hell (D) are also missing. The section on the Great Worm (LLx 26) has been reduced to a generic description of worms and serpents eating souls, and other details are also changed - the 100-headed dragon now has 1,000 heads with 1,000 eyes in each, and the souls are immersed to more varied levels in the fiery river.

Notable also are three changes in Redaction III to the original sequence of episodes:-

- the Fastbreakers (LLx 18) now follow those who injured widows and orphans (LLx 19),

¹Silverstein (1935, pp. 44 & 51) refers to this figure as an interpolation by red. III, however, although it has been radically recast, its position and function is considered here to be related to the episode of the reaction of the demons in the Long Latin (LLx 35).
- the souls' appeal to the Archangel and his response (LLx 28 & 29) now follow the Reproaches and are placed before the granting of the respite, and
- the chagrin of the ostiarius inferni precedes the joyous outcry of the souls at their respite (LLx 34), whereas the demons' chiding of the souls in the Long Latin, from which this incident appears to be derived, occurs after the acclamation (LLx 35).

The content pattern of Redaction III is therefore:-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Redaction α</th>
<th>Redaction III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A; 1-3; B; C; 4-13, 14/15*; 16-19; 20/21*; 22-26;</td>
<td>J, A; (1)-3; B, K, L, C; 4-11, 13, 14/15*, 16-17, 19, 18, 20/21*, 22-25, (26);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Going-Out of the Souls, 27-35; D</td>
<td>The Going-Out of the Souls 30-32, 28-29, 33; M; (35), 34; N.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(* indicates merged extracts) (omitted = 12, (26), 27, D)

A synoptic edition of Redaction III was published in 1935 by Theodore Silverstein,² based on eight manuscripts, divided into four groups:-

IIIa Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm. 2625, ff. 56-59v. [M1]
Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 20, ff. 66-68. [CC]

IIIb Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm. 12005, ff. 190-191. [M2]

IIIc St Gall, Stiftsbibliothek, 1012, pp. 159-164 & 167. [S2]
St Gall, Stiftsbibliothek, 1050, pp. 248-250. [S1]
Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm. 22302, 83v -84v. [M3]

IIId Vienna, Nationalbibliothek, 1629, ff. 102-103v. [Vi]
Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm. 26137, ff. 127-128v & 129v. [M4]

The affiliation of these manuscripts is shown in Silverstein's stemma,³ reproduced below:-

---
³ ibid., p. 51.
Three further witnesses of the redaction were identified by Silverstein in 1959:-

Brussels, Bibliothèque Royale, lat. 67 (II 1053), ff. 3r-4r. [Brus]
Bonn, UniversitätsBibliothek, S. 361 [227 a], ff. 81v-83r. [Bo]
Oxford, Bodleian Library, lat. th. e. 21, ff. 91r-92r. [Bodl]

The text of Bonn 361 had been published in 1901 by Aloys Meister, but not studied before in relation to the other versions of Redaction III. Silverstein published the text of Brussels 67, but the Bodleian manuscript had come to his attention too late for the inclusion of its text of the *Visio Pauli* in his article.

To the above eleven witnesses may now be added five other texts of the *Visio Pauli* which have the characteristics of Redaction III:-

Budapest, National Széchényi Library, lat. 231, ff. 10r-11v.
Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, lat. 3343, ff. 154r-155r.
Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm. 9637, ff. 70v-72r.
Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, lat. 2831, ff. 85v-88r.
Uppsala, Universitetsbibliotek, C. 77, ff. 91-93v.

---

4 Silverstein 1959, pp. 201-3, 212-14 and 229-34.
5 *Die Fragmente der Liber VIII miraculorum des Caesarius von Heisterbach* (Römische Quartalschrift für christliche Allerthumsk. u. f. Kirchengesch., 14e Supplement-heft, Rome 1901), pp. xxxviii and 208-11. The printed transcription however contains some errors, omissions and orthographical editing. A new transcription from the manuscript is given here in Appendix E.
6 See Silverstein 1959, pp. 229-34.
7 ibid., p. 201, n. 6a.
10 This was listed by Silverstein in 1935 (p. 220) as Redaction IV.
It will be shown below that each of these may be linked to one of the versions already studied by Silverstein; the first, Budapest 231, is similar in many ways to Bodley Lat. th. e. 21, the second, Paris 3343, is connected to Munich 12005 (M2), and the other three, Munich 9637, Uppsala 77 and Paris 2831, belong to the Y subgroup of Silverstein's Group IIIc. The implications of these new additions for Silverstein's stemma will be shown at the conclusion of this chapter. For ease of reference, transcriptions from the mss. of all 16 texts of Redaction III are set out in parallel numbered sections in Appendix E and will be referred to hereunder as e.g., s. 1 or <1>.12

1. Budapest, National Széchenyi Library, Lat. 231, ff. 10r-11v. (=Buda)

The Visio Pauli text in the 15th-century Budapest, Lat. 231, shares a number of characteristics distinctive of the version of Redaction III found in the early 14th-century Bodley, Lat. th. e. 21, ff. 91-92.13 For example, in both texts the souls in the Great Well are not only the heretics as in the other versions of Redaction III, but include also those que/qui templa (dei) destruunt et bona ecclesie fraudulenter auferunt <45>. Where in the other versions the souls are reminded during the Reproaches, that Christ died so that they might live, ut viveretis <62>, Budapest and Bodley have ut vos inveneritis requiem et noluistis, and in the following section both add the extra phrase: vos dedistis eternum vitam pro eterna pena <63>. Both have the same mistake in <22>: et non habent fidem contra illos instead of dum habent..., and the souls of the infanticides are punished in <39> by diaboli cum flagellis instead of angeli iniqui cum cornibus. Both have a similar variant in <7>: raptus est in tercium celum (Bodl) / raptus erat usque ad tercium (Buda), instead of exaltatus/exaltatur/exaltabatur ad celum, and they have the same omission by homoeoteleuton in <6>: vidit ibi [- <7> -- - ibi] flumen igneum.14

11 Mittelalterliche Handschriften der Universitätsbibliothek Uppsala, Stockholm 1988, Band 2, pp. 90-96. However, this catalogue errs in identifying the text of the Visio Pauli in C. 77, ff. 91r-93v, as red. X; see chapter 8 below.


13 For this manuscript, see the typescript Catalogue of Medieval MSS Accessions Since 1915 in the Bodleian Library (Duke Humfrey). Silverstein classified the redaction in general terms in his 1959 article (p. 201, n. 6a and p. 214, n. 70), but he did not note any distinctive variants. His projected study of the variants (ibid., p. 234, n. 178) has not been published.

14 Other shared variants include: <4> amar celestia paradisi; <15> phatmor; <20> cum invidia.
A further similarity is the juxtaposition of the *Visio Pauli* in both the Bodley and Budapest manuscripts with another account of Hell, *De Cameris Inferni*; in the Bodley manuscript this follows the *Visio* and in Budapest 231 it precedes it.

In spite of these shared features, however, the Bodley text is not the source of the later Budapest 231, for it has a number of omissions and variants where Budapest preserves the content and phrasing of the other versions of the redaction. The most notable of these omissions is the absence in Bodley of a substantial portion of the content of the redaction, i.e. ss. 32-36 and s. 38, in which are described the souls of the sorcerers and others enclosed within a fiery wall (ss. 32-33), the adulterers (s. 34), the false virgins (ss. 35-36) and those who injured widows and orphans (s. 38). All of these are present in the Budapest version.

Similarly, in a number of instances Budapest 231 reflects the other versions of Redaction III where the Bodley text varies, e.g. in s. 65 Bodley has *et vobis refrigerium tribuere dignetur*, while Budapest has *ut det vobis refrigerium*, which is supported by other versions of the redaction and which could not have been copied from Bodley.

While these features in the earlier text indicate that it could not have been the exemplar of the later one, the presence of the common features unique to these two texts presumes a shared antecedent. Of this lost source (=K), Budapest 231, although having its own omissions and variants, is the more complete and more accurate witness.

2. Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, Lat. 3343, ff. 154r-155r. (=P1)

---


16 ff. 92rv (Bodl) and ff. 9r-10r (Buda). The latter appears to be the fuller of the two versions.

17 Other Bodley omissions and variants are as follows, with the more usual form given in square brackets:- <9> om. ligati; <19> *homoeoteleuton*: dimersi [ad genua; <20> dimersi] ad umbilicum; <27> summum [ad (pro)fundum]; <29> precioso [proprio]; <60> *homoeoteleuton*: quare [estis in penis quare] a me petitis.
The second of Silverstein's four groups, IIIb, is represented by only one manuscript, the 15th-century Munich, Clm. 12005, ff. 190-191 (M2). Distinguishing characteristics of this version noted by Silverstein are the naming of the river Pireflegeton instead of Cogiton (or variants of this), the addition of an epilogue warning against failing in the due observance of Sunday;\(^{18}\) the substitution of the phrase *ut doceret* for the original *oportet* in the opening section, the list of the varying depths to which the souls are immersed in the river of fire;\(^{19}\) and the survival of a corrupted version of a phrase describing the serpents issuing from the *draco*, i.e. *quos conspicimur in terra* - a form of which, on the evidence of Redaction I and Göttingen, must have figured in Redaction \(\alpha.\)\(^{20}\) Three of these features can be observed in the version of Redaction III in Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, Lat. 3343, ff. 154r-155r, also of the 15th century. Like M2, the Paris text (P1) has *ut doceret nobis* (M2: *nos* timere *penas inferni* instead of *oportet nos* etc. in s. 4, and although the form of the river's name, *flagnum*, is corrupt in s. 8, this must be derived from Flegeton rather than from one of the variants of Cogiton. P1 too preserves in s. 16 a form of the original phrase describing the *draco* expelling serpents, *qui conspicuntur in terra*, and although it does not have M2's epilogue, the text from which that is drawn immediately precedes the *Visio Pauli* in the Paris manuscript.\(^{21}\)

In addition to the features of IIIb noted by Silverstein, there is a small number of other agreements between these two texts which are not found in the other versions of Redaction III descended from the hypothetical antecedent in Silverstein's stemma, IIIU. Both have in s. 26 *hic locus non habet mensuram* instead of *hic est abissus non habens mensuram*, both have *in vestimento nigra* instead of *et vestimenta nigra* in s. 35, and both omit the showing of the seven-sealed pit (*et ostendit ei puteum ....sigillus*) from s. 42.

The shared features of the two texts suggest a common source since neither of the two 15th-century texts is directly dependent on the other. Each contains material which is attested in the other versions of Redaction III, but which is corrupted or omitted in its companion. For example, M2 and other witnesses, not only of this redaction, have several substantial passages not given in P1, e.g.:-

---

18 Silverstein 1935, p. 44. For the text of this epilogue, ibid., p. 194.
19 ibid., p. 48.
20 Silverstein 1959, p. 213. The form of the verb in red. I and Göttingen is *(cum) expuit* (Appendix C, <11> and Appendix D, <10>); elsewhere in red. III (Appendix E, <16>) it is *conspuit* (IIIa M1) and *conspiciuntur* (Brus).
21 This feature is discussed further below.
M2: mulieribus et erat fovea alta plena animabus et serpentes...
P1: mulieribus et serpentes...

M2: et angeli iniqui in circuitu earum increpantes eas et dicentes
P1: et dixit angelus

Further, M2 does not repeat P1's additions invidiosi sunt and et superbi sunt in s. 31, nor does it have P1 variants such as dracones et serpentes for draconis et serpentibus in s. 39, or orate for interpella in s. 64. Thus M2 is not dependent on P1.

On the other hand, P1 contains authentic material which is not in M2; for example, section 34 describing the adulterers is omitted in M2 but not in P1, as is also section 57 describing the outcry of the souls at the ascent of the just soul. Two passages, foreshortened by homoeoteleuton in M2, are given entire in P1:

and other characteristic phrases have also been dropped from M2 but not from P1; for example, extra ecclesiam et in omni loco from s. 19, et vidit muros ex utraque parte from s. 43, and ubi erit fletus et stridor denticum from s. 51.

There is also a striking tendency in M2 to make additions or to vary its inherited material. Whole passages and categories are altered, expanded or replaced; for example, the souls immersed in the fiery river up to their knees in s. 19, are in M2 those qui discordiam sciant and not qui se inmittunt sermonibus alienis, while those immersed to the navel in s. 20, are not simply qui fornicantur but qui uxores alienas rapiunt et fornicantur, and those immersed to their eyebrows in s. 22 are those who do evil to their neighbours et vana verba locuntur in ecclesia instead of dum fidem habent contra illos. The second sin of the fastbreakers in s. 37 is not non custodiunt castitatem, rather nec elemosinam propter deum non dederunt. The whole category of the souls in the mouth of the draco is new (s. 17), and extra comment on the Great Well is inserted into s. 44: de hoc puteo scriptum est ......os suum. The Paris text has none of these features, nor does it share M2's errors such as luctus instead of fluctus <7>, angelos for flammes <10>, in circuitu virorum et mulierum for in circuitu eius <32>, stantes for in loco glaciali <38>, in aere volantem et for ululantem inter <48>, and anime peccatricum for morientes anime <59>. 
On the evidence therefore, P1 is not dependent on M2 or vice versa. What special features are shared by both are consequently to be ascribed to a common ancestor, Wl. However, the extensive changes and variations observable in M2 are those which qualify it as a subgroup of Redaction III, shown in Silverstein's stemma as deriving from the hypothetical antecedent, W. Since most of these modifications are not shared by P1, it is not appropriate for the Paris text to be classed as a representative of that subgroup, IIIb, its significance being rather as a witness of the version (Wl) from which it and IIIb were developed. Hence:

\[ W \longrightarrow Wl \]  
\[ \text{IIIb (M2)} \rightarrow \text{P1} \]

In addition, P1 can be linked to the hypothetical source of a German vernacular version of Redaction III which Silverstein posited in 1935. He argued that the German translation had two sources, primarily a Latin text of the IIIc type, but also a second source with some of the characteristics of IIIb (M2). These he identified as the equivalent of the *ut doceret* phrase in the early part of GS, the naming of the river as Flegeton, and the particular list of the varying depths of immersion in the fiery river. However, in the identification of the souls immersed to their eyebrows in s. 22, the German version reflects an authentic phrase, *dum fidem habent contra illos*, which is well attested elsewhere in the tradition but which is replaced in M2 by *et vana verba locuntur in ecclesia*. Thus GS could not have got the authentic phrase from IIIb (M2), nor could it have translated it from its other primary source, IIIc, which omits the whole section. Silverstein had to conclude, therefore, that "the second source of GS was some version close to IIIb".

This second source was perhaps closer to P1 than to IIIb (M2), although not identifiable with it. Of the features in GS which Silverstein noted, P1 has

---

23 The translation in GS (Brandes 1885, p. 86: 17-18) of the distinctive *et non credunt in patrem et filium et spiritum sanctum* identifies it more precisely with the IIIc(Y) group (Silverstein 1935, p. 48). This subgroup is discussed more fully below.
24 See Brandes 1885, p. 83: 22.
25 ibid., p. 84: 2.
26 ibid., p. 84: 23-25.
27 ibid., p. 85: 2-3: "und chainen glauben an sie habent." GS has apparently made the same mistake as Buda/Bodl in <22>: *et non habent fidem contra illos.*
28 Silverstein 1935, p. 49.
the *ut doceret* phrase like M2 in s. 4, but it also has the authentic *dum fide habent* etc. in s. 22 which M2 has changed, and, like GS, it is free of the distinctive modifications introduced by M2 as noted above. On the other hand, P1 includes two elements in the list of varying depths in s. 18, (*alii ad os alii ad nares*) which are omitted in the GS and M2 list, and it does not name all the types of sinners enclosed in the wall of fire in s. 33, who are reflected more correctly in GS. Further, while in P1, s. 8, the name of the river, *flagnum*, is probably drawn from Flegeton, the uncorrupted form in GS, *Flegeton*, would also indicate that the German translation, although related, was not directly dependent on P1.

Nevertheless the contents of Paris 3343 may arguably cast some further light on the second source of GS and on IIIb(M2). The section preceding Redaction III in the Paris ms., i.e. ff. 153v-154r, is entitled *Incipit epistola de christo filio dei Et de sancto die dominico*. In this section is a version of the 'Sunday Letter', the document purportedly written by Christ, which urges the observance of Sunday by listing the punishments to be visited upon those who do not respect the holy day, and by briefly mentioning the rewards for those who do. The version of the Letter in Paris 3343 is very similar to the one in Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm. 9550, f. 1, printed by H. Delehaye. The last eight lines of the section (f. 154r) contain a list of the holy events which occurred on Sunday and which demonstrate its particular claim for reverence, i.e. the so called 'Benedictiones' or 'Sunday List'. The Letter and the List were two separate works, but a combination of the two, either by addition or integration, was not unusual.

In the Paris ms. Redaction III follows this combination after a space of one line, and is thus a separate item, although thematically allied to some extent in that the conclusion of the redaction carries a basically similar message: *Beati qui custodiunt diem dominicum* etc. <74>. The epilogue to IIIb (M2), however, consists of the first part of the Sunday Letter (*Quia nescitis ... multas*)

---

29 These items are found in some of the other red. III witnesses (see App. E <18>), but the lists vary considerably by omission. While none of them is identical to the M2 and GS list, the omissions in the latter may possibly not be a conjunctive error.
31 Delahaye 1899, pp. 179-181.
32 See e.g. Silverstein 1935, pp. 80-81. The versions of these Lists are discussed in detail by Clare Lees (1985, pp. 136-150).
33 Ibid., p. 136 & pp. 150-151.
34 Cf. Silverstein 1935, [21], p. 194 and Delehaye 1899, p. 179: 2-16.
threatening the punishments for non observance; the wording of this passage, although similar to the Munich version of the Letter, is closer to the first 14 lines of the Epistola in Paris 3343 (f. 153v).\(^{35}\) Also, it was observed by Silverstein that the German translation of Redaction III begins with a list of the Benedictiones.\(^{36}\) No extant version of Redaction III has a similar introduction, however the eight lines immediately above, but not joined to, the opening words of Redaction III in Paris 3343, f. 154r, contain a version of the Benedictiones very close to that in the GS introduction. Herman Brandes noted in his discussion of the German translation that the preceding item in the ms. is entitled "Botschaft Christi, der er auf dem Altar Sanct Peters zu Rom geschrieben"; he observed that the contents of this had some affinity with the translation of Redaction III which followed, but he did not describe these in detail, giving only a brief summary.\(^{37}\) In the light of these connections it may be conjectured first that W1, the common antecedent of IIIb(M2), P1 and GS, had a combination of the Letter and the List preceding Redaction III very similar to the versions in Paris 3343, secondly that while P1 copied the two items separately, IIIb(M2) added the first part of the Letter as an Epilogue, and thirdly that GS or another separate Latin intermediary (=W2) attached the last part of the combination, the Benedictiones, as an introduction to Redaction III.\(^{38}\) Hence:-\(^{39}\)

\[
\text{W1} \quad \text{GS} \quad \text{W2} \quad \text{IIIB (M2)} \quad \text{P1}
\]

The conjecture that W1 had a Letter/List combination preceding Redaction III which contained versions of the two works very similar to those in Paris 3343, would be supported by the Epilogue to Redaction III\(1d.\(^{40}\) This consists of three parts: the first is one of the short and relatively rare passages in

\(^{35}\) e.g. IIIb(M2): quia nescitis eum timere nec custodire propter hec venit ira super vos; Paris: quia nescitis timere deum nec custodire propter hec venit ira dei super vobis; Munich (Delehaye): quia nescitis illum custodire propterea venit ira dei super vobis. Also, M2: gens pagana venit que corpora vestra tenent in captivitate; Paris: gens pagana venit que corpora vestra tenet in captivitate; Munich: venit gens pagana quae alios occidit, et alios in captivitatem ducit.

\(^{36}\) This would not seem to be simply juxtaposition, for the addition in GS of "an dem suntag" to the first sentence of red. III itself, links the Respite with the introduction as yet another notable event connected to Sunday: "Nu ist ze fragen, wer ze dem ersten mall erpeten hab, das dy sell ru und rest haben in der hell an dem suntag." (Brandes 1885, p. 83: 16-17)

\(^{37}\) Brandes 1885, p. 44.

\(^{38}\) This possibility would be strengthened if a detailed examination of the 'Botschaft' in the German ms. were to show a close resemblance to the version of the Epistola in the Paris ms.

\(^{39}\) If the identical list of immersions in GS and IIIb <18> is considered conjunctive, a further antecedent, common to W2 and IIIb should be inserted between them and W1.

\(^{40}\) Silverstein 1935, p. 195.
the Letter indicating the benefits to be lavished on those who observe Sunday, the second is a Sunday List, and the third argues the appropriateness of fasting on Friday because of the notable scriptural events which occurred on that day. The wording of the passage from the Letter is closer to that in the matching passage in lines 34-40 of f. 153v in the Paris ms. than to that in the Munich version, but several phrases are omitted or shortened in IIIId. The components of the List in IIIId are the same as those in GS and the Paris ms., although there is some variation in the order, and in the wording each agrees now with one, now with another. Thus the source of the first two passages in the IIIId epilogue could have been a Letter/List combination very similar to that in Paris 3343 and, as has been proposed above, also in W1. The redactor of IIIId could have taken the opening sentences for his epilogue from near the end of the Letter component of the combination, and then, having omitted the next few lines (the equivalent of the last four lines of f. 153v and the first four of f. 154r in the Paris ms.), he could have continued with the Benedictiones which then followed. This would be consistent with Silverstein's proposition that "it was probably W [the hypothetical antecedent of IIIb and IIIId in his stemma] in which the Sunday passage first appeared." He did not identify that "Sunday passage" further, however the Letter/List combination in Paris 3343 could well indicate the nature of this common source, inherited by both IIIId and W1.

3. Group IIIc and the Subgroup IIIc(Y)

42 e.g. IIIId & Paris: incredule popule; Munich: omitted. Also, IIIId & Paris: multiplicabo laborem vestrum; Munich: multiplicabo fructus vestros et dabo vobis pacem.
43 e.g. Paris: ab hora nona sabbati usque ad primam horam secunde ferie; IIIId: sicut supra dixi; Munich: omitted. Also, Paris: stabo ego in vos et vos in me; Munich: maneo in vobis et vos in me; IIIId: omitted.
44 e.g. Paris: lucem, GS: leicht, IIIId: initium, and Paris: ceteris omnibus, GS: andern gestirn, IIIId: alis sideribus. Also, Paris and IIIId include the creation of the angels in the List; this is omitted in GS.
46 Silverstein 1935, p. 50.
47 The Sunday Letter and the Sunday List are juxtaposed, either singly or in combination, with other versions of the Visio Pauli. Red. XI is followed almost immediately by a List (Vat. Pal. Lat. 220, f. 60v-61r), and a Letter/List combination, apparently similar to that in Paris 3343 (cf. Lees 1985, pp. 135-136), follows red. IV in London, BL Royal 8. F. vi (f. 24) and London, BL Royal 11. B. x (f. 184), the latter with the List integrated into the Letter, however (ibid.). A different version of the Letter/List combination precedes red. IV in Oxford, Merton College, 13, ff. 64r-65v, and the first lines of a List appear to be added to red. IV in Cambridge, St John's College, 159, f. 25v. Yet another version of the Letter follows red. X, Venice, Bibl. Naz. Marciana, lat. VI. 30 [Zanetti, lat. D VII], ff. 80-83. Cf. also red. IX in chapter 11 below.
Theodore Silverstein classified the versions of Redaction III in three manuscripts, St Gall 1050 (=S 1), St Gall 1012 (=S 2) and Munich 22302 (=M 3), as the group IIIc, characterised firstly by a "cluster of omissions", i.e. the souls immersed up to their eyebrows in the river of fire (s. 22), the oppressors of widows and orphans punished by fire and ice (s. 38), and the reaction of the *ostiarius inferni* (s. 70), and secondly, by the designation of the sinners walled in fire as *incantatrices* (s. 33). The common ancestor of all three he called X, and from this S1 descended directly, while S2 and M3 shared a subarchetype Y.

The intermediary Y omitted or altered material which was present in other versions of Redaction III, and, on the evidence of S1, was present also in X. Silverstein noted that S2 and M3 both modify the designation of the souls tormented in the sealed pit to *qui non baptizati sunt et non credunt in patrem et filium et spiritum sanctum*, whereas they are described in S1 and elsewhere in Redaction III as *qui non credunt christum natum de virgine et qui non sunt baptizati* (s. 45). Other Y modifications of X material may be added to this, i.e.:-

-<5> flumen aque infernalis: S2/M3; fluvium aque: S1
-<6> lux: S2/M3; lumen: S1
-<47> auditus est sonus tamquam tonitrua magna: S2/M3; audivit eos loquentes et flentes et gementes ut tonitrua: S1.

Further, Y omitted two key phrases which, again on the evidence of S1, were present in X, i.e.:-

-<42> et dixit sta in hoc loco et vide si potes sustinere huius putei fetorem
-<46> et iterum vidit paulus mulieres et viros (et iudeos ardentem) et serpentes eos comedentes.

There is also a substantial number of variations of Redaction III material which can be ascribed at least to Y, but because of the fragmentary state of S1, there is no evidence whether they were already in X or not. The interrelationship of these mss is shown in Silverstein's figure:-

---

Silverstein 1935, p. 44 and Silverstein 1959, p. 213. The omission of the sinners gnawed by worms and serpents in the sealed pit (s. 46) is also given as a characteristic of IIIc (Silverstein 1959, p. 213). These souls, however, are not omitted by S1, and their omission is therefore characteristic only of the subgroup IIIc(Y), on which see further below.


Silverstein 1935, p. 51.
Another text of IIIc(Y), into which four passages from Redaction IV have been introduced, is found in the composite Redaction X, identified by Silverstein in 1959.\textsuperscript{51} He noted that Redaction X drew on a form of Redaction III "close to the combination M3 and S2", and that it sometimes follows M3 and sometimes S2.\textsuperscript{52} He concluded that it can therefore "be used as an independent witness to the character of type IIIc." However, the presence in this text of the Y modifications and omissions of the IIIc archetype material noted above, shows that the version of Redaction III which Redaction X contains should be further classed as a representative of the IIIc(Y) group. It will be referred to below as 3/10.

The three additional manuscripts of Redaction III which are discussed below all share some or all of the characteristics not only of IIIc, but also of the subgroup IIIc(Y).

3. (i) Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm. 9637, ff. 70v-72r. (=M5)

A version very close to the text of IIIc in Munich, Clm. 22302, 83v -84v (=M3), is found in the 14th-century Munich, Clm. 9637, ff. 70v-72r (=M5).\textsuperscript{53} Both name the fiery river cayton in s. 8 instead of cocitus, and introduce an angel of the abyss in s. 26, hic eciam angelus abyssi, where none is attested elsewhere in the tradition (the usual phrase is hic est abyssus). Both substitute igneos gladios for the catheras igneas of s. 35, and in s. 64, ora pro nobis is substituted for the entreaty of the souls to Paul interpella pro nobis ad dominum. The same additions are to be found in both, e.g. coloratis/ colorans in <39>, nostri ihesu christi in <54>, inhiantes in <63>, et mortuis in <68>, and both have the same omissions, e.g. archangelus...ad infernum <2>, flumen and fervens <7>, angeli quatuor ... increpantes eas <40>, tunc clamor ... commoverentur <56>.

From the dating in the catalogue, M3 (saec. xiii/xiv) would appear to be earlier than M5 (saec. xiv), and thus could not have been copied from it. This is borne out by the presence in M3, s. 45, of the full phrase et spiritum sanctum where M5 has only eius.

\textsuperscript{51}Venice, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, lat. VI. 30 [Zanetti, lat. D VII], ff. 79r-80v. See Silverstein 1959, p. 203 and pp. 218-219. The text of the redaction is printed ibid., pp. 244-247.\textsuperscript{52} ibid., p. 219 and footnote 90. Silverstein observes that red. X is like M3 in naming the dragon in s. 15, while S2 does not, but the angel's response in s. 26 of red. X (hic abissus est non habens mensuram) is like S2 not M3 in which it is corrupted (hic eciam angelus abyssi).\textsuperscript{53} The Visio Pauli is preceded in the two Munich mss. by the same four items. The works following it, however, are different.
On the other hand, M5 contains the last section of the Visio, namely the second part of s. 69, ss. 71-72 and s. 74; these are all missing at the end of M3 and thus M5 could not have copied this section from M3. However, that the rest of M5 could not have been copied from M3, and the last section added separately from another source in order to complete the text, is not so certain.

The variants in M5 can be interpreted either as scribal errors or corrections, e.g. where M3 gives an alternative in s. 41, *nate estis vel fuistis*, M5 could have chosen simply *fuistis*. A notable feature in both mss. is the lacuna of between 8-11 letter spaces in s. 19, *qui de [ ] de sermonibus alienis* in M3 and between *qui [ ] de etc.* in M5, where other versions of IIIc have *qui se intromittunt de sermonibus alienis*,

However, in the absence of any evidence that another source has been used for the last section, it would appear that M3 and M5 are very close copies of a common source (= Q).

3 (ii). Uppsala, Universitetsbibliotek, C. 77, ff. 91-94v. (=Upps)

In addition to the features characteristic of Redaction IIIc(Y), the text of the Visio Pauli in the 15th-century manuscript Uppsala, Universitetsbibliotek, C. 77, ff. 91-94v (=Upps), contains a group of readings peculiar to the version in the St Gall manuscript, Stiftsbibliothek, 1012, pp. 159-164 & 167 (=S2). In contrast to the souls in the fiery furnace (s. 13) who burn (*ardent*) in all other versions, the souls in S2 and Uppsala *rident*. In section 18, S2 has *in flumine agoneo* or *ageneo* instead of *in flumine igneo*, and Uppsala has the same mistake, *in flumine ageneo*; in the same section both add *alii usque ad collum* to the levels of immersion in this river of fire. The mistake in S2 <69>, *ad secundam horam* instead of *ad secundam feriam*, is also found in Uppsala, and likewise the rephrasing of s. 10, *vidit fornacem igneam per quatuor partes flammam diversis coloribus emittens*, the substitution of *rebus* for *actibus* in s. 63, the addition of *in oratione* in s. 67, and the omissions *accipiet et ait paulus credo* from s. 52 and *ut misereatur* and *et refrigerium det vobis* from s. 65.

The Uppsala version, however, is not a copy of the earlier 14th-century S2, for it contains readings which are present in other versions of Redaction III, but not in S2. For example, S2 omits in s. 68 Christ's major reason for granting

---

54 Section 70 is omitted in all versions of IIIc and s. 73 appears only in IIIa (M1).
the respite, *et maxime pro mea misericordia*, but this is preserved in Uppsala. In the case of a number of variants between S2 and Uppsala, the readings in the later manuscript are better supported by the rest of Redaction III; for example, in s. 54, the just soul is hailed as *felicissima* in Uppsala and the Redaction III tradition, but S2 has *fidelissima*. Several mistakes in S2 are not repeated in Uppsala; S2 has *intrant* in s. 21, (*et qui non intrant ecclesiam nec extra ecclesiam volunt audire verba dei*) whereas Uppsala has *intra* here (*et qui intra ecclesiam nec extra ecclesiam nolunt/?volunt audire verbum dei*), which, although not the usual *in*, preserves the sense of the phrase. Again, S2 has *sulphure et ingredientes serpentes circa sua* in s. 39, while Uppsala has *sulphure ignei dracones et serpentes circa colla sua*. Each of these is incorrect (the phrase should read: *sulphure et igne et dracones et serpentes circa colla sua*), but, besides retaining *colla* which S2 omits, Uppsala's *ignei dracones et serpentes* is less corrupted than S2's *ingredientes serpentes*, and could certainly not have been copied or corrected from the earlier manuscript.55

The set of common readings peculiar to S2 and Uppsala comes, therefore, from a common antecedent (=R1). From this same source derive also the better supported readings in Uppsala against S2 noted above, as well as those in S2 against Uppsala, for example, in s. 12 *peccatorum* (S2) against *virorum* (Upps), in s. 36 *virginitatem* (S2) against *virtutem* (Upps) and in s. 41 *videbis* (S2) against *videns* (Upps).

Some further variants found in S2 and Uppsala are to be found also in the version of redaction IIIc(Y) which forms the major part of Redaction X,56 referred to here as 3/10. In speaking of the greater suffering Paul has yet to see in the Great Well (s. 41), the angel refers in other versions of Redaction III to *maiora tormenta* which will be *septies peiora*, but in 3/10, S2 & Uppsala these are *maiora supplicia* which are *septies maiora*.57 In s. 54, all three reverse the order of the adjectives in the address to the just soul (3/10 also changing to the accusative plural): *O anima(s) felicissima(s) o leta(s) sponsa(s) etc.*58 All three have

---

55 Upps gives the more correct 'cocitus' instead of S2's 'concitus' in <8>, but this could have been corrected independently. Similary 'nigerrimum' (Upps) for 'nig(er)eim(um) (S2) in <30>; on the latter see further below.
56 Venice, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, lat. VI. 30 [Zanetti, lat. D VII] (saec. xiv), ff. 79r-80v. The text of the redaction was published in Silverstein 1959, pp. 244-247.
57 For 3/10 see Silverstein 1959, p. 246,[14]. Subsequent references are to this edition by paragraph and page number.
58 3/10 =[18], p. 246.
mortuorum for morientes <59>, sanctos for fratres <68>, and pacem for partem <74>.59

But the antecedent of the S2 and Uppsala (=R1) is not the 14th-century 3/10 because they have at times better readings where 3/10 either omits, adds to, or varies the text. For example, 3/10 omits mille oculos from the description of the draco in s. 14,60 also, perhaps by homoeoteleuton, the fiery river from s. 30 (ubi [erat flumen igneum et ardens in quo] erant),61 and in nocte diei dominice usque in perpetuum from s. 69,62 but it adds in die dominico to s. 1,63 inserts karissimi fratres into s. 464 and adds et non egerunt penitenciam to s. 20.65 In 3/10, Paul witnesses the fate of an unspecified number of sinful and good souls,66 in contrast to S2, Upps and all other versions of Redaction III where he sees only one of each.67 Also, the souls in s. 9 are hanging by their lips, instead of by their arms, only in 3/10.68 Other variants in 3/10 not found in S2 and Upps are aliam arborem et fornacem for ignem ardentem in s. 10,69 occurrerunt angeli ad eas iustas animas for adduxerunt angeli animam iusti in s. 53,70 sancte michael ora pro nobis sancte paule for miserere nobis michael et tu dulcissime paule in s. 64 and rex glorie for fili david in s. 66.71

In the above analysis, "3/10" has referred to the version of IIIc(Y) which is presumed to have been used in the composition of Redaction X, although it is possible that some of the omissions, additions and variants could be the work of the redactor and not present in his source. Nevertheless, the set of shared variants in the three versions of IIIc(Y), 3/10, S2 and Uppsala, indicates that they descend from a common source (=R), and that their interrelationship may be figured thus:-

---

59 The ms. of S2 has 'pacem' (p. 167, line 8), however, this variant is not given in the published edition of IIIc (Silverstein 1935, [20], p. 193: 8). For 3/10 see [19], p. 246; [19], p. 247; [21], p. 247.
60 [4], p. 244.
61 [7], p. 245.
62 [19], p. 247.
63 [1], p. 244.
64 ibid.
65 [5], p. 245.
66 [17 & 18], p. 246.
67 <48>,<53>.
68 [3], p. 244.
69 ibid.
70 [18], p. 246.
71 [19], p. 247.
The third new addition to the subgroup Redaction IIIc(Y) is the text of the Visio Pauli in Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, lat. 2831, ff. 85v-88r. This version has all the characteristics of IIIc(Y) listed above, except that in s. 45 where this subgroup typically describes the souls in the Great Pit as those qui non crediderunt in patrem et filium et spiritum sanctum, Paris 2831 has qui non crediderunt in filium dei. This variation will be discussed below, but the presence in this version of all the other features characteristic of IIIc(Y) indicates that it belongs to that category.

However, Paris 2831 cannot be allied as closely as the other new additions with other witnesses of the subgroup identified by Silverstein. The text of this version has quite a number of variants peculiar to itself. For example, mille gulas in s. 14 instead of mille oculos, in s. 15 animas captivas instead of animas cunctas, in s. 27 in illo dolore ponuntur instead of numquam fundum tangit/attingit, in s. 34 respiciens in alio loco instead of rursumque in alio loco and mulieres ac vero grossas valde instead of viros et mulieres nigros valde, in s. 39 cum corpibus suis instead of cum cornibus suis igneis, in s. 40 filios for infantes, in s. 49 que maligna fecistis opera for que opera fecisti in terra maligna, in s. 51 et maligni angeli suscipiunt eam for et diaboli susceperunt eam, in s. 65 non flete flebo pro vobis for nunc flete et ego flebo vobiscum, and in s. 72 requiem for qui dignatus es dare nobis refrigerium. It adds latus meum to s. 61, and in s. 37 ex eo sumere is expanded to ex ore gustare nec sumere. Several passages are corrupt, notably in s. 39 vidit [...] alio loco inductus et sulphore et igne for vidit in alio loco mulieres indutas pannis et pice et sulphure, and in s. 43 et exivit fetor et [...] peior inferno for et surrexit quidam fetor durius et peior inferno. The tendency to compress by omission evident in this last phrase is widespread in this version. At many points it omits phrases or parts of phrases, e.g. in s. 17 et accusatores instead of et mali ministratores et accusatores cum malis moribus suis, in s. 20 it has corpus christi et sine confessione etc. instead of corpus et sanguinem domini immundi et ita sine confessione etc., in s. 41 it omits numquid vidisti maiora

72 There is a space in the ms. here.
tormenta and in s. 48 *septem ululantem*. This tendency to compress by omission and, unless the exemplar was defective, a certain freedom or carelessness in dealing with the inherited text, may be the reason for the variation in s. 45, *non crediderunt in filium dei* instead of the typical IIIc(Y) phrase *non crediderunt in patrem et filium et spiritum sanctum*.

Although, therefore, Paris 2831 may be assigned to the IIIc(Y) subgroup in spite of its idiosyncrasies, it is not dependent on any of the other versions in the group, nor on their presumed antecedents, Q and R, identified above. Firstly it does not share the characteristics of Q, the source of M3/M5. Both M3 and M5, and therefore Q, omit text which is supported by other witnesses of Redaction III and Redaction IIIc(Y), but this text is present in Paris 2831. For example, in s. 7 Paris 2831 has the missing *flumen* and *fervens*, and it has the omitted phrases *archangelus ... ad infernum* in s. 2, *angeli quatuor ... increpentes eas* in s. 40 and *tunc clamor ... commoverentur* in s. 56, all of which must have been derived from a source other than Q. Further, the Paris text does not add *inhantis/inhiantes* to s. 63 as do M3/M5, or *et mortuis* to s. 68, nor does it substitute *igneos gladios* for *cathedas igneas* in s. 35 or *ora pro nobis* for *interpella pro nobis ad dominum* in s. 64. The angel of the abyss is not introduced in s. 26 where Paris 2831 has only *hinc abyssus*, and the river is not named at all in s. 8. It is clear then that the Paris 2831 version is not drawn from the same source as M3/M5.

On the other hand, Paris 2831 does not share the common features of R, the antecedent of 3/10, S2 and Uppsala, either. Once again, it contains text which is supported elsewhere in the Redaction III tradition and omitted from 3/10, S2 and Upps, and thus R. For example, in s. 20 it has *sine confessione vixerunt* and in s. 24 *et semper ad dominum miserere nobis*. It does not substitute *mortuorum for morientes* in s. 59 nor *pacem* for *partem* in s. 74. In the other instances of variants shared by 3/10, S2 and Uppsala noted above, the Paris text is ambiguous. Where they have *maiora supplicia* instead of *maiora tormenta* in s. 41, it omits the phrase, where they have *septies maiora tormenta* instead of *septies peiora tormenta* also in s. 41, it has *peiora et atriora tormenta*, and where they reverse the order of adjectives in the address to the just soul in s. 54, *O anima

---

73 The phrase is shortened also by Upps (in *patrem et filium*) and in M5 (in *patrem et filium eius*). It should be noted also that Sl, the only representative of IIIc(X), has the original phrase 'non credunt christum natum de virgine'. While P28 also refers only to belief in Christ, the wording of this, together with the other shared characteristics of IIIc(Y) and the tendency towards omission in P28 indicate that it should be placed in the IIIc(Y) subgroup.

74 For 3/10 see [5], p. 245 and [6], p. 245.
felicissima O leta sponsa, it has domini eleta. Instead of the fratres referred to in Christ's granting of the Respite in s. 68, the Paris ms. has electos, but this may have resulted from a misreading of the abbreviation for sanctos which is the adjective in 3/10, S2 and Uppsala.

While Paris 2831 is thus not dependent on either the antecedent of M3/M5, namely Q, or that of 3/10, S2 and Uppsala, namely R, it does share some common features with one or more of 3/10, S2 and Uppsala, as in the following two cases. Firstly, the reaction of the lost in Hell at the sight of the just soul being carried off to Paradise after judgement is described in s. 56 of Redaction III generally as:-

<56> et clamabant omnes qui in inferno erant videntes animam iusti/iustam et angelos descendentes cum ea in paradisum et clamor magnus factus est in inferno.

All the witness of IIIc(Y) omit clamabant, creating a grammatical problem by the removal of the main verb of the first phrase. No attempt to resolve this is made by M3/M5 which also omit the last phrase (et clamor etc.). However P28, 3/10, S2 and Upps all change omnes to de omnibus and substitute ascendentes for descendentes (S2 and Upps also correct videntes to videntibus in apposition to omnibus).75 Secondly, the river of fire in s. 30 is described by P28 as nigereimum, as nigerrimum in Uppsala and nigereimum in S2;76 the phrase is omitted in 3/10.77 However, in M3/M5 and elsewhere in the Redaction III tradition it is described as igneum,78 which is the better reading. In both these cases, the variants link P28 to 3/10, S2 and Upps, and suggest a common antecedent. If this is so, the antecedent could not be Y since the better readings in M3/M5 must have been inherited from Y. Only the clamabant omission must have been in Y and passed down to all its descendants; the common antecedent of P28, 3/10, S2 and Upps, therefore, would be L, descended from Y. Thus the interrelationship of the IIIc(Y) versions would be:-

75 For 3/10 see [19], p. 246.
76 P28 and S2 have the same abbreviation in the ms. nig(er)eim(um). But ? nig(er)rim(um) in 52.
77 [7], 245.
78 The adjective in the published edition of red. IIId is "niger" which has been corrected from "nigrem" (Silverstein 1935, [7], p. 173: 11). However, it is 'igneu(m)' in the ms. (Vienna, Nationalbibliothek, 1629, f. 100r, line 33).
However, P28 can apparently also be linked to M3/M5 by the presence in all three of *exauditores* in the list of souls placed in the mouth of the *draco* (s. 17). Instead of these, 3/10 has *et auctores*,\(^79\) and S2 and Upps have *exactores*. According to the schema above, this would mean that *exauditores* was in Y and passed to Q and L (and thus to M3/M5 and P28), but changed by R into a form which produced *et auctores/exactores* in 3/10, S2 and Upps. These latter readings however, are found in the other redactions which contain the *draco* interpolation. In Redaction I, s. 12, four of the eight versions have *et auctores/auctores* and the other four omit; Redaction BR, s. 12, has *et exactorers*, Göttingen, s. 12, has *exactores* and Redaction II [2] has *et actores*.\(^80\) Thus the 3/10, S2 and Upps readings are better supported in the *alpha* tradition.

However, in the surviving versions of Redaction III itself, these forms do not appear elsewhere, indeed it seems that quite early on the passage itself became unstable. Seven of the other versions (including S1) omit this particular group: Brussels has *sagitatores* and CC has *eraclitatores*, but one of them, Paris 3343, has the form *exauditores* found in P28 and M3/M5. On the extant evidence therefore - and excluding contamination - it would seem, in the light of the proposed affiliation of the IIIc(Y) group, that the form *exauditores* was in the text which the group IIIc inherited. If IIIc had inherited the form *exactores*, then *exauditores* would be an error and a common source would need to be postulated for P28 and M3/M5, independent of the other IIIc(Y) versions. But the variants discussed earlier show a common independent source (L) for P28 and 3/10, S2 and Upps, and unless there was contamination, P28 cannot have two independent sources. Therefore, either *exauditores* was a misreading of *exactores* made independently by P28 and M3/M5, or the antecedent of 3/10, S2 and Upps, namely R, emended *exauditores* to *exactores*. The authority of the other redactions would be in favour of the first alternative (and therefore of the conclusion that Y had *exactores*), while the absence of *exactores*, or a variant of it, in the rest of Redaction III and the presence of *exauditores* outside the IIIcY group in Paris 3343 (unless this too was an independent misreading), would tend to favour the second alternative (and therefore the conclusion that Y (and W) had *exauditores*).\(^81\)

\(^79\) [4], p. 245.
\(^80\) See App.s C & D, and for red. II Silverstein 1935, [2], p. 156: 15.
\(^81\) Cf. in s. 7, *flatus* / *fletus*: M3/M5 & P28; *fluctus*: 3/10, S2 & Upps. The correct form is *'fluctus*', cf. s. 4 in red. BR, Göt & red. I, and in s. 7 of red. III, S1 (therefore X in Silverstein's stemma), P28 (therefore W) and Brus (therefore U). A number of other red. III witnesses share the misreadings of P28 & M3/M5. See App. E <7>. 
The interrelationship proposed by the schema above would also have implications for two cases of shared variants between M3/M5 and S2/Upps, which occur in s. 43 and s. 52. The first of these occurs in a passage which very soon appears to have become corrupt in the *alpha* tradition, or was already so in *alpha* itself. In the Long Latin text Paul looks into the Great Well:

(LLx24). et respeci in puto et vidi massas igneas ex omni parte ardentem.

The only redactions in which the phrase survives are Redaction I (s. 40), Göttingen (s. 37) and Redaction III (s. 43); in these the *massas* have generally become *muros* (corrupted occasionally to *viros*), or, in the case of one branch of Redaction I, *animas/flammas*, but the verb *ardentes* was replaced by several different variants. In Redaction III it appears as either *iactantes se* or *iacentes (se)*. In the subgroup IIIc(Y), P28 has *iactentes* and 3/10 *iactantes*, while S2, Upps and M3/M5 have *iacentes*. Among the ten other versions of Redaction III only Bonn has *iacentes*; four have *iactantes*, one has *stantes* and three omit, as does S1 (IIIc(X)). To account for P28 and 3/10 on the one hand and M3/M5 and S2/Upps on the other in the light of the proposed schema above, it would seem necessary to presume that the alternation between the two verbs with the same meaning, 'iacere' and 'iactare', which took place outside IIIc(Y) as evidenced by Bonn, also occurred within that subgroup. Thus either P28 and 3/10 independently alternated *iacentes* with *iactantes*, or M3/M5 and S2/Upps independently alternated *iactantes* with *iacentes*.

In the second case of a reading shared by M3/M5 and S2/Upps against P28 and 3/10, similar but independent changes would also need to be presumed. In s. 52 after seeing the angels bearing off the wicked soul to Hell, the angel asks Paul if he can now believe that *sicut fecerit homo sic accipiet*. This is the form of words which appears with small variations in all the other versions of Redaction III (including P28 and 3/10), except M3/M5 and S2/Upps. In M3/M5 the phrase is expanded to *sic fiet ei et accipiet*, while S2/Upps have *sic fiet ei* only. It may be that *sic fiet ei* is an echo of a well-known phrase, which has been introduced independently by M3/M5 and S2/Upps, or, if the insertion had already occurred in Y, it may be that P28 and 3/10, recognising that one or other of the two phrases was superfluous, omitted the first, whereas in a similar reaction, S2 and Upps omitted the second.

---

82 Red. I Barcelona: animas; red. I Venice: flammas.
83 e.g. 'elevantes' (red. I), 'iacentes' (red. I Venice), 'imminentes' (Göttingen). Red IIIId (Vi) has restored 'ardentes', presumably by conjecture.
84 [15], p. 246.
85 The last part of the section is omitted in S2/Upps.
CONCLUSION

In 1959 Silverstein did not redraw his 1935 stemma to include his new additions Bonn, Brussels and Bodley (or 3/10). However, he concluded that Bonn, Brussels and Bodley were independently derived from "a text of the type IIIU", and hence in his stemma presumably:

In addition to the expansion of IIIc(Y) in the preceding section, the discussion in this chapter has linked Budapest 231 to Bodley through a common ancestor (=K), and Paris 3343 to IIIb(M2) through a common ancestor (=W1), and it has been argued that the second source of the German version, GS, (which is primarily derived from a version of IIIc(Y)), is either the antecedent of Paris 3343 and IIIb(M2), namely W1, or a separate descendant of W1, namely W2. On this basis, the Silverstein stemma would be modified as shown below:

---

86 Silverstein 1959, pp. 213-4. On 3/10 see ibid., p. 219: "it can be used as an independent witness to the character of type IIIc."
87 Diagram drawn by G. Cerutti.
PART II  Redaction IV

Chapter 4

REDACTION IV AND ITS WITNESSES

Introduction

Redaction IV is the most numerous and widespread of all the medieval Latin redactions of the *Visio Pauli*. Its most distinctive features are the characteristic opening sentence *Dies dominicus dies est electus* and the interpolations of the torment of the fiery wheel and the bridge of Hell.

The redaction was identified in the 19th century by Herman Brandes who published a text of it in 1885,¹ and this has remained the standard reference since then. Another text of the redaction was published by Paul Meyer in 1895, and a further text is contained in the *Patrologia Latina*.² The form of Redaction IV and "its place in the general scheme of the Latin Redactions" was discussed by Theodore Silverstein in 1935, but he did not publish an edition of the text.³ His stemma of the *alpha* redactions, revised in 1959,⁴ shows Redaction IV as a key redaction drawn from two sources, namely from the secondary hypothetical antecedent *beta* through Redaction III, and also from *alpha* directly; it was subsequently combined with Redaction I to form Redactions VII and VIII, and with Redaction III to form Redactions V, IX and X.

¹ *Visio S. Pauli: Ein Beitrag zur Visionslitteratur, mit einem deutschen und zwei lateinischen Texten*. Halle 1885, pp. 75-80.
³ Silverstein 1935, p. vii and pp. 52-58 & 76-79
⁴ Silverstein 1959, p. 225. In the revised stemma a hypothetical antecedent of redaction IV (γ) was eliminated. On this antecedent and its elimination see Silverstein 1935, pp. 60-61 and 1959, pp. 223-224; also chapter 9 below.
Neither Brandes’ printed text of the redaction nor Migne’s is divided into sections. Brandes has only line numbers for each page and Migne prints the text as a continuous unit in two columns. Meyer’s text is divided into 31 sections but for the purposes of electronic collation used in this study, and to facilitate discussion of individual elements, the text of Redaction IV has been divided into shorter sections numbered 1-72 as shown in the reprint of the Brandes text below. The corresponding page and line numbers of the Brandes 1885 edition are given in parenthesis.5 The sections are also grouped here under subject matter headings for ease of reference.

<2> [75:2-3] Interrogandum est, quis primus rogaverit deum,
<3> [75:3-4] ut anime habeant requiem in penis inferni.
<4> [75:4-5] Id est beatus apostolus Paulus et Michahel archangelus, quando iverunt ad infernum,
<5> [75:5-6] quia deus voluit, ut Paulus videret penas inferni.

Sections 6 - 7: The Fiery Trees [Brandes: 75:6-9]
<6> [75:6-8] Vidit vero Paulus ante portas inferni arbores igneas et peccatores cruciatos et suspensos in eis.

Sections 8 - 13: The Furnace [Brandes: 75:9-18]
<8> [75:9-11] Et iterum vidit fornacem ignis ardentem per septem flammis in diversis coloribus, et puniebantur in eo peccatores.
<9> [75:11-14] Et septem plage erant in circuitu eius: prima nix, secunda glacies, tercia ignis, quarta sanguis, quinta serpens, sexta fulgur, septima fetor.
<10> [75:14-15] Et in illa anime peccatorum puniuntur qui non egerunt penitenciam post peccata commissa in hoc mundo.
<12> [75:16-18] Et alii flent, alii ululant, alii gemunt, alii ardent et querunt mortem,
<13> [75:18] quam non inveniunt, quia anime non possunt mori.

<14> [75:19 - 76; 2] Timendus est nobis locus inferni, in quo est tristicia sine leticia, in quo est dolor sempiternus, in quo est gemitus cordis, in quo est bargidium magnum, in quo est habundancia lacrimarum, cruciatio et dolor animalum.
<15> [76:2-5] in quo est rota ignea habens mille orbitas. Mille vicibus uno die ab angelo tartareo volvit, et in unaquaque vice mille anime cruicantur in ea.

---

5 The sections used in Meyer’s 1895 edition correspond to those used here as follows: 1 (Meyer) =1-5 (here); 2 =6-7; 3 =8-10; 4 =11-13; 5 =14-5; 6 =16; 7 =17; 8 =18-9; 9 =20; 10 =21; 11 =22; 12 =23; 13 =24; 14 =25; 15 =26-7; 16 =28; 17 =29; 18 =30-1; 19 =32-3; 20 =34-5; 21 =36-7; 22 =38-42; 23 =43-4; 24 =45-8; 25 =49-54; 26 =55-6; 27 =57-9; 28 =60-3; 29 =64-5; 30 =66-9; 31 =70-2.
In Silverstein’s summary (1935, pp. 52-3), the content of the redaction is divided into 11 sections, corresponding to those used here as follows: 1 (Silverstein) =6-13 (here); 2 =14-15; 3 =16-25; 4 =26-27; 5 =28-31; 6 =32-35; 7 =36-37; 8 =38-44; 9 =45-54; 10 =55-69; 11 =70-71.
Sections 16 - 19: The Horrible River and the Bridge  [Brandes: 76: 5-19]
16> [76: 5-8] Postea vidit flumen orribile in quo multe bestie dyabolice erant quasi piscis in medio maris, que animas peccatrices devorant sine ullis miserericordia quasi lupi devorant oves.
17> [76: 8-10] Et desuper illud flumen est pons per quem transeunt anime iuste sine aliqua dubitatione, et multe peccatrices animae merguntur unaqueque secundum meritum suum.
18> [76: 11-15] Ibi sunt multe bestie dyabolice multaque mansiones male preparate, sicut dicit dominus in evangeliis: Ligante eos per fasciculos ad comburendum; id est similis cum similibus, adulteros cum adulteris, rapaces cum rapacibus, iniquos cum iniquis.
19> [76: 15-16] Tantum vero potest quisque per pontem illum ire quantum habet meritum.

20> [76: 16-19] Ibi vidit Paulus multas animas dimeras, alie usque ad genua, alie usque ad umbilicum, alie usque ad labia, alie usque ad supercilia, et perhenniter cruciantur.
23> [76: 24-26] Alii mersi usque ad labia? Hi sunt qui gaudent de malitia proximi sui.

27> [76:30 - 77:2] De quibus ait angelus: Hi sunt feneratores pecuniarum qui usuras querunt et non sunt misericordes.

Sections 28 - 31: The Infanticides  [Brandes: 77: 2-13]
28> [77: 2-5] Et vidit alium locum in quo omnes pene erant, erantque ibi puelle nigre habentes vestimenta nigra, indute pice et sulfure et dracones igneos et serpentes atque vipere circa colla sua.
29> [77: 5-8] Et erant .iiij. angeli maligni increpantes eas habentes cornua ignea, qui ibant in circuitu earum. dicentes: Agnoscite filium dei, qui mundum redemit.
30> [77: 8-10] Et interrogavit Paulus que essent. Tunc sic respondit angelus: He sunt, que non servaverunt castitatem usque ad nuptias
31> [77: 10-13] et maculate necaverunt infantes suos et in escam porcis et canibus dederunt et in fluminibus vel aliis perdicionibus proiecerunt et postea penitenciam non fecerunt.

32> [77: 13-14] Post hoc vidit viros ac mulieres in loco glaciali, et ignis urebat de media parte et de media frigebat.

Sections 34 - 35: The Fastbreakers  [Brandes: 77: 15-18]
34> [77: 15-17] Postea vidit viros ac mulieres super canelia amnis et fructus ante illos erant. Quibus non licebat aliquit sumere ex eis.

37> [77: 19-24] Et interrogavit Paulus quis esset. Dixitque angelus: Episcopus negligens fuit; non custodivit legem dei, non fuit castus de corpore vel de verbo nec cogitacione vel opere, sed fuit avarus et dolosus atque superbus. Ideo sustinet innumerables penas usque in diem iudicii.
Sections 38 - 44: The Great Well [Brandes: 77: 24 - 78: 12]


<40> [78: 1-2] Et aperto ore putei surrexit fetor malus et durus superans omnes penas inferni.

<41> [78: 2-4] Et dixit angelus: Si quis mittatur in hoc puteo, non fiet commemoracio eius in conspectu domini.

<42> [78: 4-8] Et dixit Paulus: Qui sunt hi, domine, qui mittuntur in eo? Et dixit angelus: Qui non credunt filium dei Christum venisse in carni nec nasci ex Maria virgine et non baptizati sunt nec communicati corpore et sanguine Christi.

<43> [78: 8-9] Et vitit in alio loco viros ac mulieres et vermes et serpentes comedentes eos.

<44> [78: 9-12] Et erat anima una super alteram quasi oves in ovili. Et erat profunditas eius quasi de terra ad celum. Et audivit gemitum et suspitrum magnum quasi tonitruum.

Sections 45 - 54: The Judgement of a Wicked and a Good Soul [Brandes: 78: 12-29]

<45> [78: 12-14] Et postea aspexit in celum a terra ac vidit animam peccatoris inter dyabolos .vij., quum ulularent deducebant eo die de corpore.

<46> [78:14-16] Et clamaverunt angeli dei contra earn dicentes: Ve, ve, misera anima, que operata es in terra?


<49> [78: 20-22] Et dixit ei angelus: Credis et agnoscis, quia sicut homo fecerit sic accipiet?

<50> [78: 22-23] Post hoc in uno momento adduxerunt angeli animam iustam de corpore portantes ad celum.


<54> [78: 28-29] Et clamor factus est contra animam iustam, quasi celum et terra commoveruntur.


<55> [78: 30-32] Et exclamaverunt peccatores, qui erant in penis, dicentes: Miserere nobis, Michahel archangele, ac tu, Paule, dilectissime dei, intercedite pro nobis ad dominum.


<57> [79: 2-4] Audientes hoc, qui erant in penis, exclamaverunt una voce et Michahel archangelus et Paulus apostolus et milia milium angelorum.

Sections 58 - 60: The Appearance of Christ [Brandes: 79: 4-10]


<60> [79: 8-10] Et vox filii dei audita est per omnes penas: Quit boni fecistis? Quare postulatis a me requiem?
Sections 61-63: The Reproaches [Brandes: 79: 10-16]
<61> [79: 10-12] Ego crucifixus fui pro vobis, lancea perforatus, clavis confixus, acetum cum felle mixtum dedisti[s] mihi in potum.
<62> [79: 12-13] Ego pro vobis me ipsum in martirio dedi, ut vinceretis mecum.
<63> [79: 13-16] Sed vos fuistis fures et avari et invidiosi, superbi et maledict[i], nec ulla bonum egistis nec penitenciam nec ieiunium nec elemosinam, sed mendaces fuistis. in vita vestra.

Section 64: The Appeal of Michael, Paul & all the Angels [Brandes: 79: 16-19]
<64> [79: 16-19] Post hoc prostravit se Michael et Paulus et angelorum milia milium ante filium dei, ut requiem haberent die dominico omnes, qui erant in inferno.

Section 65: The Granting of Respite [Brandes: 79: 19-22]

Section 66: The Hostiarius [Brandes: 79: 22-24]

<67> [79: 24-26] Vere letati sunt omnes, qui cruciabantur ibi, ac clamaverunt dicentes: Benedictimus te, fili Davit excelsi, qui donasti nobis refrigerium in spacio unius diei et noctis.
<68> [79: 27-29] Nam plus est nobis remedium huius diei et noctis quam totum tempus vite, quod consumptum est super terram.

Section 69: The Reward of Sunday Observance [Brandes: 79: 29-30]
<69> [79: 29-30] Ideo qui custodierunt ipsum sanctum diem dominicum, habeant partem cum angelis dei.

Sections 70-71: The Number of Pains in Hell [Brandes: 79: 30-80: 4]
<70> [79: 30-80: 2] Et interrogavit Paulus angelum quot pene sint in inferno. Cui ait angelus: Sunt pene .c.xliij. milia,
<71> [80: 2-4] et si essent .c. viri loquentes ab inicio mundi et unusquisque .c.iiiij. linguis ferreas haberent, non possent dinumerare penas inferni.

Section 72: Concluding Exhortation [Brandes: 80: 4-6]

Structure and Content

In structure and content Redaction IV is closest to Redaction III. Like III but unlike I, BR and Göttingen, it preserves from the presumed Redaction α the
episode of the Going-Out of the Souls and all three episodes of the Respite section, i.e. the Appearance of Christ, the Reproaches and the Granting of the Respite. It contains the same distinctive interpolations found in III, namely the Interrogandum sentence in its preface, the souls hanging from the burning trees, the Furnace, the precise duration of the Respite and the exhortation to Sunday observance (Interpolations J, K, L, M and N). Like III, it contains none of the interpolations characteristic of Redaction I (but not of BR and Göttingen), i.e. the 3 extra classical rivers, the Limbus Patrum, Paul’s mission to preach and the concluding Expavescite sentence (Interpolations E, F, G and H). Also, in Redaction IV as in Redaction III, the hostiarius inferni replaces the original episode of the demons’ chiding of the souls (LLx 35). Both Redaction III and Redaction IV omit the Oceanus section (LLx 1-2) which must have appeared at the beginning of the Visio in alpha and which is maintained in Redactions I, BR and Göttingen, and both III and IV reduce the Great Worm section (LLx26), which appears in Redaction BR and Göttingen (and therefore was present in alpha), to a generic description of worms and serpents eating souls.

However, Redaction IV preserves alpha material which is omitted or altered in Redaction III. Most notably its contents include the episode of the Negligent Bishop (LLx 12), relocated to immediately precede the Great Well, and it also has the numbering of the pains of hell at the end (alpha interpolation D). It preserves the correct order of the Injurers of Widows and Orphans and the Fastbreakers, which Redaction III reverses, and the Appeal of the Souls to the Archangel and his response are more correctly placed before the Reproaches, not after as in III. On the other hand, it omits a number of alpha episodes which are preserved in III (and other redactions). These are the Abyss (LLx 9-10), part of the Angel’s rebuke (LLx 11), the episodes of the sorcerers (LLx 14/15) and the adulterers (LLx 16), and the Angel’s summons Sequere me etc. (LLx 23).

In addition to its new interpolations, the dies dominicus opening sentence (=O), the fiery wheel (=P), the bridge of Hell (=Q) and the convertamur ending, (=R), Redaction IV makes several distinctive changes to its inherited material; it alters alpha’s river of fire (LLx 3) to a flumen horribile inhabited by bestie diabolice, 6

---

6Silverstein considered, however, that traces of this episode were discernible in the final section (14) of BR: “The passage has undergone a radical revision at the hands of the author of Br, yet mangeas to keep the remnants of motifs belonging to the ancient Long Latin original ....”(1959, p. 217). “This section [14] is unique to Br but seems to recall the incidents of the going out of the souls of the Long texts, found also (but with more literal adherence to the source) in III, IV, V, and VIII.” (ibid, p. 238 n. 204).
and it merges into one the separate groups of the unchaste girls (LLx 15/16) and the infanticides (LLx 20/21). The admonition, *Oportet nos timere* etc, which must have appeared at the beginning of alpha and which followed the new *Interrogandum* opening of Redaction III, is radically recast in Redaction IV (*Timendus est nobis* etc), and is transposed to follow the description of the Furnace.

The content pattern of Redaction IV is therefore:-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Redaction α</th>
<th>Redaction IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A; 1-3; B, C; 4-13, 14/15*, 16-19, 20/21*, 22-26</td>
<td>O, J, K, L, (A), P; (3); Q; 4-8, (11), 13, 17/20/21*, 18, 19, 12, 22, 24-25, (26);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Going Out of the Souls</td>
<td>The Going-Out of the Souls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27-35, D</td>
<td>28-33; M; (35), 34; N, D. R.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* indicates merged extracts

Omitted =1-3, 9-10, 14/15, 16, 23, 27.

Texts of Redaction IV

Texts of Redaction IV are to be found in 44 mss. and in the *Patrologia latina*. This number of texts far exceeds the number for the other redactions, the nearest being Redaction III with 16 and Redaction I with 5.

The number of mss. known to contain Redaction IV has gradually increased over the century since Herman Brandes identified it in 1885 and used the texts in 3 mss. for his edition. In the introduction to Paul Meyer’s edition of Redaction IV in 1895, 21 mss. containing Redaction IV were listed, including the three used by Brandes. The latter were not used by Meyer for his edition

---

7 The second of these groups was already the result of a merging of originally separate groups; cf. Introduction.

8 The text of the *Visio Pauli* printed in the *Patrologia Latina* (XCIV, 501-502) is of red. IV but the source of this text is not named and is not identifiable among the mss. presently known to contain the *Visio Pauli*; it is therefore considered as an additional version.

9 The edition gave the text of the redaction in a Vienna manuscript, Nationalbibliothek, 876 (no. 43 in the list of mss. below) with some variants noted from two British Library mss. (Additional 26770 and Harleian 2851; nos 14 & 16 in the list of mss. below).

10 Meyer 1895, p. 359. In the list are the mss. numbered below as 14-16, 18, 19 (misprinted as 8F instead of 8E), 20-23, 26, 30-1, 33-36, 43.
which was based on three of the others listed. 11 Forty years later, at the end of his 1935 study of the *Visio Pauli*, Theodore Silverstein named 27 mss. of Redaction IV, (including those listed by Brandes and Meyer), 12 plus the text of the redaction in the *Patrologia Latina*. One of the mss. listed as Redaction IV by both Meyer and Silverstein contains, however, a version of Redaction III. 13

Silverstein also listed 4 "unclassified" texts of the *Visio Pauli* in 1935, two of which are of Redaction IV. 14 In 1959 he noted a text of the redaction in a Vatican ms. (Reg. Lat. 524), and printed the text of a fragment in the Huntington Library (San Marino, California), thus bringing the total to 31 witnesses. 15 The list of unclassified versions of the *Visio Pauli* compiled after 1959 by Silverstein and now published, 16 contains twelve additional texts of the redaction. 17 Two other texts in the Bibliothèque Nationale of Paris can now also be added, 18 making a total of 45 witnesses in all. Of the 45, 41 are complete or substantial texts of Redaction IV, 40 of these in manuscripts dating from XII to XV century and one in the *Patrologia Latina*. The other four are fragments only.

The full list is given below together with the sigla by which they will be referred to in discussion.

A. MSS
1. Bruges, Bibliothèque Publique, lat. 162, ff. 58v-60v. Late xii c. 19 [Bru]
2. Cambridge, Gonville and Caius College, 362 [441], f. viii a/r. xiii c.
   (fragment 20) [Gon]
3. Cambridge, Jesus College, 46 (Q.D.4), f. 138r. xv c. (fragment 21) [Je]

---

11 Montpellier, École de médecine, 503; Paris BN, lat. 5266 & 10729 (nos. 26, 34 & 35 in the list below).
12 Silverstein 1935, pp. 220-221. Two of the mss. listed by Meyer are omitted; Silverstein pointed out that one was in fact of red. V (p. 222), and the other (no. 26 below) he considered doubtful (pp. 221-222).
13 It is listed as Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm. 9637, f. 71rv. xiv c.; the present folio numbering is 70v-72r.
14 Silverstein 1935, pp. 221-222. See nos 26 & 28 below.
15 Silverstein 1959, p. 203 & pp. 247-248. The transcription of the Huntington Library fragment given at p. 247 is titled "Extract", but from the description on p. 203 this seems to be a transcription of the complete fragment.
16 T. Silverstein & A. Hilhorst 1997, p. 19 n. 4. The list was generously made available to the present writer by Prof. Silverstein some years before it was published.
17 Nos 1, 3, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 24, 25, 39, 42 & 44 below.
18 Nos 37 & 38 below.
19 Dated by R. M. Thomson.
20 ss. 1-7 (8) only.
21
4. Cambridge, Pembroke College, 103, ff. 124rv & 126rv. Late xii c. [Pem1]
5. Cambridge, Pembroke College, 258, ff. 52r-53r. Late xiiic. [Pem2]
6. Cambridge, St John’s College, 95, ff. 199v-201v. ?xv c. ²² [StJD]
7. Cambridge, St John’s College, 159, ff. 24v-25v. Late xv c. [StJF]
9. Dublin, Trinity College, 277, ff. 335-338. xv c. [TriD2]
10. Dublin, Trinity College, 519, ff. 95r-96r. xv c. [TriD5]
11. Dublin, Trinity College, 667, ff. 76-78. xv c. [TriD6]
12. Erfurt, Stadtbibl., Amplon. Fol. 304 [CA 2a 304], f. 102v. 1st half xiv c. [Erf.]
13. Graz, Univ.-Bibl. 731, f. 261r. xv (fragment ²⁴) [Gra]
15. London, British Library, Arundel 52, ff. 63r-64r. xiii c. [Arun]
16. London, British Library, Harleian 2851, ff. 58v-60v. xv c. [Harl]
17. London, British Library, Royal 8.B.X, ff. 82r-83r. xv c. [Ro8B]
19. London, British Library, Royal 8.E.XVII, ff. 122v-123r. Late xiii or early xiv c [Ro8E]
20. London, British Library, Royal 8.F.VI, ff. 23r-24r. xv c. [Ro8F]
24. London, St Paul’s Cathedral, 8, ff. 188r-189r. "after 1400" [StP]
25. Melk, Stiftsbibliothek, 1706, (97 [B. 65]) ff. 224v-225r. ?Late xiii c. [Mel]
26. Montpellier, École de médecine, 503, ff. 37v-39r. xiv c. [Mont]
27. Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm. 12728, ff. 122r-123v and 132v. xv c. [Mu12]
28. Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm. 14348, f. 217r-218r. xiii c. [Mu14]²⁸

²¹ ss. 70-71 only.
²² The catalogue (M. R. James) has "xiv and xv". It is assumed here that the latter part of the
codex in which the Vis. P. is written, is 15th c.
²³ The folio, the last in the ms., has suffered damage. The text of red. IV is legible on the whole
(although it is barely so or illegible in parts) as far as s. 57. It appears to have continued for
several lines which are now obscured (by a patch in the lower right corner) or obliterated, and
the rest of the page appears to have been blank.
²⁴ ss. 2-10 only.
²⁵ The text of red. IV finishes at s. 32.
²⁶ The text of red. IV finishes at s. 33.
²⁷ Silverstein listed this as unclassified in 1935 (p. 221), although he noted that P. Meyer had
classified it as red. IV (Meyer 1895, p. 359). Meyer was correct in his classification and this ms.
is the base text for his 1895 edition of red. IV.
29. Oxford, Balliol College, 228, f. 268rv. xv c. [Bal]
32. Oxford, Merton College, 13, f. 66rv. xv c. [Mer]
34. Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, lat. 5266, ff. 21v-23v. xii c. [Pa32]
35. Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, lat. 10729, ff. 1r-2v. xii c. [Pa10]
36. Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, lat. 16246, ff. 133v-134r. xv c. [Pa16]
37. Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, lat. 3528, ff. 14r-16r. xv c. [Pa28]
38. Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, lat. 3529a, ff. 121r-122r. xiii-xiv c. [Pa29]
39. Prague, Univ.-Bibli., IX 4, ff. 73r-75v. xiii-xiv c. [Pra]30
40. Rome, Vatican, Bibl. Apost., Reg. lat. 524, ff. 190r-191r. xv c. [Vat]
   (fragment31) [SanM]
42. Schlägl (Austria), Stiftsbibliothek, 226, ff. 206r-206v. xv c. [Schl]32
43. Vienna, Nationalbibliothek, 876, ff. 142r-143r. xiv c. [Vi]1
44. Worcester, Cathedral Library, Q. 27, ff. 154r-155r. xiv c. [Wor]33

B. Printed

C. Revised classification
   
   - Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 9637, f. 71rv. xiv c.

   This ms. was listed as Redaction IV by P. Meyer in 189524 and by Silverstein in
   1935 (p. 220). However it is in fact a text of Redaction III (the present folio
   numbering is ff. 70v-72r.).

---

29 Listed as unclassified by Silverstein in 1935 (p. 222) with the observation that “This ms. came to
my attention too late for its use in the present study”.
29 The outer left corner of f. 161v has been excised, creating a lacuna of gradually diminishing
length at the beginning of each of the first 13 lines of the written text. A fold in the middle of the
folios partially obscures one line of the written text.
30 The text of red. IV finishes with the first words of s. 50 at the end of line 13 of f. 75v. The
following lines, in the same hand, appear to be part of a sermon or "evangelicam lectionem" directed to "fratres" (f. 77v, lines 6 & 5), which begins in mid sentence at line 14 of f. 75v, and
continues to the end of the ms, f. 77v.
31 ss. 64, 65, 67, 69-72 only
32 The text of red. IV finishes at s. 42. It is followed immediately by another description of
Hell, *De Cameris Inferni*. This latter work is also juxtaposed with two versions of red. III; see
chapter 3 above.
33 Four lines of text at the top of ff. 154v and 155r are damaged by damp.
34 Meyer 1895, p. 359.
Silverstein (1935, p. 222) noted that this ms. which was listed by Meyer as a text of Redaction IV, was in fact of Redaction V.

D. Unidentified or Lost
- Geneva, Bibliotheque publique et universitaire, lat. 48. xiv c.
Silverstein (1935, p. 221) noted that this ms containing a text of Redaction IV had once been in Geneva but was no longer there. It was recorded together with an "excerpt" in the 1779 Senebier catalogue of the library. Silverstein reported that the library "suggested that it was once borrowed from Montpellier and has since been returned", and he in turn suggested that it may have been Montpellier, 503 (no. 26 [Mont] above). A comparison of the text of Redaction IV in the latter with the "excerpt" in the Senebier catalogue reprinted by Silverstein, shows that the two are not identical but nevertheless belong to the same subgroup of Redaction IV mss.

- a Harleian ms., 3776, in the British Library was listed by Brandes but this ms. does not appear to contain a version of the Visio Pauli.

- Cambridge, Trinity College 1129 II is listed in the M. R. James Catalogue of the library, vol IV, under "Apocryphal writings, Visio Pauli", but it could not be identified from the headings in the microfilm of 1129 II [O. 2. 25], ff. 89b-186.

---

36 The excerpt is of sections 28-31 of red. IV. For the analysis of its identifying characteristics see below, chapter 5.
37 Brandes 1885, p. 22.
Chapter 5
THE CLASSIFICATION OF REDACTION IV TEXTS (1)

The 45 texts of Redaction IV presently identified, fall into five groups or families, here designated A, B, C, D & E. Each of the families has a shared set of distinctive characteristics, consisting mainly of variants of a linguistic nature, but also of omissions or preserved authentic material, as well as some structural features. The linguistic variants are, in many cases, small changes of vocabulary, word order or syntax and many would not, by themselves, be sufficient to classify a text of the redaction. However the presence of a specific and substantial group of these features creates a recognisable and distinctive verbal texture which differentiates and groups the versions of the redaction in various manuscripts, and which enables even fragments to be classified.

The manuscripts containing the texts assigned to each family group are listed in this and the following chapter according to the alphabetical order of their sigla. The list of manuscripts for each family is accompanied by a survey of the distinctive characteristics which make up the group profile. In several cases the combination in the texts of characteristic variants from otherwise distinct families indicates contamination between the families by editing or change of exemplar. The manuscripts in which this occurs are listed with an asterisk in the first or prime family group to which the text belongs and are discussed individually below. The scribal editing of a text belonging to a single family group is also indicated in this way.

1. Family A

Ten texts and two fragments are classified here as Family A. The Vienna text (Vi) on which Brandes based the first published version of redaction IV belongs to this group, as well as the Montpellier text (Mont) published by Meyer and the San Marino fragment published by Silverstein. The published versions of the redaction therefore, except for Migne, represent only one of the five families of texts in the redaction IV mss now known.

---

1 The excerpt from the lost Geneva ms. (ss. 28-31), reprinted by Silverstein (1935, p. 22; see chapter 4 above), also belongs to the A family. See the analysis below.
Characteristic Variants of A Texts

Texts belonging to Family A are immediately recognisable by their opening sentence: *Dies dominicus dies est electus in quo gaudebunt/gaudent angeli et archangeli maior/magis diebus ceteris.* The future tense *gaudebunt* and the inclusion of *archangeli* are typical of this group, and, while the comparison of Sunday with other days is made also in another group (Family D), the form of the comparison *maior/magis diebus ceteris* is distinctive of the A texts. In s. 5, the phrase *et misit deus michaelem cum paulo ut ostenderet ei penas inferni* is generally omitted (except Bru) but not exclusively so, as this has occurred (probably in the same way, by homoeoteleuton) also in most of the B group.

ss. 7 - 19

The content and order of the list of ways in which the sinners are hanging from the burning trees in s. 7, as well as its grammatical form, serve to distinguish various family groups. In the A texts the pattern is by the feet, hands, hair, ears, tongues and arms, all in the ablative case (*pedibus, manibus* etc.) Small examples here of the verbal texture characteristic of this group, are the use of *in*
eis <6> referring to the fiery trees and et puniebantur in ea or et puniebantur in ea peccatrices anime <8>, where the other families use different expressions; also indicative are: in circuitu eius <9> and quam introducing s. 13, accompanied in the same section by anime non possunt mori or anime mori non possunt.

The exhortation in s. 14 names some of the sufferings to be feared in Hell and is again a differentiating feature between the families. The A texts begin the list typically with tristitia sine leticia, and a substantial number include bargidium magnum which is rare or corrupted elsewhere. In this section too, the nominative cruciacio is used, as the last of the series, by all but one, whereas other groups have an accusative after propter. Diabolic beasts devour animas peccatrices <16> in the horrible river spanned by a bridge. In other groups the souls of the sinners pass across this bridge according to their merit, but in the A texts the addition of merguntur means that many are instead immersed in the river according to their merit, et multe peccatrices anime merguntur unaquaque secundum meritum suum <17>. Peculiar to this family too is the repetition of the multe bestie dyabolice of s. 16 at the beginning of s. 18. Most of A begin s. 19 with tantum vero and use quisque instead of unusquisque; all omit secundum opera sua at the end. These are traits which are found rarely elsewhere individually, and particularly in combination.

ss. 21 - 57
All the A texts have reduced inmittunt in s. 21 to mittunt, which occurs in other groups but not consistently, and a cluster of A texts also use the present participle interrogans instead of interrogant in this section. With one exception, the sinners in s. 22 are identified as fornicatores (et) adulterantes while the other groups use verb forms (qui fornicantur et adulterantur), and all the A group have non recurrunt or non recordantur (ad penitenciam) at the end of the section rather than non revertuntur.

Several other small but distinctive features of A's verbal texture are the opening words to s. 26 (deinde), and s. 27 (de quibus ait angelus), and erantque ibi introducing the description of the Infanticides in s. 28. The description of these sinners is based partly on the Long Latin description of the False Ascetics (LLx 21) viros et mulieres indutos pannis picem plenis et sulforem ignis et erant drachones circumvoluti colles eorum, which is merged with the description of the False

---

3 The significance of this item is discussed below, see chapter 7.
4 Bru = propter cruciationem.
5 Bru.
Virgins in LLx 17 puellas abentes indumenta nigra. The passage seems to have caused some difficulty in transmission and is variously treated in redaction IV texts. The A group's version has indute pice, omitting pannis; it also transfers the fire to follow the dragons and changes the construction to the ablative case - thus et draconibus et igne ....circa colla sua <28>. The angel's reply, tunc sic respondit <30>, is exclusive to A texts, as is also the distinctive change to the past participle maculate at the beginning of s. 31 where the other groups use a verb form (maculaverunt se). Further, the reference to parentibus which was originally in the Long Latin, and which is found in other groups, albeit in corrupted form, is omitted by A; the word order too, in escam....dederunt, is distinctive of A texts. This group consistently has in fluminibus vel in aliis perdicionibus proiecerunt, whereas the texts in the other groups which retain this second element, either alter it or use the accusative case. For the description of the fire and ice punishment of the Injurers of Widows and Orphans which then follows, the A group characteristically use the structure urebat de media parte et de media frigebat <32>.

The description of the Fastbreakers in s. 34 appears to be corrupted in all the redaction IV texts. In the Long Latin they are pendentes super canela aque; the A group describe them as super canalia ampnis (or with variants or corruptions of this phrase), and the prohibition to eat of the fruit before them is phrased quibus non licebat aliquid sumere. The section on the Negligent Bishop (s. 37) is introduced in the A texts by max, and the majority of this group have the error spiritus for episcopus, (due either to a misreading of the abbreviation or to censorship), which is found in only two other isolated cases in the rest of the redaction IV texts. That this soul will suffer innumerable pains on the day of judgement (sustinebit ...in die iudicii) is typical of the A group, whereas in other groups the soul is presently suffering (sustinet) or will suffer (sustinebit) such pains until the day of judgement, usque ad/in diem iudicii.

ss. 39 - 54
Confronted with the Great Well in s. 39, St Paul is advised to stay longe rather than a lange as elsewhere, although in this group, as elsewhere, the form longius is also found. All the A texts add hunc to fetorem at the end of this section and begin the next section with aperto/apertoque ore putei <40>; the stench arising from this pit of Hell exceeds omnes penas inferni. Identifying the occupants of

---

6 nescientibus parentibus suis (LLx 17).
7 James 1893, [39], p. 32: 1.
8 One striking example is super carnales hamos (Bru).
the pit in s. 41, the A group generally substitutes *in hoc puteo* for the accusative consistently found elsewhere after *quis mittatur*, and has *non fiet* for *numquam fiet* before *commemoratio*. These souls are described in s. 42, amongst other things, as *non baptizati nec communicati corpore et sanguine Christi*.

The place where St Paul then sees the dramatic judgement of the newly dead wicked and good souls, varies between the families. In the majority of A texts *aspexit in celo et in terra*; there he sights the souls whom devils *deducebant eo die de corpore*<45>. Also present are the *angeli dei* and their challenge to this wicked soul in s. 46 also varies across the families; in the A texts they say *que operata es*. They then invite each other to consider this soul (using the singular or plural imperative) *vide/videte istam animam*<47>, and, because of the position of *animam* (and its accusative case) before rather than after *quomodo*, the second part of the angels' comment reads in this group as an exclamation - *quomodo contempsit* etc. <47>. Then (*mox*<47>) the soul reads the record of its sins and judges itself, after which (*tunc*<48>) demons (*demones* rather than *diaboli*) cast it into exterior darkness. In calling on St Paul to recognise the matching of reward to deeds in s. 49, the angel guide in most of the A texts uses *sibi* (found only in this group) instead of *ei* or *paulo* as in other groups. A similar distinctive cluster of small elements of verbal texture can also be noted in A's account of the judgement of the good soul, i.e. the omission of *pro ea* after *letancium*, and of *hodie* after *letare*<51>, and the consistent use of the future *leget* (<52>) which is unstable in other groups where it varies with past and present subjunctive tenses.

In the following sections 54 - 56, there are several notable structural characteristics. Firstly, the two phrases in s. 54 describing the reaction of the souls in Hell to the judgement of the good soul, *clamaverunt ....contra animam iustam et clamor factus est* etc. are compressed into one by the A group, hence: *et clamor factus est contra animam iustam*. Also, several distinctive changes have been made by the A texts to the Archangel's reply to the souls' plea for intercession in s. 56, which is introduced characteristically by *quibus sic ait angelus*. In the Long Latin the phrase is:-

*Tunc autem flete et ego flebo vobiscum et qui mecum sunt angeli cum dilectissimo paulo si forte misereatur misericors deus ut det vobis refrigerium.* (LLx 29)

which is reflected in other redaction IV families. However the A group alters this by omitting the angels and substituting *paulus* for *cum dilectissimo paulo*, thus making him and not God the subject of *misereatur* and adding that he might pray (*oret*) that God would grant the souls respite, hence:-
Quibus sic ait michael angelus: Flete et flebo vobiscum [...] paulus si forte misereatur vestri oret ut donet vobis misericors deus aliquod refrigerium.

ss. 58 - 72

An important feature in the drama of Christ's descent, vidit celum moveri, is surprisingly omitted ins. 58 by this group, and the phrase et filium dei descendentem is replaced by deus descendit. Both this and the following section have characteristic introductory phrases, audito sono eorum <58> and quem ita deprecbantur/deprecbant <59>. In the latter section, Christ is addressed in the souls' plea for mercy as fili david excelsi rather than fili dei excelsi and the voice of Christ is then heard per omnes penas, posing the question quid boni fecistis. In the reproaches which follow, Christ says that he was given vinegar mixed with gall in/ad potum <61>, a distinctive phrase in over half of the remaining A texts, and, characteristic of the whole A group in s. 62, that he gave himself in martirio/martirium in order that vinceretis mecum instead of viveretis mecum as in all the other groups. The souls are then castigated in s. 63 with a list of failings, beginning fuistis fures in the A texts and finishing set mendaces fuistis in vita vestra, and they are told, amongst other things, that they have done (egistis rather than fecistis) no good. Christ however grants (dono) the respite in s. 65 propter bonitatem meam, and for the time limit of this respite, the A texts use the ablative, in prima hora, rather than the accusative.

The hostiarius inferni is described as the hostiarius baratri in the following section 66, which begins characteristically mestus ergo and omits the final phrase et contristatus est valde. However the middle part of this section concerning the name of the hostiarius and/or his dog appears to have been seriously corrupted in the transmission of redaction IV texts. The A group has either cui nomen canis cerberus eternal( is/iter) or a reduced version cui nomen est cerberus, followed by elevavit (caput suum) rather than exaltavit.9

Section 67 in the A family begins typically vere letati sunt omnes qui cruciebantur ibi and the souls again address Christ as fili david rather than fili dei. The phrase in spacio unius diei etc is used by all the A texts, and all omit the whole of section 68. All begin section 69 with ideo and add sanctum to diem, and in most cases they use the subjunctive habeant rather than the future tense.10 The angel's answer with the number of the pains of Hell in s. 70 is prefaced with cui ait

---

9 This section is discussed more fully below; see chapter 7.
10 For fili david & in spacio unius diei <67> and habeant <69>, see also the C1 group below in chapter 6.
angelus and the verb, haberet/haberent, is placed after ferreas rather than after unusquisque. In the penultimate section 71, the A texts say that it would not be sufficient for one hundred men to have each 104 or 100 tongues of iron, instead of four, to tell the number of the pains of Hell (penas inferni). In this family the concluding exhortation in s. 72 has the simple formula ut regnemus cum ipso et vivamus.

The classification of St P and Bo1

a) The text of the redaction in the St Paul ms. has sufficient of the verbal texture and particular features of the A family to class it as primarily related to that group. It begins at section 4 and therefore does not have the distinctive opening sentence, but it has, for example, the compression of the two phrases in s. 54, and the castigation of the souls in s. 63 begins with fures and ends with set mendaces etc. Items of Family A’s verbal texture include quam non inveniunt <13>, the position of tristicia <14>, interrogans <21>, the noun forms fornicatores et adulterantes <22>, deinde <26>, de quibus ait angelus <27>, the omission of pannis and the position of igne (but as the adjective ignis) <28>, tunc respondit angelus <30>, quibus non licebat <34>, mox <36> and <47>, baptizati/communicati <42>, que operata es <46>, demones <48>, vel deinceps (usually deinde) hec simul <52>, quem ita precabantur and fili david excelsi <59>, bonitatem meam <65>, mortinus (usually mestus) ergo and hostiarus baratri <66>, in spacio unius diei et noctis <67>, cui ait <70> and the position of haberet <71>.

Significantly, however, it does not have a substantial number of distinctive A features. It does not repeat bestie diabolice at the beginning of s. 18, it has maculaverunt se not maculate at the beginning of s. 37 and it retains the reference to parentibus in that section. The souls not ignis are the subject in s. 32 (igne urebantur) and it does not restructure s. 56 by the use of Paulus and the insertion of or et. It begins s. 58 with auditus est sonus not audito sono eorum and it does not omit celum moveri or substitute deus descendit for filium dei descendentem. Notably it has viveretis not the distinctive A version vinceretis in s. 62, and it does not have the variant in martirium for in mortem. Unlike the A texts it does not omit contristatus est valde at the end of s. 66. This may indicate that the particular features of A which St P does not share, are the result of later developments in the main body of the group from which St P was separated, and this might be supported by the fact that Bru, the oldest of the A group, also does not omit et misit etc. from s. 5 or celum moveri from s. 58, and it also has
filium dei descendentem instead of deus descendit in that section. However these and other aspects of St P’s verbal texture are found in other groups, at times the two streams being evident in the same section in St P.\textsuperscript{11} Since there seems to be no clear affiliation with any one of the other groups,\textsuperscript{12} this may be due to the grafting of the early stage of A changes onto a base drawn originally from a common pool.

On the other hand, there is evidence in the St P text of some scribal editing. The list of ways in which the souls are suspended in the fiery trees (s. 7) uses the ablative case as in the A group, but it includes not only A’s auribus but also collo which in the other groups replaces auribus. A clear indication that St P is combining different versions is the insertion of passages from Redaction III in the latter part of the text. This occurs at the end of section 63 where a second appeal of the souls to the Archangel, the repetition of his reply, a second appeal to Christ and his opening question to the souls, are added by inserting a passage from Redaction III, et iterum clamabant .... quod boni fecistis.\textsuperscript{13} This is not simply a repetition, due to scribal error, of Redaction IV’s sections 55, 56 and parts of 57, 59 and 60, because the position of this passage immediately after the reproaches and also its wording are clearly characteristic of Redaction III. The influence of redaction III can also be seen in the addition of et misericordiam to bonitatem meam in <65> (Redaction IIIa has both) and in the phrase qui dignatus es...refrigerium <67> which is distinctive of Redaction III; the wording too of s. 68 (and probably also the inclusion of this section since it is omitted in A) is from Redaction III. Traces of the use of this redaction by St P can be seen also in preceding sections: et dixit Paulus credo <49>, postea cito <50>, o felicissima sponsa o beata in Christo <51> and prosit adventus tui <58>.\textsuperscript{14}

b) The case of Bol is quite different. In the first half of the redaction this text sits comfortably in the mainstream of the A group and thus is classified here with this family. However at approximately s. 30, a change occurs. While

\textsuperscript{11} e.g. in s. 13 StP has quam non inventunt (= A) and anime numquam morientur (= other groups), and in s. 19 it has quisque (= A) and secundum opera sua (= added by other groups).

\textsuperscript{12} Although several features appear to link St P to the B family (quasi exaltantur celi a terra <44>, inter celiun et terram <45> and fiebimus <56>), it does not have other of the B characteristics e.g. habetur pons <17>, and perhaps the similarities may have arisen independently.

\textsuperscript{13} Cf. e.g. IIic, Silverstein 1935, [19], p. 187: 15 - p. 189: 1-8.

\textsuperscript{14} Cf. Silverstein 1935, [17], p. 182: 16 (IIib); [18], p. 185: 1 (IIIc); [18], p. 184: 5-6 (IIib); [19], pp. 186-7: 3-5 (IIib, c, d). The reversed order (typical of red. III) of the Injurers of Widows and Orphans and the Fastbreakers in St P, however, may well be simply scribal error; the scribe has apparently jumped from the beginning of s. 32 to s. 34 and then added the main part of s. 32 (omitting s. 33) to s. 35.
retaining some, but not all of A's characteristics after this point, it has also a number of distinctive features which it shares with Family E, and which are discussed in the following chapter.

**The classification of the fragments SanM and Je.**

a) The San Marino extract published by Silverstein consists of the opening sentence and sections 64, 65, 67 & 69 - 72, all of which contain characteristic features indicative of the A family. They are: *gaudebunt* and *maior diebus ceteris* in the opening sentence, *propter bonitatem meam, dono* and *in prima hora* <65>, *in spacio unius diei et noctis* <67>, the omission of section 68, *ideo, sanctum* and *habeant* <69>, *cui [...] angelus* <70>, *centum et quatuor linguas*, the position of *haberent* and *penas inferni* <71> and the simple formula *cum ipso regnemus et vivemus* <72>.

The fragment also has several features which relate it closely to Bru within Family A: *milia milium anglorum* rather than A's typical *angelorum milia milium* in s. 64, *verum letati sunt omnes qui crudeliter ibi cruciebantur* rather than *vere letati sunt omnes qui cruciebantur ibi* together with *dedisti* rather than *donasti* in s. 67, and the plural *haberent* in s. 71. However it does not copy Bru's *duobus noctibus* in s. 67, *angelis sanctis* in s. 69 or *committamur* in s. 72. Unlike all the A texts the fragment omits section 66, and it refers to Christ as *fili dei* rather than *fili david* in s. 67.

b) The fragment in the Jesus College Cambridge ms. 46 (Q.D.4) consists of six lines only and contains only sections 70 and 71 concerning the number of the pains of Hell. It may be classed, provisionally at least, in Family A as it has several, but not all of that family's characteristic features in these sections; it has, however, other features peculiar to itself. The six lines are as follows:

[f.138] *aulus apostolus interrogavit angelum domini quot essent pene in inferno Cui ait angelus centum quadraginta quatuor milia. Et si essent*

---

15 The characteristics of the excerpt (ss. 28-31) from the lost Geneva ms, reprinted by Silverstein (1935, p. 22; cf. chapter 4 above), which show that it belongs to the A family are the following: *erantque ibi* & the omission of *pannis* <28>, *tunc sic respondit* <30>, and *maculate* & the omission of *sanctis parentibus* <31>. However, the variants in the excerpt *comitantes, ingentia (cornua) & ante eas ibant* <29>, and *conjecerunt & propterea* <31>, are not shared by any other member of the A family.

16 Also Vi & TriC.
centum viri loquentes et unusquisque centum xl iiij
milia linguas ferreas habent et omnes viri
loquentes non possent dinumerare penas infernorum

St Paul's question is given here in indirect speech (quot essent etc.) rather than in
direct speech (quot sunt etc.) usually found in A texts, but the phrase cui ait
angelus (s. 70), is typical of A texts. The position of haberent in the following
sentence (s. 71) is also typical of A texts as well as penas infernorum, but the
omission of ab initio mundi, the number (144,000) of the linguas ferreas and the
repetition of omnes viri loquentes, are not found elsewhere in redaction IV texts.

2. Family B

Family B also comprises 10 texts including the other published version of the
redaction in the Patrologia Latina. In this group is also one of the texts which
Brandes used in his notes (Add 2677), as well as one of the texts referred to in
Meyer's notes (Paris 10729).

The mss classed here as Family B are:-
Bal Oxford, Balliol College, 228, f. 268rv. xv c.
Bo2 Oxford, Bodleian, Cod. Laud misc. 527, ff. 263r-264v. xiv c.
Mer Oxford, Merton College, 13, f. 66rv. Late xiv c.
Pa10 Paris, Bibliotheque nationale, lat. 10729, ff. 1r-2v. xii c.
Pra Prague, Univ.-Bibl., IX F 4, ff. 73r-75v. xiii -xiv c.
Ro11 London, British Library, Royal 11.B.X, f. 2rv and 184r. xv c.
(*) TriD5 Dublin, Trinity College, 519, ff. 95r-95r. xv c.

and in addition the printed text:-
Mi Migne, Patrologia latina, XCIV, 501-502,
and the fragment:-
Gon Cambridge, Gonville and Caius College, 362 [441], f. viii a/r. xiii c.

---

17 The catalogue entry for Jesus 46, f. 138r reads "Paulus de penis inferni. P. apostolus
interrogavit angelum domini quot essent pene in inferno. Cui ait angelus centum quadraginta
quatuormilia. 5 lines"
18 Vi = quod pene sint
19 Family D however has C viri ad hoc constituti instead of centum viri loquentes ab initio mundi.
In the discussion below the group as a whole is referred to as B, however two subgroups within the family have been identified. Where there is significant difference, the first, comprising all but four of the above, is referred to as B1, and the second, comprising the other four (Mer, Pra, Ro8C & TriD5), as B2. Within B1 a further internal grouping (Bal, Bo2 and Mi) is also observable.

Characteristic Variants of B Texts

While a number of characteristics can be identified for the B family, there is greater diversity within this group than in the A family. As with physical and other observable traits in human family groups, the distribution of characteristic features is not uniform or consistent over all the surviving witnesses of the group, nor indeed within the two subgroups, thus reflecting possibly a more complicated and numerous transmission than that of the other groups. The changing internal affiliations of the B texts in relation to individual variants, may be likened to the changing patterns of a kaleidoscope in response to each rotation. Nevertheless, characteristics common to at least a substantial number of texts in both the B1 and B2 groups - and which therefore may be regarded as significant of overall B family affiliation - are listed here. Although individually some of the differences with other groups are small, the aggregation of a sufficient number of these features produces a recognisable profile for the B group as a whole.

ss. 1 - 32
Firstly this group has the short form of the opening sentence, dies dominicus ... gaudent angeli,\textsuperscript{20} omitting the comparison of Sunday with other days, and the answer in s. 4 to the question in the preceding sections, is prefaced with phrases such as respondendum/dicendum est. In contrast to Family A, the sinners in s. 7 are hanging from the burning trees in this group by the feet, hands, hair, necks, tongues and arms, and the form of the list here is per plus the accusative. The ablative case is used in s. 8 for the \textit{vii flammis} instead of \textit{per vii flammas}, and ponebantur is substituted for mittuntur in s. 10, usually accompanied by seculo instead of mondo at the end of the sentence. All the B texts have unusquisque rather than omnes in s. 11, and the majority have propter cruciationem et dolorem/dolores\textsuperscript{21} animarum at the end of s. 14,\textsuperscript{22} all but three omit section 19. A

\textsuperscript{20} Ro8C adds \textit{letantur archangeli}.
\textsuperscript{21} Mer, Pra & TriD5 (=B2) have \textit{dolores}.
susbstantial number expand et flevit at the beginning of s. 21 with phrases such as quod videns, and they use requirunt rather than querunt with usuras in s. 27. In the word order of s. 28, et igne precedes the nominative case of dracones etc., and B texts use the passive plural igne urebantur rather than ignis urebat in s. 32; this is followed by the active plural frigebant instead of the singular.

ss. 34 - 53
In the famously corrupted description of the Fastbreakers super canelas aque in s. 34, B texts characteristically have either super camelos or in quodam loco, and most have sinebantur (or variants of this verb). They also have super humanum genus added to the angel’s question, quare flest paule, in s. 38. All but one have numquam fiet commemoracio in s. 41, and in s. 42 the passive verb forms baptizantur and communicantur are used with two exceptions, the latter having the singular past participle baptizatus and communicatus not the plural as in other family groups.

For the place in which the judgement of the wicked and good souls takes place, St Paul in the B texts will look inter celum et terram in s. 45, and the question posed by the angels to the wicked soul in s. 46 is quid fecisti in terra in all but two cases. Instead of the imperative vide/videte or videamus found elsewhere, the B texts use the Perfect Indicative vidimus for the angels’ comment on the deeds of the wicked soul in s. 47, and all refer to sanctus michael placing the good soul in Paradise in s. 53.

ss. 58 - 72
The B texts have the construction auditus est sonus at the beginning of s. 58, and in the following description of Christ’s descent in this section, they all introduce habentem (or variants of this verb) referring to the diadema in capite suo. This is followed by the distinctive opening to s. 59 rursus clamaverunt.

Christ reproaches the souls in s. 61 for the the bitter drink given him ad potandum in all but one, and they are reminded of his sacrifice usque ad mortem in all but two. Only in this family, the final reproach at the end of s. 63 is that they were iniqui in omni vita vestra. The archangel, St Paul and thousands of angels prostrate themselves orantes filium dei rather than ante filium dei in s. 64.

22 Bal & Bo2 omit the last part of the section after habundacncia (lacrimarum); Mi has only propter cruciationem animarum.
23 Bal, Bo2 & Mi have super camelos; RoSC has both variants, i.e. in quodam loco quasi super camelos sedentes.
24 Also in Family D.
and Christ says that it is propter preces michaelis etc and also pro resurrectione mea, that some respite is to be granted (concedo) to the souls from their suffering.

The B group uses the vocative fili dei in the grateful acclamation of the souls in s. 67, and omits the last phrase of that section referring to the respite, in spacio unius diei et noctis. Only the B texts have section 68 in full - Families C and D have only parts of it (due probably to homoeoteleuton), and the others omit it altogether. In s. 71 the hundred men having (habentes rather than the usual conjugated verb), would not be able to enumerate ceteras penas, and in the final section two distinctive features are the reference to tanta tormenta gehenne, and the addition of valeamus to vivere or regnare in the concluding formula.

The Subgroups B1 and B2
B1 = Add, Bal, Bo2, Gon, Mi, Pa10, Ro11.
B2 = Mer, Pra, Ro8C, TriD5.

The division of the B texts into the two subgroups, B1 and B2, is based primarily on the presence in the latter of a set of phrases which are found also in the D family, although not all four have all of these all the time.

Like Family D, two of them, Pra and Mer, add a form of the Long Latin phrase cum exierunt de ecclesia to s. 21, and Pra, Mer and TriD5 have non penitent usque ad mortem instead of non revertuntur ad penetenciam at the end of s. 22. The same three expand the opening phrase of s. 27 to et dixit michael (ad paulum). All four add sanguine suo to redemit mundum at the end of s. 29, and Pra Mer and TriD5 reverse the position of in circuitu earum and increpantes eam in the first part of that section. St Paul's lament in s. 38 is verbalised in Ro8C and Pra (Ve peccatoribus ut quid nati sunt), as well as in the D texts, and the same B family texts also insert qui passus est pro salute mundi into s. 42. All four B2 texts add the adjective nudos to viros ac mulieres in s. 43, and use the plural present participles flentes et gementes instead of the noun gemitus et suspirium in s. 44; all four add ululatus multus (in D ululatus magnus) to s. 47. The possible connection of Ro8C to the D family in the problematic hostiarius section (s. 66), is discussed in chapter 7 below.

Not surprisingly given the labile nature of the B family in general, the boundary between the two subgroups is somewhat permeable, and characteristics of B1 are at times found also in some B2 texts, e.g. a form of
habere rather than of esse with the septem plage in s. 9 in the B1 group, appears also in Mer and TriD5 (et septem plage habebantur). Of the four B2 texts, Ro8C is the most likely to share characteristics typical of at least a substantial number of the B1 group; these are habetur pons in s. 17, the omission of section 19, the use of revertuntur in s. 22, also ceteri in s. 22 and reliqui in s. 23, absolvent in s. 35, and et aperuit os putei at the beginning of s. 40. Three of B1 and Ro8C share the omission of the number of iron tongues in s. 71, and three also have the transposition in s. 16 where quasi is moved from its usual position, quasi pisces in medio maris, to pisces quasi in medio maris, and que, referring to the preceding bestie diabolice, is changed to qui, referring to pisces, with the result that it is the fish which are devouring the souls in the river not the bestie diabolice whose presence in the horrible river is described elsewhere in Redaction IV as like fish in the sea.

Other B1 characteristics are: the omission of the second part of s. 31, in fluminibus ...fecerunt, the Future tense instead of the Perfect with nam...adhuc instead of non (thus nam videbis adhuc instead of non vidisti) in s. 38, the omission of the first part of s. 49 et diaboli ...mittentes, the use of flebimus instead of flebo in s. 56, and misereatur deus in the same section. The B1 texts also omit, surprisingly, the first question of Christ to the souls in s. 60, going straight to the Reproaches in s. 61, and in the defective section 66 concerning the name of the hostiarius inferni, the B1 version is either qui dicitur cerberus or qui dicitur canis.

The Classification of the Gonville & Caius Fragment (Gon).

The Gonville & Caius fragment contains sections 1-7 and the first part of s. 8. The order and content of the list of hanging sinners in s. 7 - by the feet, hands, hair, necks, tongues, arms - and the form (per plus the accusative) are typical of the B family. Further, the opening sentence does not have the comparison of Sunday with other days. These features are found also in the E family but the fragment does not belong to that family since it lacks the characteristic E family

---

25 Add, Pa10, Ro11.
26 Bo2, Add, Pa10. Another B1 text, Bal, has the transposition but not the change of relative pronoun.
27 Mer has videbis adhuc.
28 The phrase is shortened also in Mer and TriD5 making it closer to B1 than to the usual version.
29 cerberus (or variants) = Bal, Bo2 & Mi; canis = Add & Pa10; omitted = Ro11.
feature in s. 6, i.e. *suspendentes in ramis earum.* Also, as in most of the B texts, the second part of s. 8 (*et misit deus* etc) is omitted, but this phrase is present in most of the E family texts.

The prefacing of the answer to the opening question with *respondendum quia* in s. 4, links the fragment to the internal group of mss. within B1, namely Bal, Bo2 & Mi, as does also the insertion of *rogaveunt deum* after *michael* in the same section. In particular, the fragment shares with one of these, Bo2, the omission of *quia voluit deus* at the beginning of s. 5, so that in both versions the phrase reads: *rogaverunt/interrogaverunt deum [...] <4>, [...] ut penas inferni videant/viderunt <5>.* The 13th-century Gonville & Caius fragment and the later 14th-century Bo2 would therefore seem to be drawn from a common ancestor in the B family.

**Contamination in TriD5**

The presence in TriD5 of the repetition of *multe bestie diabolice* at the beginning of s. 18, which is exclusive to the A family, strongly suggests contamination at that point. Other links to A in this area are the addition of *aures* (as well as other body parts) to the list in s. 7, *mori non possunt* in s. 13, *multe anime peccatrices merguntur* in s. 17, the omission of *secundum opera sua* in s. 19 and the word order *per pontem ire* in s. 19; later, *in die iudicii* in s. 37 and perhaps also *hunc fetorem* in s. 39, may recall the A family.

If TriD5 (or an antecedent) uses an A group text in the early part, it may be that the exemplar was at times defective in that area. Notably, its companion Mer, with whom it shares an antecedent, omits the whole of s. 19 and the latter part of s. 20, but the missing text containing A features is present in TriD5.

---

30 See chapter 6 below.
31 Smaller features - the inversion *paulus vidit* <6> and the position of *pendebant* at the end of s. 7 - are also common to Gon and Bo2.
32 Mer and TriD5 share a number of distinctive variants, e.g. *in loco gladii for in loco glaciali* <32>, the rephrasing *et vidit septem diabolos inter se ducentes animam peccatoris* <45>, the transposition of the phrase *flete....paulo* to the end of s. 56, and the substitution of *cum clavibus (eius)tribus* for the corrupted passage on the name of the *hostiarus inferni* ins. 66. However, TriD5 is not copied from the earlier Mer, since it does not repeat Mer variants such as *Et duxit illum ita a longe ut posset sustinere fetorem* <39>, nor does it transpose *et vermes et serpentes commodentes eos* from <43> to <44>, and it includes authentic passages which Mer omits e.g. the last phrase of s. 55, *et tu paulae* etc. and the concluding s. 72.
33 In addition to the two A features in s. 19 noted above, TriD5 also has A's opening words *tantum vero*, and in s. 20 *perhenniter without cotidie*. The omission of *cotidie* from the phrase *et perhenniter cruciantur* <20> is not exclusive to the A family however.
Also, at the beginning of s. 18 Mer has the variant *anime* (not found elsewhere) for *mansiones*, which may be the result of scribal conjecture. The overall affiliation of both TriD5 and Mer is, however, clearly with the B family and in particular with the subgroup of that family, B2.
Chapter 6

THE CLASSIFICATION OF REDACTION IV TEXTS (2)

The three families, C, D and E, which will be described in this chapter, are not represented by any of the published versions of Redaction IV, except as ancillary references in two cases, C and E.

1. Family C

Family C consists of 8 mss and includes the second text to which Paul Meyer referred in the notes to his edition (Paris 5266).

The mss. classed here as Family C are:-
*Mel Melk, Stiftsbibliothek, 1706 (97 [B. 65]), ff. 224v-225r. ?Late xiii c.
Mu14 Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm. 14348, f. 217r-218r. xiii c.
Pa28 Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, lat. 3528, ff. 14r-16r. xv c.
Pa29 Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, lat. 3529a, ff. 121r-122r. xiii-xiv c."
Pa32 Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, lat. 5266, ff. 21v- 23v. xii c.
Pem1 Cambridge, Pembroke College, 103, ff. 124rv & 126rv. Late xii c.
TriD2 Dublin, Trinity College, 277, ff. 335-338. xv c.

and in addition the following fragment:-
Gra Graz, Univ.-Bibl. 731, f. 261r. xv c.

Two of the mss listed above, Pa28 and Pa29, constitute a separate group within the C family. As far as section 42 (with the exception of s. 1) they share the characteristics of the C family, but in the sections which follow, they have some, but not all of the features found in the other mss of the group, thus indicating a divergence in the tradition. In the list of characteristics below, where they differ from the other mss, Pa28 and Pa29 will be referred to as C2 and the other mss as C1. The designation C is used for those features shared by both groups, and characterising the C family as a whole.

Characteristic Variants in C Texts

STRUCTURE

Family C is primarily identifiable by the characteristic reordering of parts of its material; none of the other groups do this. The major restructuring occurs
between sections 24 and 36 where the sequence of episodes is altered after the
description of the last of the souls immersed in the river (s. 24) and the omission
of Paul's lament for the souls in torment (s. 25). The Infanticides (sections 28-
31) are placed immediately after section 24, the Usurers (sections 26-7) follow
them, then the Fastbreakers (sections 34 & 35), the Injurers of Widows and
Orphans (sections 32 & 33), and then the Negligent Bishop (sections 36 & 37).
The order of sections is thus 24, 28-31, 26, 27, 34, 35, 32, 33, 36, 37 etc. Other
smaller rearrangements occur between sections 41 and 52, i.e. (e.g.) the phrase
credis et agnoscis quia sicut fecerit sic accipiet is moved from the end of the
judgment of the wicked soul (s. 49) and inserted into the angel's warning about
the Great Well in s. 41. Another phrase, postea aspexit paulus in celum et terram, is
moved from s. 45 to s. 43 in the C1 texts, and this group also transposes the
phrase et ipsa legit ... bona to begin s. 52.

ss. 1 - 42.
As noted above, the characteristic C variants up to s. 42 are, on the whole,
shared by the two subgroups of the C family, although not in s. 1 where
the opening sentence is omitted in C1 but not in C2. In both groups, ideo (..)
misit replaces misit deus in s. 5, the second part of s. 8 (et multi etc.) is omitted,
and the genitive case is used instead of the nominative for the list of plage in s.
9. In the following section in (ipsis) penis/plagis is added after fornacem <10>,
and anime is added to s. 11, while the explanation that the souls will never die
is omitted from s. 13. Section 14 is specifically addressed to Fratres, and the list
of afflictions to be feared, omits tristicia except in Mu14 and Pa32, where it
precedes dolor at the beginning of the series. In this same section C2 has
bragidium magnum after gemitus cordis (cf. Family A), and while this is omitted
in most of the C1 texts, a corrupted version of it, brachium magnum, appears in
this position in Mu14, and also what seems to be a translation of the word,
clamor magnus, is in BM11 in the same position. The Fiery Wheel in s. 15 has
either 1,000 cubitus/os or rotas instead of orbitas.

In s. 21 et suspiravit is omitted after flevit paulus, and in s. 22, C1 has recordantur where C2 has revertuntur. The souls immersed in the river up to their
eyebrows who rejoice in the evil of others, are described in all the C family texts

---

1 Only two texts (Peml & Mel) have the correct genitive glaciei; Mu14 has a mix of nominative
and genitive.

2 See the discussion of this word below in chapter 7.

3 Pem1 has orbitas.

4 TriD2 has revertuntur.
as traditores <24>. All the C group omit s. 25 and in s. 26 (which is displaced to follow s. 31) they begin with postea and have the variant qui comedebant for comedentibus. They insert et interrogavit qui essent and add tenebrosum to the Infanticides' place of suffering in s. 28, and they omit increpantes eas from s. 29. The identification of the souls there is changed from non servaverunt castitatem usque ad nupcias to non servaverunt castitatem nupciarum <30>. For the punishment of the Injurers of Widows and Orphans in s. 32, frigescebat is used only by the C group. The phrase et interrogavit paulus qui essent is again inserted, by C1, into s. 33, and the same phrase is inserted by all the C texts into s. 35. The number of demons in s. 36 is seven instead of four, and C1 describes the Negligent Bishop as non custodiens legem dei <37> (in the other families this is non custodivit legem dei), while C2 omit the phrase. All the C texts add et suspiravit to et flevit paulus at the beginning of s. 38 and, like the A texts, they do not have super humanum genus after the angel's question cur fles in the same section.

For the opening of the Great Well (s. 40), the C family have two of the variants which are found singly in the other families, et aperuit puteum, apertoque ore putei <40>, and the stench arising from it is described as habens in se multa mala <40>. The sinners therein are those qui non sunt baptizati nec communicati de corpore et sanguine Christi <42>.

ss. 43 - 54
From this point a considerable diversity between the two subgroups of the C family may be observed as well as characteristic features common to both.

All the C texts have alium locum tenebrosum plenum viris et mulieribus in s. 43, instead of in alio loco viros et mulieres, and all omit et erat profunditas...terram after ovili/e in s. 44. However, as noted above, the C1 texts insert the opening phrase of s. 45 into s. 43, while the C2 texts retain it in its correct position. Within that phrase, C1 has aspiciebat and C2 aspexit, and most C1 texts have in celum et in terram. All the C group add plorantem to ululantem in describing the animam peccatricem they see there being conducted by devils, but C1 have

5 Family D also has this.
6 But not by BM11.
7 Cf. the A family: non baptizati sunt nec communicati corpore etc.
8 aspiciebat: Pa32; vidit: BM11.
9 Pa32 has in ceelo et in terrae. The C2 texts vary: Pa28 has in ceelo et in terra; Pa29 has in terram et postea in ceelo.
10 Family D also has peccatricem.
either *qui* or *quia deducebant*,\(^{11}\) while C2 have *quam*. The challenge to the wicked souls by the angels has been moved in C1 texts from s. 46 to s. 47 following *mandata dei*, where it appears in the form *Ve misera que venis de terra*; in C2 it remains in s. 46, but as (Ve ve) *O miserrrima anima, que operata es(t) in terra*. In s. 47 the angels in C1 say *videamus istam animam* in the opening phrase, all of which is omitted by the C2 texts. In the latter pair the section thus begins with the second phrase, introduced by *mox legit*; in C1 this phrase is introduced by *deinde ipsa legit*. The angel's question to St Paul in s. 49 has been moved by all the C texts to s. 41, and part of it is abbreviated in C2 (perhaps by homoeoteleuton) to *quia homo sic accipiet* instead of *quia sicut homo fecerit sic accipiet*.

In s. 50 angels conduct (C1: *adduxerunt*; C2: *eduxerunt*) the good soul from his body towards *paradisum* instead of the usual *celum*. This just soul is praised in the following section 51 by *milia milium angelorum*, C1 omitting *o beata* from the list of laudatory adjectives, and substituting *que fecisti voluntatem dei* for the usual *quia fecisti* etc. which is retained by C2. In all the C texts the angels say *levemus eam* in s. 52 and insert *cartam suam in qua erant (scripta)* before *opera bona*. The C1 group, however, reverses the two phrases in this section, so that *et ipsa legit ... bona precedes et dixerunt... deum*. They also shorten s. 53 by omitting the last phrase (*ubi erant omnes sancti*) and they omit the whole of the following section 54 describing the reaction to the translation of the good soul to paradise. The C2 texts on the other hand, conclude s. 53 with *ubi sunt sancti* and they have the compressed form of section 54, which is found also in the A family.\(^{12}\)

**ss. 55 - 63**

There is a marked difference between C1 and C2 in the latter part of s. 55 and the first part of s. 56, but they share the same distinctive variant in the second half of s. 56. In s. 55 the souls appeal to the Archangel and St Paul and here the C2 texts generally follow the form found in other families, although replacing *paule dilectissime dei* with *paule dulcissime*. The C1 group however, changes and transfers the second part of s. 55 (the souls' appeal to St Paul) to replace the first part of the angel's reply in s. 56. Thus, where C2 has:-

\(<55>...\ archangele ac tu paule dulcissime intercede pro nobis ad dominum <56>\)

*quibus sic ait*\(^{13}\) *angelus flete et flebo vobiscum cum paulo*...,

\(^{11}\) *qui*: BMll, TriD2; *quia*: Mu14, Pa32, Pem1.

\(^{12}\) *et clamor factus (est) contra animam iustam quasi celum et terra moverentur* (in the A family the last verb is usually *commoverentur*).

\(^{13}\) *quibus sic ait* is found also in Family A.
the C 1 texts have:-

<55> .....archangele <56> et ait/dixit angelus intercedite paulum qui est vobiscum ...

Both groups, however, omit the reference to the other angels (in the full version et qui mecum sunt angeli follows vobiscum ), and both alter the original si forte misereatur deus ut det vobis refrigerium to read ut suis orationibus det vobis (deus) refrigerium (C2: aliquid refrigerium). The C1 texts omit et michael ...angelorum at the end of s. 57 and reverse the order of the first two phrases of. s. 58, so that the words of the plea to Christ precede sonus auditus est super quatuor celos (the latter instead of the more usual in quarto celo ). On the other hand, C2 retains the second part of s. 57 and omits the first phrase of s. 58, so that, although the latter section thus begins with the plea to Christ as in C1, it is not clear that this is due to the transposition of the phrase. Both C groups, however, have the reversed order una voce exclamaverunt in s. 57, and in s. 58 they have the vocative fili hominis which alternates with filii hominum in other groups.

Section 59 is omitted by C1 but retained in C2, where it begins with quem ita (de)precabuntur as in the A family. In the following section 60, the voice of Christ (C1: vox dei; C2: vox filii dei), is then heard, C1 adding per/super omnes penas inferni but C2 omitting this phrase. Only in both groups of the C family are the souls addressed here as O maledicti. The first question which usually opens Christ's words in other families (quid boni fecistis), is omitted by C1 and changed to qui bona non fecistis by C2, but in the second question both groups use petitis instead of the usual postulatis. In the reproaches which follow, Christ reminds the souls in s. 61, that he was lancea vulneratus (C1) or the more usual lancea perforatus (C2), and that he was given vinegar and gall to drink, bibere (C1) or potum (C2), then in s. 62, that he gave himself in martirio (C1) or in mortem (C2). A list of the souls' vices follows in s. 63 and here all the C texts add in vita vestra to et vos mendaces fuistis at the beginning of the section, C2 repeating the phrase again at the end. Both groups add et dolosi to the list of charges against the souls (C1 after fures and C2 in the repetition of the opening phrase at the end of the section), and C2 adds several others as well. Other differences in this section between the two C groups include the change of et maledicti to the vocative O maledicti by C1, which also has nullum bonum where C2 has nec quicquam boni.

---

14 Pa29 also has dolosi et fures after the opening phrase.
15 et odium habuistis contra proximos vestros nec decimam rectam dedistis nec sanctam dei ecclesiam honorastis <63>. On this passage see also chapter 9 below re Brno.
Section 64 describing the prostration of the angels and St Paul before Christ, pleading for the Sunday respite for the souls, is omitted by C1, as is also the opening phrase of s. 65, with the result that Christ's words continue without interruption from the end of the Reproaches. The two C2 texts, however, have the full version of the two sections, expanding s. 64 slightly *deprecantes ut tantum requiem haberent* etc. They have the full set of reasons why the respite is granted in s. 65, i.e. it is for the sake of Michael, the angels and St Paul but mostly on account of Christ's own goodness (*bonitatem*). Two of the C1 texts omit the last of these from the list,16 and three have only Christ's goodness (*bene* *nitatem*), omitting the rest.17 For the formula of the grant itself, Christ uses *do in* this family.

In section 66, apparently corrupted to a greater or lesser extent in all the surviving versions of it in Redaction IV, the C family shares the same confusion about the name of the *hostiarius inferni*; C2 gives it as *(?)* *certinal(is) vel baratus* and C1 offers a range of variants (*acharon*18, *eternalis*19, *erner*20, *cerberus*21), preceded by *cui nomen* (C2) or *qui vocatur* (C1). Both groups, however, change the singular verb and object to the plural: *exaltaverunt* (C1)/*ele* *vaverunt* (C2) *capita sua*.

The differences between the two groups continue in s. 67, where those who are *in penis* (C1) or *in inferno* (C2) rejoice, *gaudebant* C1 or *letati sunt* (C2), blessing Christ, *filii david* (C1) or *fili dei* (C2), for granting the respite, *qui dedisti nobis refrigerium in spacio unius diei et duarum noctium* (C1) or *qui donasti nobis requiem die dominico* (C2). Only the last part of section 68 survives in C1, *super omne tempus vite nostrre*, and the whole section is omitted by C2. In the exhortation to Sunday observance in s. 69, the C1 group add *vivent* before *custodierint* and add either *sanctum*22 or *secundum deum*23/*secundum dei preceptum*24 after *diem dominicum*. On the other hand, C2 inserts *in paradiso after partem* and adds *cum omnibus sanctis* at the end.

---

16 TriD2 & BM11.
17 Mu14, Pa32, Pem1.
18 M14, Pa32.
19 TriD2.
20 BM11.
21 Pem1.
22 TriD2.
23 Pem1.
24 Mu 14 & Pa32(*domini*).
The question in s. 70 concerning the number of the pains in Hell, is indirect (quot essent) in C1 and direct (quot sunt) in C2, and while the answer (introduced by cui in the C2 texts as in the A family), gives the usual 144,000 in both groups, the C1 group alone in all the Redaction IV families, specifies that these are the maiores pene. This distinction continues into the next section which the C1 texts begin with et de minoribus (penis) <71>, thus relating to the minor pains only, the inability of the hundred men with tongues of iron to number the pains of Hell. In this same section 71, the C1 group is again unique in using Pluperfect Subjunctives (fuissent, habuisset, potuisse(n)t,) whereas C2 has the more usual Imperfect Subjunctives (essent, haberet, possent), the first verb following unusquisque in C1, and following linguas in C2. The C2 group also omits ferreas after linguas and increases the number of the tongues from 4 to 100. However, they conclude the section in the usual way, dinumerare penas inferni, while the C1 texts expand this to enarrare vel dinumerare minores penas inferni. In the final exhortation, C1 has a shorter introduction, fratres nos audientes etc., and C2 the longer version, nos autem fratres karissimi audientes etc.; C1 has also other smaller differences from C2, tanta mala rather than ista mala, debemus converti ad dominum deum nostrum rather than convertamur ad dominum, and ut regnemus et vivamus cum eo rather than et regnemus cum ipso et vivamus, the forms in C2 here (except for et regnemus instead of ut regnemus) reflecting those found in the A family.

The Classification of the Graz fragment

The Graz fragment consists of sections 2-10. Although it therefore lacks the sections which are restuctured in the C family, it has nevertheless been classified in this group on the evidence in the verbal texture of the existing sections. In section 5 it has ideo misit instead of misit deus, which is characteristic of C texts, and it omits the object of ostenderet, as do most of the C texts. The omission from the description of the furnace of the last part of s. 8 after coloribus, and the addition of in ipsis penis/plagis in s. 10 are also characteristic of the C family.

The fragment also has other features which link it to one of the two groups within the C family; they are the absence of the opening sentence which is common to the C1 group, and the omission of in before diversis coloribus in s. 8, which is observable in a number of this group. In addition, the order of the list of hanging sinners in s. 7 (by the feet, hands, arms, ears and tongues) is found exclusively in two C1 texts, Mu14 and Pa32, and the form of the list, namely per
plus accusative for the first element and the ablative for the others, is found in the same two texts and partly in a third (TriD2). A closer link with Mu14 may be seen in the inversion *inferni penas* (not found elsewhere) and the omission of *ei* after *ostenderet* in s. 5, but the fragment does not copy the Mu14 variant *primus* at the beginnng of s. 4.

Unlike both groups of the C family, however, the Graz fragment uses the nominative rather than the genitive in the list of *plage* in s. 9, as do all the other families, but this does not invalidate its classification with the C group.25

**The Classification of Melk**

The text of Redaction IV in Melk 1706 is an edited version of a Family C text. In structure, it shows the same reordering of sections which is typical of the C family except that, after s. 31, the order of sections is 34, 35, 26, 27 instead of 26, 27, 34, 35 as in the other C texts. Also, it omits ss. 36 and 37 which follow s. 33 in the C texts, and goes from s. 33 to s. 38. Evidence for the smaller rearrangements between ss. 41 and 52 is lacking, however, either because they were not made in the text being copied, or because of later omission by Melk.26

The omission of ss. 36 and 37 concerning the negligent bishop, and a number of other omissions throughout the text suggest a conscious editing process rather than random scribal lapses. For example, the bridge sections 17 and 19 are omitted, but s. 18, describing the *bestie diabolice* and the like with like grouping of souls, is retained. The second part of s. 39 and the whole of s. 40 referring to the stench arising from the Great Well, also seem to have been deliberately excised, and similarly the deletion of the two sections relating to Sunday observance, ss. 69 and 72, would seem to have been intentional. Section 29 is omitted from the description of the Infanticides (ss. 28 - 31), however the words of the *angeli maligni* in s. 29, *agnoscite filium dei qui redemit mundum*, are transposed and used for the demons' challenge to the wicked soul in s. 46 (*nunc agnoscite dei filium qui venit redimere mundum*).

---

25 Mu14 begins with *nix* instead of *nivis* and if Gra is linked to this version, the scribe of Gra may have continued the use of the nominative for consistency.

26 The phrase *credis et agnoscis* etc. which is transposed by C texts from s. 49 to s. 41, does not appear in Melk s. 41, and s. 49 itself is omitted; the phrase *postea aspexit* etc. is omitted in Melk s. 45, but, as s. 43 is omitted, there is no evidence the phrase was transposed to that section; the phrase *et ipsa legit* etc. is omitted from s. 52 and thus there is no evidence for its internal transposition.
Some of the omissions seem to have been made to abbreviate and possibly to improve and streamline the narrative structure, for example the omission of ss. 43 & 44 from the description of the Great Well. This could not be said, however, of the omission of s. 61, containing the first part of Christ's reproaches (Ego crucifixus etc.), nor perhaps of the omission of the hostiarius inferni (s. 66), both of which seem, on the contrary, rather to diminish the dramatic effect.

This abbreviating tendency, which is most notable from s. 45 on, can also be seen quite markedly within the sections which have been retained, and the stylistic concerns of the editor are further indicated throughout the text by the reworking of the language, where he has evidently sought to smooth and enhance the syntax and vocabulary of his basic text. Nevertheless significant features of the verbal texture of the C texts are still discernible through this rephrasing and recasting of the language, for example:- the use of the genitive in the list of the plage <9>, cubitos instead of orbitas <15>, the identification of the souls immersed up to their eyebrows as traditores <24>, the use of frigescere in s. 32, and in s. 56 preces suas reflecting ut suis orationibus which is typical of the C texts, etc. That the editor's base text was from the C1 group is indicated, amongst other things, by the use of benignitatem for Christ's goodness ins. 65, and the reference to the impossibility of numbering even the summam minorum penarum in s. 71. (In Mel the 144,000 pains of s. 70 are also minores, not maiores as in the C1 texts).

Contrary to his overall abbreviating tendency, the editor has also 'improved' his basic text by expanding some sections and adding details of his own, for example in the rephrasing of the description of the Fiery Wheel in s. 15.27 Other examples are the 'vii' demons escorting the wicked soul in s. 45, who become iiijor demones capitis suis iiijor dyademata ferentes, the angels' praise of the good soul in s. 51, where quia fecisti voluntatem dei tui becomes que dei complesti mandata que in ullis excessisti regnum celeste possidebis, and also et michael archangelus collocavit eam in paradiso in s. 53, which becomes et superveniens michahel locavit eam in paradysum dicens hoc sit tibi remedium usque ad extremum dei iudicium. This reworking can actually change the text, however, as in s. 35 where the Fastbreakers, who are elsewhere those qui solvunt ieiunium ante

---

27 mille vicibus in una die percussa ab angelo tartareo et in unaquaque vice mille anime cruciantur is rendered by Melk as follows: et millesies in una qualibet die percussa et in una qualibet vice percussionis peracta anime mille superponuntur et a rege prefato rotacione percussionis peracta ad yna inferni precipitantur ibidemque eternaliter cruciabuntur.
tempus, become here those qui voluptuose et delitiose vixerunt in hoc seculo et de hiis quam minime miseris et debilibus partiti fuerunt in momicas fieri probibuerunt (sic).

The result of this reworking by abbreviation, expansion and rephrasing is a distinctive version of a C family text, which does not, however, appear to have had any following in the textual tradition of the Visio Pauli on present evidence.

2. Family D

Family D consists of 9 mss, none of which has been used in the published versions of the redaction.

The mss classed here as Family D are:-

*Mu12 Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm. 12728, ff. 122r-123v. xv c.
Pa16 Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, lat. 16246, ff. 133v-134r. xv c.
Pem2 Cambridge, Pembroke College, 258, ff. 52r-53r. Late xiiic.
Ro8B London, British Library, Royal 8.B.X, ff. 82r-83r. xv c.
Ro8E London, British Library, Royal 8.E.XVII, ff. 122v-123r. Late xiii or early xiv c.
Ro8F London, British Library, Royal 8.F.VI, ff. 23r-24r. xv c.
Schl Schlägl (Austria), Stiftsbibliothek, 226, ff. 206r-206v. xv c.
*StJD Cambridge, St John's College, 95, ff. 199v-201v. ?xv c.
TriD6 Dublin, Trinity College, 667, ff. 76-78. xv c.

In the discussion of the variants below, the recurrence of a cluster of three mss. comprising the two oldest mss., the late 13th-century Pem2 and Ro8E together with the later 15th-century Ro8F, will be observed, indicating a divergence in the textual history of this family.

Characteristic Variants in D Texts

As in the case of Family A, the opening sentence immediately distinguishes Family D. Here, Sunday is a day of joy rather than electus, and, although the comparison with other days is also made by this group, it uses different terminology, thus: dies dominicus dies letus/leticie in quo gaudent angeli plusquam aliis diebus. The other major characteristic of the D texts is that they preserve phrases which reflect the Long Latin (and thus presumably the original language of alpha), and which are paralleled in some of the other redactions descending from it. These are in-
s. 21, *cum exeunt de ecclesia*  [Long Latin (James 1893, [31], p. 28: 36.): *cum exierint de ecclesia*,\(^2^8\)

s. 38, *Ve Ve peccatoribus ut quid nati sunt*  [Long Latin (James, [40], p. 33: 28): *ve peccatoribus, ob quid nati sunt*],\(^2^9\) and

s. 55, *Scimus enim quia per vestras orationes adhuc nobis miserebitur deus*  [Long Latin (James, [42], p. 35: 2): *quia propter tuas oraciones stat terra*].\(^3^0\)

ss. 3 - 38

The D texts add *in die dominico* to s. 3 and in the description of the fiery trees in s. 6, they replace the usual *peccatores cruciatos et suspensos* with *in quarum ramis peccatores pendebant*. The order of the ways in which these souls are suspended in s. 7, is exclusive to this group, beginning by the hair, hands and feet and then continuing by the necks, tongues and arms, as in the B texts; like the B texts too, they use *per* plus the accusative for the form of this list. Section 11 is omitted in this group, as are also *anime* after *quia* in s. 13 and the last part of s. 14 after *lacrimarum*. The fiery river is *fluvius* <16> instead of the usual *flumen*,\(^3^1\) with its bridge *super illum* <17>, and the mansions which stand beside it, are described as *multe* <18> but not *male* in these texts. Like the C family, this group add *secundum opera sua* to s. 19, and half of them\(^3^2\) have *die ac nocte* (possibly instead of *cotidie*) in s. 20. They also have the distinctive phrase noted above, *cum exeunt de/ab ecclesia*, at the end of s. 21. The identification in s. 22 of the souls immersed in the river up to the navel, omits *et adulterantur* after *fornicantur* and substitutes *et non penitent usque ad mortem* for the usual *non revertuntur ad penitenciam*; those immersed to their eyebrows rejoice *de ruina proximorum* <24>, rather than *de malitia proximi sui*. The following section 25 is omitted by all the D texts.\(^3^3\)

---

\(^{28}\) In the other redations a reference to *ecclesia* in the description of the group of souls immersed up to the knees, remains in red. I <15>, *ad (sanctam) ecclesiam non venerunt*: St Omer, Vien and also Borgh (Brown 1998, p. 86 [3]) and see also red. IIIa <19>, *in ecclesia et extra ecclesia*: Silverstein 1935, [5], pp. 166: 22 - 168: 1.


\(^{31}\) The subgroup Ro8E, Ro8F and Pem2 change the phrase describing the *bestie diabolice* in this river, *quasi pisces in medio maris sunt* <16>, to *quasi (in) medio maris natant*.

\(^{32}\) SfJD, TrID6, Schl, Ro8B.

\(^{33}\) Also by the C. family.
In the sections describing the Infanticides (ss. 28 - 31), the verbal texture has a number of small but distinctive variations. In the phrase *habebant circa colla sua ignem* which precedes *dracones* etc. in s. 28, *circum colla sua* has been brought forward from its more usual position at the end of the sentence, and *et igne* has been transferred from the preceding description of the souls’ *vestimenta* and changed into the accusative case. The position of two phrases in s. 29 is reversed so that *in circuitu earum* (omitting *qui ibant*) follows *angeli maligni*, and *inrepantes eas* follows *cornua ignea*; at the end of this section *sanguine suo* is added. In addition, this group replaces the usual *maculaverunt se* with *fornicate sunt* in s. 31, and the infants are given to *bestiis ad devorandum* rather than *in escam porcis vel canibus*, or they are thrown *in aquas/aquis* rather than *in fluminibus*. For the punishment by cold of the Injurers of Widows and Orphans in s. 32, each family has a different and distinctive variant; in the D group this is *frigus*.

In the following description of the punishment of the Fastbreakers in s. 34, variously corrupted in all the Redaction IV texts, several of the D group have *super canellas/canulos aque*, which is the closest of all the groups to the Long Latin (and presumably the alpha version) *pendentes super canela aque*. But in other texts of this group *super canelas* has been radically changed in successive stages, the initial corruption of *canelas* there probably occurring through association of this word with *anhelare*, as proposed by Silverstein. Characteristic of the D family as a whole, however, is the addition of *morientes fame* before *et multos fructus*. There is some variation within the group in s. 36; five of the texts change *in alio loco* to *alium locum* and consequently have *et* (in *hoc*) *senem* etc., while the other three retain *in alio loco* but substitute *animam* for *senem*. Like the B family, the D group all have *super humanum genus* after *paule* in s. 38, the combination of this with the D characteristic *ut quid nati sunt* being found also in redaction I. However, the phrase *ut quid nati sunt* has

---

34 TriD6 & Mu12; Pa16 has *super littus aque* and Schl has *super aquas*.
35 James 1893, [39], p. 32: 1.
36 Ro8E: *super aleanentes aque*; Ro8F: *superbos volantes et*; Pem2: *superba voluntes etque*.
37 Silverstein 1935, p. 114, n. 54.
38 In this section StJD differs from all the other D texts having *super camelos et multos fructus*. See the discussion of this ms. below.
39 Mu12, Pa16, StJD, TriD6, Schl.
40 Ro8E, Ro8F, Pem2.
41 See red. I (Paris) <37>.
been corrupted in many of the extant D texts, notably to *et inquinatis*,\(^42\) *iniquitatibus*\(^43\) and *coinquinati*\(^44\) <38>.

ss. 39 - 54
In three of the D family\(^45\) the Great Well is sealed by seven *flagellis* <39>, but the variants in s. 40, *apertum est os putei* and *ita ut omnes penas superaret*, are characteristic of the group as a whole. The whole group also replaces the verb *mittatur* in the following section 41, but the verbs substituted for it differ in the extant texts: *inciderit*,\(^46\) *ceciderit*,\(^47\) *iverit*,\(^48\) *fuerit*.\(^49\) The identification of the souls in the Great Well (s. 42), has a number of distinctive features in this group; Paul's question to the angel is shortened by the omission of *qui mittuntur in eo*, the phrase *qui passus est pro salute mundi* is inserted after *filium dei*, the usual *venisse in carne* is changed to *assumpsisse carnem*, and *non baptizantur* is expanded to *sacrum/sanctum baptismum non suscipiunt/acceperunt*. There are two further variants within the group here, i.e. the relocation of the negative before *credunt* (and omission of *Christum*), so that the phrase reads: *credunt filium dei qui passus......... mundi non assumpsisse carnem*,\(^51\) and the insertion of *in* after *credunt*, thus: *qui non credunt in Christum filium dei*\(^52\).

In the following sections 43 - 44 there are again a number of small but distinctive features in the verbal texture, namely the addition of *nudos* after *viros ac mulieres* <43>, in *illo loco* inserted after *anime*<44>, *eos flentes et gementes* instead of *gemitum et suspirium*<44>, and *quantum distat celum a terra* instead of *quasi de terra ad celum* <44>. This continues together with more substantial characteristic changes in the episodes of the judgement of the wicked and good souls which follow: *post hec* and *longius* <45>, the omission of *contra eam* and *in terra* <46>, and the angels' challenge to the wicked soul *quid operata es* <46>. The fact that this soul had contempt for God's law (*preceptum dominii/dei* rather than *mandata dei in terra*), is presented in this family as a statement by the angels, *Ista anima contempsit* etc.<47>, rather than depending on a form of *video*

\(^42\) RoSE & Pem2.
\(^43\) RoSF.
\(^44\) Schl.
\(^45\) RoSE, RoSF, Pem2.
\(^46\) Pa16, StJD.
\(^47\) TriD6, Schl.
\(^48\) RoSE.
\(^49\) RoSF, Pem2.
\(^50\) sanctum: RoSE, RoSF, Pem2.
\(^51\) RoSE, RoSF, Pem2.
\(^52\) Mu12, Pa16, StJD, TriD6.
(either imperative or indicative) as in the other groups. The D texts have *ululatus magnus* after *stridor dencium* in s. 48, and typically use the imperative *crede et agnosce* for the angel’s admonition in s. 49 rather than *credis et agnoscis*. After judgement, the Archangel conducted the just soul to paradise, *portavit eam* <54> in the D group, *collocavit eam* elsewhere.

ss. 55 - 72
As noted above, the D family has the additional phrase *Scimus enim* etc. at the end the soul’s plea to Michael and St Paul in s. 55, and in the angel’s reply in s. 57 most of the group have *utrum* (or variants) *forte* instead of *si forte*. Their appeal is heard on high, *audita est vox eorum* (elsewhere *sonus sonus vocis eorum*) *in celo* (elsewhere *in quarto celo*) in s. 58, and is answered in s. 60, *vox dei* (rather than *filii dei*) *audita est*. At the beginning of the Reproaches which follow in the same section, the D group change Christ’s question substantially to *quare/cur non fecistis bonum*, and the souls are asked why they now seek *benedictionem vel requiem* from God (elsewhere *requiem* only). Among the specific charges in ss. 61 - 63, these texts have *dedistis mihi bibere* (like the C family) referring to the vinegar mixed with gall in s. 61, and *nec quicquam boni* (instead of *nec ullum bonum*) *fecistis* in s. 63. Like the B family some of them insert a verb before the plea *ut requiem haberent* in s. 64, but in this case forms of *petire* are used;53 the formula for the granting of the respite is *dabo* in the D group.

The structure of the troubled section 66 is here *hostiarius* (*inferni is omitted*) cui *nomen* [variants] *et nomen canis eius cerberus* etc. The name of the *hostiarius* presents again the usual difficulty; here it is given as *eternalis*54 or *etanael*, the latter being possibly the closest in all the surviving redaction IV texts to the original form.55

The D family make a radical change in s. 67 where the grateful acclamation of the souls after the granting of the respite *Benedicimus te fili dei* is changed to a declaration of faith *et dicimus/credimus te filium dei esse*. The duration of the respite itself is given here as for one day, omitting the usual *et noctis*. Four of the D texts56 retain a version of the second part of the continuation of the acclamation in s. 69 (two of these inserting *magis/maior gaudium est* before the

---

53 petierunt: Ro8F, Pem2; petii: Pa16.
54 Instead of *eternalis* in Ro8F, Silverstein (1935, p. 115 n. 59) reads *est Na*is.
55 The possible significance of *etanael* (TriD6) is discussed below in chapter 7.
56 Ro8E, Ro8F, Pem2 & TriD6.
phrase\textsuperscript{57}), the others omit the whole section. In the penultimate section 71, the D family has the apparently correct combination of 100 men and four tongues of iron, and typically adds \textit{ad hoc constituti} after \textit{C viri}. For the the formula of the concluding exhortation in s. 72 the majority of the surviving group uses \textit{ut maneamus cum ipso} instead of \textit{ut vivamus}.

\textbf{Change of Exemplar in StJD and Mu12}

Between sections 46 and 63 StJD consistently lacks the characteristics and verbal texture of the D family. For example it does not have \textit{ululatus magnus} at the end of s. 48 or the \textit{Scimus enim} etc. phrase at the end of s. 55; section 58 is not introduced by \textit{audita est vox eorum}, nor is Christ's question changed to \textit{Quare/cur non fecistis bonum} ins. 60, nor is \textit{benedictionem} added to \textit{requiem} in the same section. However, it contains features distinctive of texts of the E family and in particular of one of these, Arundel. Features typical of the E texts include the acclamation of the good soul \textit{O anima iusta (et immaculata)}\textsuperscript{58} et \textit{felicissima et libera <50>}, \textit{misericordiam} instead of \textit{refrigerium <56>}, and the transposition in s. 58 of the souls' exclamation \textit{Christe Jesu miserere filiis hominum} by reversing the two phrases in that section.\textsuperscript{59} There would thus seem to have been a change of exemplar for sections 46 - 63 from one belonging to the D family, to one belonging to the E family.

Several features in StJD suggest that that exemplar had close links to the oldest of the E family texts, the 13th-century Arundel 52, notably the omission of s. 46 and the first part of s. 47, and the variant reading in s. 49, where StJD has \textit{sicut fecerunt diaboli cum anima ista sic accipiimus} and Arun has \textit{sicut fecerunt cum hac anima sic accipimus,} instead of the usual \textit{sicut homo fecerit sic accipiet} found elsewhere.\textsuperscript{60} That this exemplar may not have been Arun itself however, but an antecedent, is suggested by the presence in StJD of the more correct \textit{deus miseretur} in s. 56 where Arun has \textit{Christus miseretur,} and also the correct \textit{clavis confixus} in s. 60 where Arun has \textit{clavis crucifixus}.

\textsuperscript{57} Ro8F & Pem2.
\textsuperscript{58} \textit{et immaculata} is not found in E texts.
\textsuperscript{59} It is transposed also in Family C.
\textsuperscript{60} An association with Arun or its antecedent as early as s. 34, might possibly be indicated by \textit{super camelos} in StJD. In this section StJD does not have any of the typical D variants and additions. Arun has \textit{super camelos} as does also Bo1 (which is associated with the E family from s. 31 on; see below in this chapter). However, the transformation of \textit{canellas} into \textit{camelos} could have been made independently, and it should be noted that StJD does not share the other features of Arun (and Bo1) in this section.
After section 63, however, StJD returns to a D family exemplar. For example, it introduces *rogaverunt* into s. 64 (the D texts use *petierunt/petiit*), it has *dabo* rather than *dono* in s. 65, and most notably, it has the distinctive D family affirmation of faith in s. 68, *et nos filium dei credimus*; in the final section it has *maneamus cum ipso* <72>, which is found only in D texts.

A change of exemplar occurs also in Mu12 for the latter part of the redaction, i.e. from section 59 through to the end. Up to section 59, Mu12 belongs clearly in the D family, but from this point the characteristics of that group are absent and the text shows instead distinctive features of the A family. For example, section 59 is introduced by *quia ita deprecabantur*; in this position the D texts have *et (tunc) exclamaverunt*, but the A texts have *quem ita deprecantur*. Also in the same section, Mu12 has A's *filii david excelsi* not D's *fili dei excelsi*. In the following section 60, Mu12 does not change Christ's question to *cur/quare non fecistis bonum* as in D, but has the more correct form *quid enim fecistis bonum* similar to that in A; it also does not follow D in this section by adding *benedictionem* and it has A's *per omnes penas* rather than D's *super omnes*. In s. 61 Mu12 has *potatus*, recalling A's *ad/in potum* or *ad potandum*, rather than D's *bibere*, and s. 63 begins like A with *set vos fuistis fures* and finishes with *set mendaces fuistis* etc. as in the A texts.

The whole of the problematic section 66 reflects the version in the A texts, describing, for example, the *hostiarius inferni* as the *hostiarius baratri*, and beginning the section with *mestus vero* and omitting *contristatus est valde* at the end. The following section 67 also begins with a variant of the typical A opening *vere locuti (letati in A texts) omnes qui cruciebantur*, and the verbal texture of this and the following sections again presents typical A features such as *filii david* and *spacio unius diei* <67>, *ideo* and *sanctum* <69>, the position of the verb after *ferreas* (Mu12 has *habuisset* instead of A's *haberet* however) as well as *penas inferni* in <71> and *ad dominum* in <72>.

However, in s. 62 Mu12 does not have *vinceretis* which is distinctive of the A family, having instead the correct *viveretis* found elsewhere, and it inserts *deprecantes* before *ut requiem haberent* in s. 64. In the latter case Mu12 may have felt independently the need to insert a verb, as happened also in texts of the B family (*orantes*) and of the D family (*petierunt/petiit*), and it may have corrected...

---

61 This occurs also (at <67>) in a number of red. III texts (see e.g. IIIc in Silverstein 1935, [19], p. 189: 12), but other III texts such as IIIa (ibid. p. 190: 4), do not have a verb before *ut*. 
vinceretis also independently. On the other hand, it may have had access to a version of A which predated the change of viveretis to vinceretis.62 It could be noted that the C family, which shares features of A,63 has viveretis, and that two of that group, Pa28 and 29 forming the subgroup C2, also have deprecantes ut etc.64 However features of Mu12 such as its version of s. 66 show that it was not dependent on any of the extant C texts. It thus remains the case that the overall preponderance of A features in sections 59 to 72 confirms the change of exemplar in Mu12 from one of the D family to a text belonging to the A family.

3. Family E

The remaining 4 substantial texts of the redaction comprise Family E and this group includes the second of the two texts referred to in Brandes' notes (Harleian 2851).

The mss classed here as Family E are:-

Arun London, British Library, Arundel 52, ff. 63r-64r. xiii c.
Erf Erfurt, Stadtbibl., Amplon. Fol. 304, [CA 2° 304], f 102v. 1st half xiv c.
StJF Cambridge, St John's College, 159, ff. 24v-25v Late xv c.

In addition, the second half of the redaction in:-

*Bo1 Oxford, Bodleian, Laud misc. 527, ff. 191v-192v. xiv c.65

The three main representatives of the E family are Arun, Erf (consisting of ss. 2 - 56 only) and StJF. The fourth, Harl, while having distinctive E features, exercises considerable freedom with the text by omission or abbreviation on the one hand,66 and by recasting or embellishment on the other.67 Within the

---

62 See also chapter 5 above re St P.
63 See the argument for a common antecedent below in chapter 7.
64 The other C texts (C1) omit section 64.
65 Bo1 is listed above with the A family to which the first half of its text of the redaction belongs.
66 e.g. Harl omits all of ss. 32 - 35 and by selecting a part only of ss. 21 -23, reduces several different groups of sinners to one.
67 e.g. the sinners hanging from the burning trees in s. 6, are described sicut solent poma multa pendere super arbores tempore estatis and the Fiery Wheel of s. 15, transposed to s. 39 to precede the Great Well, is described as plenam uncis ferreis in quibus pendebat magna hominum multitudine quam nemo dinumerare poterat.
group some particular affiliation may be observed at times between Arun and Harl\textsuperscript{68} and between Erf and StJF.\textsuperscript{69}

At a secondary level, the whole family is an example of change of exemplar. The primary level is the set of characteristics which distinguish it as a separate family, however the basic text onto which these features were grafted, reflects in its first half features associated with the B family, but in its second half it has instead characteristics distinctive of the A family. This and the case of Bo1 are discussed below.

**Characteristic Variants in E Texts**

ss. 6 - 37

The E texts preface the description of the fiery trees before the gates of Hell in s. 6 with *cum igitur venerunt ad infernum*, and the three main texts describe the sinners as *(sus)pendentes in ramis earum*. Similarly the opening of s. 8 is expanded to *in eodem loco* by all, and in the three main texts the furnace is described as *ardentem et emittentem vii flammamas* instead of *per vii flammamas*. Here in all four texts are the sinners who did not repent *post commissa facinora* \textsuperscript{<10>} instead of *post peccata commissa*. As well as the many mansions beside the horrible river and the bridge in s. 18, there are also - rather incongruously perhaps - *multi pauperes* in the three main texts; the same three also identify the sinners in s. 21 immersed to their knees in the river, as *qui aliis detrahendis studium vite suae exercent*.\textsuperscript{70} In section 25 the opening is prefaced by *his auditis* in the three texts which have the first part of the section,\textsuperscript{71} the lament in the second part is tripled to *ve, ve, ve* by all but Harl, and *tormenta* is substituted for *pene* by all four texts. The retribution for those who *non sunt misericordes* is underlined in s. 27 by inserting *quia*\textsuperscript{72} before *non sunt* and expanding *propterea sunt in pena* to *sine misericordia penas recipiunt*.

\textsuperscript{68} e.g. *misit deus/ad eum angelum suum michaelem qui eum duceret ad infernum* \textsuperscript{<5>}, *amatores pecuniarum* \textsuperscript{<27>}.

\textsuperscript{69} e.g. *serpens* \textsuperscript{<9>}, *super arenam* \textsuperscript{<34>}.

\textsuperscript{70} Harl has a number of omissions in this area; it omits s. 14, inserts s. 15 (with variations) into s. 39, omits ss. 16 - 19, and has only parts of ss. 20 - 23.

\textsuperscript{71} Arun omits the first part.

\textsuperscript{72} Arun inserts *qui*. Harl omits this part of s. 27.; it shares the variant *amatores* (instead of *feneratores*) with Arun, but it has the more usual *quaerunt* with *usuras* instead of *requirunt* which is found in the other three E texts.
At the beginning of the description of the Infanticides in s. 28, erant omnes pene et ibi erant is omitted by the whole group after in quo, and circum colla earum/sua is brought forward to precede dracones etc.\(^{73}\) Circling around these souls in s. 29 of all four texts, are maligni spiritus instead of angeli maligni, and in s. 31 of the three main texts, although these sinners maculaverunt se as in the other groups except A, the usual accompanying reference to parentibus is omitted. In the same three texts, the infants are given to animals ad manducandum or manducare <31>, rather than in escam.\(^{74}\) These texts describe the next group of souls in s. 32 as burning (although omitting specific mention of fire) ex una parte, and for them too the Fastbreakers in s. 34 are either super camelos\(^{75}\) or super arenam.\(^{76}\) All four texts omit plorantem et ululantem in describing the negligent bishop in s. 36, and the usual three substitute habebit for the more common sustinebit in s. 37.

ss. 45 - 72
In all the E texts St Paul will look in terram only to see the wicked soul among the demons in s. 45. The soul here is described as inter septem diabulos ululantem et in eo die de corpore (ex)euentem/existente; the verb deducebant/(de)ducentes, referring to the demons, is omitted, so that the description no longer says, as elsewhere, that they were either conducting the soul from its body,\(^{77}\) or that they were conducting the soul which had exited (egressam) from its body.\(^{78}\) In two of the E group (Arun & Harl) de corpore (tunc) exeuntem is repeated for the just soul in s. 50.\(^{79}\) The same two E texts substitute iusta and libera for leta and beata in the angels’ acclamation of the good soul in s. 51. All four use the singular imperative leva in s. 52 for the angels’ decision to raise the good soul up before God, and in s. 56 of all four the Archangel advises the souls to weep so that God may grant them misericordiam as well as the usual refrigerium.

The legible Erfurt text finishes at this point but in the remaining three of the E group, the first appeal of the souls is addressed to Jesu Christe (or Christe Jesu) instead of simply Christe, and it is brought forward by reversing the two

\(^{73}\) Cf. Family D; however, the E texts do not preface this with habebant as in D, but add erant after, and et igne is not displaced and changed to the accusative.

\(^{74}\) Harl omits these parts of s. 31, and all of ss. 32 - 35.

\(^{75}\) Arun.

\(^{76}\) Erf & StJF.

\(^{77}\) Cf. Families A, C, some of Family B (Add, Bal, Bo2, Pa10; Pra, Ro8C) and some of Family D (Mu12, ?Pa16, TriD6).

\(^{78}\) Cf. some of Family B (Mer, Mi (exeuntem), Ro11,TriD5) and StP.

\(^{79}\) also StJf (=D family); cf. de corpore egredientem: Bm11 (=C1), de corpore egressa(m): TriD5 & Ro11 (=B).
phrases in s. 58.\textsuperscript{90} Two of the three (Arun and StJF) insert \textit{per latus meum} before \textit{perforatus} in the first of Christ's reproaches in s. 61, and the sinners are branded as \textit{malefici} rather than \textit{maledicti} by the same two in s. 63.\textsuperscript{81} In s. 65 of these two texts the exclamation \textit{ecce} prefaces the granting of the respite, but in all three of the group the \textit{hostiarius inferni} section (s. 66) is omitted. The following section 67 begins \textit{tunc omnes qui cruciebantur (cruciati erant) letati sunt} transferring the main verb to follow the relative clause, and the accusative \textit{filium david} is used after \textit{bendicimus te} instead of the vocative found elsewhere. The admonition \textit{ideo observandus est (nobis) dies dominicus} in s. 69 is characteristic of E texts, and they also omit the promised reward in the second part of that section.\textsuperscript{82} Two E texts (Arun and Harl) have the distinctive error \textit{centum xliiii} for the number of the pains of Hell in s. 70, but StJF has the correct number, 144,000, and it also contains section 71 (the men with tongues of iron) which is omitted by the others.

\textbf{Family B characteristics in E texts}

As well as the variants listed above, the E texts share a number of Family B characteristics in the first part of the redaction. For example in s. 7 the content, order and form of the list of hanging sinners (i.e. by the feet, hands, hair, necks, tongues and arms, using \textit{per} plus the accusative), is that of Family B, and in s. 10 they also have the B variants \textit{ponebantur} for \textit{mittuntur} and \textit{secolo} for \textit{mundo}. In s. 11 two of them\textsuperscript{83} have the B characteristic \textit{unusquisque}, in s. 12 like B they all have \textit{desiderant} either instead of, or as well as, \textit{querunt},\textsuperscript{84} and at the end of s. 14 the main three texts\textsuperscript{85} have \textit{et dolorem} (i.e. depending, like \textit{cruciationem}, on \textit{propter}), although without the accompanying \textit{animarum}.

Two of the group have the distinctive B phrase \textit{habetur pons} in s. 17, and the other two either alter or omit the section.\textsuperscript{86} Like many of the B texts they all omit s. 19, and in s. 20 the main three have the two adverbs, \textit{cotidie perhenniter}, which are found together in a cluster of B1 texts.\textsuperscript{87} The same three E texts

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{90} The two phrases are reversed also in Family C.
\textsuperscript{81} also in Mi & Ro8C (=B). Harl omits this part of the section.
\textsuperscript{82} Arun omits s. 69.
\textsuperscript{83} Erf & Harl. Arun has \textit{omnes} and StJF omits the section.
\textsuperscript{84} Most of C also have \textit{querunt} et \textit{desiderant}.
\textsuperscript{85} Harl omits s. 14.
\textsuperscript{86} Erf & StJF; in Arun the phrase is corrupted (\textit{vidit alium flumen}) and the section reordered, and Harl omits the section.
\textsuperscript{87} Bal, Mi and, partly corrupted, in Bo2; Harl omits this part of s. 20. The two adverbs are also found together in most of the C family and StP. The three E texts have \textit{animas diversas} in this
\end{footnotesize}
begin s. 22 with ceteri as do most of B1 (+Ro8C), and two\(^{88}\) have the correct revertuntur ad penitentiam found only in B1(+Ro8C) and in TriD2 of the C group. These two also begin s. 23 with reliqui as again do most of B1(+Ro8C),\(^{89}\) and instead of querunt in s. 27, they and also Arun have requirunt, which is found only in the B family.\(^{90}\)

The last part of s. 31 (fluminibus...fecerunt) is omitted by the whole group as in the B1 texts, and in s. 32 the souls rather than ignis are the subject of the plural verbs as in all the B texts, but not elsewhere. One of the E family has the variant camelos in s. 34, which is found only in a cluster of texts within B1 (+Ro8C),\(^{91}\) but the three main E texts have sinebant(ur) in this section as do most of the B texts.

**Family A characteristics in E Texts**

In the second half of the redaction there is a marked occurrence of A characteristics rather than distinctive B traits in the E texts. Only rarely are specifically A features observable in the first part of the redaction. The most notable is in s. 13 where all the E group have the A family's quia anime non possunt mori instead of B's anime numquam moriuntur/morientur,\(^{92}\) and two of them, at least, have the addition of merguntur in s. 18 which is typical of the A group.\(^{93}\) Only a few other similarities occur in one or several of the E texts, e.g. serpens <9> in Erf and StJF.\(^{94}\)

After section 34, however, the E texts move away from features identifiably of the B family to those typical of, or shared by, the A group, e.g. in s. 35, the three main E family representatives have the usual verb solvunt with ieiunium rather than absolvunt characteristic of B1 (+Ro8C).\(^{95}\) There seems to be some oscillation at first; in s. 37 Erf & StJF have A's in die iudicii but Arun has the
usual *usque in diem iudicii*, and in s. 38 all but Harl omit *super humanum genus* as do A and C, and add *hunc* to *fetorem* in s. 39. From s. 40 on, however, the recurrence of features of the A family is clear even though there are some important exceptions.

All the E texts add *inferni* to *penas* in s. 40, and they all have *non fiet/fiat commemoratio* in s. 41. Two of them (Erf & StJF) have *baptizati* in s. 42, and in s. 46 they give the angel’s question to the wicked soul as in the A group, i.e. *que operata es in terra.* The second person imperative, *vide/videte,* is characteristic of A texts in s. 47, and in the E texts the plural *videte* is used. Both groups have *demones* instead of *diaboli* in s. 48, and both omit *pro/post/propter ea(m)* after *letancium* and *hodie* after *letare* in s. 51. The distinctive A opening to s. 52, *deinde hec simul dixerunt,* appears with some small variation or omission in E, and the two separate and juxtaposed phrases found elsewhere in s. 54, are compressed into one in both E and A: *clamor factus est contra animam/eam.*

Section 56 is the last legible text in the Erfurt ms. and is partly damaged, however it appears to share with StJF the insertion of *oret* which is exclusive to the A texts, and presumably it also had A’s change of structure which is clear in StJF [*Paulus si forte misereatur vestri oret ut doneit.*] There is no evidence these changes were made in Arun and Harl, however all omit the *angeli qui mecum sunt* from the Archangel’s words as A does. All three remaining E texts have the A opening to s. 58, *audito sono,* and they also omit the phenomenon preceding the descent of Christ, *vidit celum moveri subito,* which is typically omitted by A. Variants of A’s *quem ita deprecabantur* at the beginning of s. 59, appear also in Arun and StJF, as does the appeal in the same section to *filii david* (instead of *filii dei*) although without A’s accompanying *excelsi.* The E texts repeat or reflect the A version of Christ’s question in s. 60 with *quid bani/bonum fecistis,* and two of them (StJF & Harl) have *(in) potum,* which is found only in four of the A family, referring to Christ’s bitter drink. Like A they all begin

---

96 Harl omits this part of the section.
97 Arun & Harl omit the second part of s. 42; Arun omits s. 46 and Harl omits the second part of the section.
98 Arun omits the first part of s. 47.
99 *deinde simul dixerunt hoc:* Arun; *deinde simul hoc dixerunt:* Erf; *deinde sunt qui dixerunt:* StJF; *deinde angeli dixerunt:* Harl.
100 For this change in A see chapter 5 above. StJF also has A’s opening, *quibus sic ait angelus,* but this part is not legible in Erf.
101 Arun has si forte christus misereatur vestri ut deus det; Harl has ut deus det.
102 Arun has potandum.
103 Arun has potandum.
the accusations in s. 63 with *fuistis fures* and, also like A, Arun and StJF conclude with *sed mendaces fuistis in vita vestra*, and have *invidiosi* rather than *invidi* in the list of the souls' defects. All three (with sight variations) change A's opening to s. 67, *vere letati sunt omnes qui cruciabantur ibi to tunc omnes qui cruciabantur ibi letati sunt*; in the same section, like A, they again address Christ as the son of David rather than the son of God, and StJF also uses *spacio* with *unius diei et noctis* referring to the respite. Some small similarities between the two groups may be observed in the final sections, e.g. the omission of section 68, *cui ait ins.* 70, and StJF, the only E text having this section, has *penas inferni* in s. 71, but not A's characteristic positioning of *haberet* after *linguas ferreas*, rather than, as here, after *unusquisque*.

At several other points in the second part of the redaction, the E texts also do not have distinctive A features, most notably they do not have the exclusively A variant *vinceretis* in s. 62, having instead the usual verb *viveretis* found in all the other groups. Again, in s. 47 the change of structure in A (and C), *videte istam animam quomodo contempsit* etc., does not appear in the E version of this section, although the latter does have the A imperative: *videte quomodo ista anima contempsit* etc; in the same section also, the E group do not omit *scripta* as in A. In s. 45 all four E texts, and in s. 50 two of them (Arun & Harl), have the present participle *exeuntem*, omitted by A (and C).

Nevertheless, the E version of redaction IV has clearly undergone a change of substance in its second half, indicating a change of exemplar from the one associated with the B family which had been used in the first half, to one with a distinctly A family character. In both parts, however, the E version has its own distinguishing features, which give the resulting version of the redaction an identifiable separate character from the families which provided its basic text.

**Bo1 and Family E**

Another change of exemplar involving the E group and the A family, is evident in the text of the first of the two versions of Redaction IV in the 14th-century Bodleian ms., Cod. Laud Miscellany 527 [Bo1]. This text is classified in Family A because the first part clearly belongs to that group, sharing, on the whole, its key characteristics, e.g. *auribus* in the list in s. 7, the position of *tristicia* and the

---

104 Harl omits these parts of s. 63.
105 The opening phrase in B, C2 & D is (with small variants) *et letati sunt qui erant in penis;* in C1 it is *et illi qui erant in penis gaudebant.*
inclusion of *bargidum* [sic] in s. 14, and the repetition of *multe bestie diabolice* at the beginning of s. 18. At section 28 however, the text of Bo1 seems to diverge from the extant witnesses of the A family, although at first the indications are slight; in that section, through omission, it lacks the transference of *igne,* and while it has the A (and C) family's ablative *draconibus,* it does not have A's *erantque ibi.* More indicatively, in s. 30 it does not have A's preface to the angel's reply *tunc sic respondit angelus* and, decisively, in s. 31 it does not have A's exclusive *maculate,* having instead the usual *maculaverunt se.*

At this point also there is a clear connection with the E group. Like the E texts it omits the reference to *parentibus* after *maculaverunt se,* and, although through omission of most of the section, it does not have the E characteristic *ad manducandum,* the truncated section in Bo1, *et maculaverunt se necantes infantes suos,* mirrors the form of the first part of the section in Arun. This connection with the E family continues in the following sections (e.g. *qui ex una parte* and the plural verbs in s. 32, *sinebat* in s. 34, *habebit* in s. 38), and throughout the rest of the redaction where the combination of A features with specifically E traits is replicated. The association with Arun first noticed here also continues, e.g. *viduis et orphanis nocentes* in s. 33, *super camelos* in s. 34 etc., and also with Arun in combination with Harl, notably in the acclamation in s. 52 *O anima iusta et felicissima et libera,* and the erroneous number (144) of the pains of Hell in s. 70. At other times however, it is associated with other combinations of E texts; significantly, for example, it has the insertion of *oret* and the change of structure in s. 56, which is found in Erf and St1F but not in Arun or Harl. Thus the exemplar to which Bo1 changed in the middle of the redaction, lies behind all four of the extant texts representing the E family.

One important discrepancy in Bo1, however, must be noted. In section 62 at the end of Christ's reproach, Bo1 has *ut vinceretis mecum* which is exclusive to the A family, instead of *ut viveretis mecum* which is found in the E group and all the other groups. Since the connection of Bo1 and the E texts is clear, this could indicate that in the basic text drawn from A, which the E texts used in the second half of the redaction, the verb was *vinceretis* and that this is maintained by Bo1, but has subsequently been changed to the more usual *viveretis* by the E texts. On the other hand, if *viveretis* was in the common antecedent of Bo1 and the E texts (and thus predated the change to *vinceretis* in the extant A group),

---

106 Also *serpens* <9>, *infiguntur* (for *merguntur*) <17>, and *de quibus* at the beginning of s. 27 (followed by *dixit* not *ait* however). Some A features are missing through omission, including the opening sentence.
Bo1 has either independently made the same error as the extant A group or it has, in this isolated instance, referred back to an A family text.\textsuperscript{107}

\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{107} The occurrence of \textit{viveretis} instead of \textit{vinceretis} has been noted above in other texts associated with Family A, i.e. St P (chapter 5) and Mu12 (in the preceding section of this chapter). Family C which is related to Family A, also has \textit{viveretis}. See the discussion of the interrelationship of the five families in the following chapter.
Chapter 7
FAMILY INTERRELATIONSHIP AND A BASE TEXT FOR REDACTION IV

Although the five families of extant Redaction IV texts each have a distinct profile, there is also evidence of some cross relationships between the families. It has been argued in the previous chapter that Family E is related to Family B in the first part of the redaction and to Family A in its second half. Other cross relationships support the association of the A and C families against the B and D families.

This can be illustrated in the first instance by the variants in section 34 concerning the punishment of the Fastbreakers. In the Paris text of the Long Latin 1 tradition to which the medieval Latin redactions belong, the souls are described as suspended super canela aque,1 "a phrase" - in Theodore Silverstein's words - "which had a marvellous afterlife in the Western vernacular translations." 2 This is no less true of those medieval Latin redactions in which the phrase survives in modified or corrupted form, and in particular of Redaction IV. However, in many of the extant witnesses of the versions of the Visio descended from the hypothetical ancestor alpha, the phrase was omitted. This was perhaps due to the elimination of the thirst aspect of the punishment, evidently in alpha itself,3 leaving the focus rather on the tormenting desire for the food tantalizingly displayed before the souls, and thus the detail of the suspension of the souls over water would no longer have seemed to be relevant. Nevertheless, a form or variant of the phrase does survive in a number of isolated instances,4 and in most of Redaction IV.

---

1 Silverstein & Hilhorst 1997, p. 146, col. a, line 19. The description of the Fastbreakers' punishment differs considerably in St Gall, the other representative of the L1 tradition (ibid., p. 146, col. b, line 18 ff.), and is not reflected in the medieval Latin redactions.
2 Silverstein 1959, p. 207.
3 In the Long Latin the souls are described as pendentes super canela aque, et lingue eorum siccae satis et multi fructus constituti in conspectu eorum etc. (James 1893, [39], p. 32: 1-3; Silverstein & Hilhorst 1997, [39], Paris ms., p. 146: 19-21). Only in three Family D texts of red. IV, does the thirst element appear (morientes fame et siti: Pa16; morientes siti et fame: St[D]; siti et fame morientes: Schl). Given the absence of this from all the other descendants of alpha, and all the other texts of red. IV, the reference to thirst would seem to have been re-introduced as an addition to the phrase morientes fame which had been interpolated into all the Family D texts.
4 Redaction I, Barcelona ms. only: super prata virentia (Silverstein 1959, [6], p. 228); Göttingen <31>: super canale aque; red. II: currentes super calidissimam aquam (Silverstein 1935, p. 157: 24); red. IIIa only: super canalem aque (ibid., p. 176: 6); red. V: super camera/camonal[?] (ibid., p. 199: 19); red. VII: super ripam aquarum (ibid., p. 207: 3).
For the description of the Fastbreakers in Redaction IV, in lieu of the Long Latin *canela*, an apparently invented third declension neuter plural is used in Family A: *canalia/canelia* and also in Family C: *canalia/canelia* (C1), *camelia* (C2). These forms are not found in the other groups. In the texts of Family D where the phrase has not been radically corrupted, a first declension feminine plural *canellas* or a second declension masculine plural (?) *canulos/camilos* or *camelos* is found, the latter obviously a corruption. Family B also has *camelos* in three cases, the rest, possibly baulking at the incongruity of this, have instead *in quodam loco*. The original *aque* which is retained only in Family D, appears as *amnis* (or variants) in A; it is omitted by B and C.

The handling of the Archangel's exhortation to the souls in section 56 also indicates an association of A and C against B and D. In the original Long Latin this read:--

\[ tunc autem flete et flebo vobiscum et qui mecum sunt angeli cum dilectissimo Paulo si forte misericatur misericors deus ut det vobis refrigerium. \]

In Families B and D the phrase survives in recognisably authentic form, e.g.:--

D (Ro8E): flete et flebo vobiscum et angeli qui mecum sunt cum dilectissimo paulo uterum forte misericatur vestri deus et donet vobis aliquid refrigerii,

B (Add): nunc flete et flebimus vobiscum et angeli qui mecum sunt cum dilecto paulo si forte misericatur deus et donet vobis refrigerium.

---

5 The original Long Latin *canela* appears to have been the neuter plural of *canelum*. The noun *canellum* is one of three variants, *canella - um - us* given in the Dictionary of Medieval Latin from British Sources, Vol I, A - L, Oxford 1975, i.e. "canella - um - us [dim of canna, infl. by AN canel OF chanel < canalis] channel, watercourse."

6 *canelia*: Vi, StP.

7 *canelia*: Pem1.

8 *TriD6*.

9 Mu12. Silverstein (1935, p. 114, n. 54) reads this as "super camilos (or canulos) aque". From the script it could be either, but arguably 'canulos'.

10 StJD; on this see also chapter 6 above.

11 Bo2, Bal & Mi (=B1); Ro8C (=B2) has *in quodam loco quasi super camelos sedentes*. In Family E which is related to B at this point, one ms. (Arun) also has *camelos*, and likewise Bo1 (=A) which is related here to Family E.

12 In the D group *aque* is retained (in differing phrases however) by TriD6, Mu12 and Ro8E, and as the sole element by Schl (super aquis). The variant *atque* (possibly for reasons of sense) in Pem2 & StJD, and hence *et* in Ro8E, would also be consistent with a preceding *aque*.

13 James 1893, [42], p. 35: 21-23.
However, as has already been noted,\(^{14}\) Family A introduces into this phrase an explicit reference to St Paul’s prayers for God’s mercy, thus highlighting the importance of his intercession for the souls’ respite:-

A (Vat): flete et flebo vobiscum paulus si forte misereatur vestri oret ut donet vobis misericors deus aliquod refrigerium.

An explicit reference to St Paul’s prayers is also introduced in Family C, although the phrase differs in other aspects (markedly so in the case of C1):-

C2: flete et flebo vobiscum cum paulo ut suis orationibus det vobis deus aliquid refrigerium.
C1(Pa32): intercedite paulum qui est vobiscum ut suis orationibus det vobis deus refrigerium.

Although the wording is different, the explicit focus on St Paul’s prayers would ally C with A rather than with B/D.

A further indication of this association can be seen in section 54. In Redaction III, to which Redaction IV is related in Silverstein’s stemma of the alpha redactions, two phrases describe the reaction of the souls in Hell on seeing the just soul being taken to Paradise:-

Et clamabant omnes qui in inferno erant, videntes animam iustam et angelos descendentes cum ea in paradisum. Et clamor magnus factus est in inferno quasi celum et terra moverentur.\(^ {15}\)

In Family D two phrases also describe the reaction to the just soul’s translation to Paradise, however, it is not the souls who are the subject of clamaverunt, but rather - explicitly or implicitly by juxtaposition - the saints in Paradise who were referred to at the end of the preceding section.\(^ {16}\)

et tunc clamaverunt contra iustam animam et clamor factus est quasi celum et terra moverentur.\(^ {17}\)

These two phrases are to be found also in the Family B texts, albeit, in a number of cases, with the usual internal variations and omissions. In Family A, however, the two phrases are telescoped into one: *et clamor factus est contra animam iustam quasi celum et terra commoverentur*, and the same compressed version is present in the two C2 texts of Family C; the C1 group all omit this section. Families B and D also share another characteristic in sections 53 - 54 against Families A and C. The phrase *in/cum magna leticia* is inserted either

\(^{14}\) Chapter 5 above.


\(^{16}\) Red. III <58>: postea michael collocavit eam in paradiso ubi erant omnes sancti.

\(^{17}\) RoSF <54>.
after sancti at the end of s. 53, or after clamaverunt in s. 54 in texts of both the D and B families, but there is no trace of it in either A or C.

Several grammatical structures may also be noted which differentiate the A/C group. In s. 47, when the angels observe the sinful soul which has just left its body, they use an imperative with an accusative in Families A and C: vide/videte (A) or videamus (C) istam animam quomodo contempsit in terra mandata dei. In Families B and D the nominative is used, preceded by quomodo in B: vidimus quomodo ista anima contempsit mandata dei, or standing alone (and without any form of the verb 'to see') in D: ista anima contempsit preceptum dei/domi. In the description of the Infanticides in s. 28, Families B and D preserve the original dracones et serpentibus which A and C change into draconibus et [igne et =A] serpentibus. Other examples of the division between the two groups are first, the phrase super humanum genus in section 38 after the angel's question quare ploras paulo which is found in B and D, but not in A and C, and secondly, the word order in the admonition timendus est nobis locus inferni in section 14, which lists the doleful experiences to be feared in Hell, one of which is tristicia sine leticia. This latter item begins the list in Family A, preceding dolor semptimemus and gemitus cordis, but it is placed after gemitus cordis in B and D texts where the list begins instead with dolor semptimemus. Like A, two C texts also place tristicia at the beginning of the list but the others omit it from the list altogether, so that while it is not clear from which position it was dropped, the initial position would seem more probable.

It may be argued therefore on the evidence adduced above, that Families A and Care descended from a common antecedent (Z), with C subdividing into C1 and C2. The smaller C2 reflects in its second half forms closer to A and therefore, if contamination is excluded, these must have been present in Z.

---

18 Inserted after sancti: Ro8E, Ro8F, Mu12, Pem2 & TriD6(=D), Bal (=B1) and Ro8C(=B2); inserted after clamaverunt: TriD6(=D)(repeated), Mi(=B1) and Mer & TriD5(=B2).

19 C2 omits this phrase.

20 See James 1893, [40], p. 33: 8; also red. III, [13] (Silverstein 1935, pp. 176-9).


22 Although only Mu14 & Pa32 (=C1) have tristicia, some further support may be drawn from the version which provided the red. IV interpolations in red. X. Two of these interpolations can definitely be shown to be from a Family C text, and arguably, therefore, so was the interpolated timendus admonition which begins the list with tristicia. (Silverstein 1959, [31], p. 244). On these interpolations see chapter 8 below.
Families B and D also share a number of features which distinguish them from A and C. Some of these can be ascribed to the two sources from which, in Theodore Silverstein's analysis, Redaction IV was drawn; these were firstly, a version of Redaction III which lay behind the extant versions of that redaction, and secondly the hypothetical common ancestor alpha, whose content may be conjectured from its other direct derivatives (mainly Redaction I, but also Redaction BR and Göttingen) as well as its own source, the Long Latin. Where features common to B and D against A and C are found also in these sources, they are arguably inherited from the early form of Redaction IV and therefore do not presuppose an antecedent (Y) particular to B and D. Among the passages cited above, the archangel's exhortation to the souls in s. 56 and the two phrases in s. 54, would fall into this category. In other cases features shared by B and D cannot be verified by reference to these sources and therefore are not firm evidence for or against Y, since they may be attributable either to the original redactor or to a later intervention (Y). Two examples of this second category are also among the passages cited above, i.e. the phrase *in/cum magna leticia* inserted into s. 53 or s. 54, and the word order of the Admonition (s. 14).

However, the presence in the subgroup B2 of a set of words or phrases, found also in D, but not elsewhere in the Redaction IV groups (including B1), would seem to support the view that B2 and therefore its own source B, shared a common antecedent (Y) with D. This set, which occurs between s. 21 and s. 47, consists of the ten features listed below. It will be noted that only Pra of the B2 group shares the complete set with D; Mer and TriD5 both have nos 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 9 & 10, and Mer has no. 1 also, while Ro8C has only nos 4, 6, 7, 8, 9 & 10.\(^{23}\) These ten features\(^ {24}\) are:-

---

\(^{23}\) There is considerable evidence in Ro8C of borrowing from red. III (e.g. clearly in s. 54, but probably also the form of the angels' question in s. 46 and of the *ululatus* addition in s. 48; see Appendix F, IV Apparatus ad loc.), and many of the features in the B2/D list are also in red. III. However the *qui passus est* phrase (no. 7 below) is not in red. III and therefore Ro8C can be presumed to have accessed it from the same source as Pra.

\(^{24}\) Note that some aspects of the wording of the phrases may vary between the B2 mss. and in D.
Of these ten features, five (nos. 4, 5, 8, 9 & 10) are found also in Redaction III, one (no. 6) in all the other redactions including III, and one (no. 7) in Redaction II, which, in Silverstein's stemma, derives from Beta, the hypothetical antecedent of Redaction III. The remaining three features are exclusive to B2 and D among the surviving texts of the medieval redactions, but one, *cum exierint/exeunt de ecclesia* (no. 1), is directly linked to the Long Latin. Traces of the phrase may be found in Redactions I and III, and in ms. Göttingen, but none preserves the original form which is most closely replicated in B2/D. In the context of the Silverstein stemma, the external links of eight of these features, either with other redactions or with the Long Latin and thus with the conjectured sources of Redaction IV, would argue for their presence in the
original form of the redaction. Since they are in B2 and D, they could be assumed to have been passed down through Y to D, and through Y and B to B2.

One of the two remaining features exclusive to D and B2, (no. 3), is the fairly unremarkable expansion of the introduction to s. 27, and could be coincidence, however the other, (no. 2), concludes s. 22 with the phrase *non penitent usque ad mortem* instead of *non revertuntur ad penenteciam* which is found in B1. The B1 phrase can be authenticated by Redaction IIIa and Redaction I, therefore it could be presumed to be in both B and the early form of IV, as well as in Y if it existed. The presence of the variant phrase in B2 and D could not therefore be through a hypothetical Y but must either have been introduced from D directly, or from another common source (8). Transmission through a common source rather than direct from D is suggested by the presence in B2, s. 21, of the more correct version, *exierint*, from the Long Latin *cum exierint de ecclesia* (no. 1 above), whereas the extant texts of D have *exeunt*; also, the absence in B2 of other characteristic D features both in the sections from which the set of common phrases is drawn and in the intervening sections (e.g. the accusative *angelos malignos* in s. 29 and the variants for *venisse in carnem* and *baptizantur* in s. 42) would argue against the direct dependence of B2 on D. It would seem therefore that B2 modified its B text between ss. 21 and 47 by referring to a text of δ which contained the authentic phrases inherited from the early form of IV, as well as its own rephrasings (nos. 2 & 3). These modifications may have been made by annotation rather than substitution, which could explain the absence of some of the ten features in the extant B2 mss. - the individual scribe adopting some but not all of the alternatives in the annotated version before him; this could also account for the presence of both the B1 and the alternative readings in several instances. For example, in s. 44, B1 has *gemitum et suspirium magnum* but B2, like D, has the present participles *gementes et flentes* as in Redaction III. While in Pra these replace the nouns (*audivit eos flentes et gementes*), the other three B2 mss. retain traces of the B1 form as well (Ro8C: *audivit voces gemenorum et flencium et suspiriosum*; Mer & TriD5: *audivit eos flentes et gementes et suspitium magnum*).

---

33 e.g. Add: et audivit gemitum et suspirium magnum.
The absence from B1 of all the authentic phrases in the B2/D set would suggest a possible association of B with Z, the antecedent of A and C in which they are all also lacking. This is strengthened by the form of s. 29 in B1 which is similar to that of s. 29 in A and C. For example Ro11(=B1) reads:

<29> Et erant ibi quatuor angelii maligni increpantes eas habentes cornua ignea et ibant in circuitu earum dicentes Agnoscite filium dei qui redemit mundum,

and Vi (=A):

<29> et erant quatuor angeli maligni increpantes eas habentes cornua ignea qui ibant in circuitu earum dicentes Agnoscite filium dei qui mundum redemit.

In both, the word order is increpantes eas preceding habentes cornua and et/qui ibant in circuitu earum preceding dicentes. Family C (both C1 and C2) omit increpantes eas but have qui ibant etc. in the same position, as e.g. Mu14(=C1):

<29> et erant ibi quatuor angelii maligni habentes cornua ignea qui ibant in circuitu earum dicentes Agnoscite filium dei qui redemit mundum.

However, in Family D and B2 (Pra, Mer & TriD5), the word order is in circuitu earum preceding habentes cornua and increpantes eas preceding dicentes, as e.g. in Ro8F(=D):

<29> et quatuor angelos malignos in circuitu earum habentes cornua ignea increpantes eas et dicentes Agnoscite filium dei qui redemit mundum sanguine suo,

and Pra(=B2):

<29> et quatuor angeli maligni in circuitu earum erant habentes *capita sua (*al. cornua) ignea increpantes eas e dicentes Agnoscite filium dei qui redemit mundum *suo sanguine (*al. sanguine suo). 34

The quatuor angeli maligni come from episode of the False Virgins35 but the rest of s. 29 is based on Redaction III <39-40>, best represented here by IIIC (and IIIb);

<39-40>: ... et angeli iniqui cornibus igniis percuciebant eas .... Et angeli (iniqui) in circuitu earum increpantes eas et dicentes, 'Agnoscite filium dei, qui vos redemit sanguine suo.' 36

In Redaction IV the fiery horns have been inserted into the latter sentence in all the families, but the word order of Family D and B2 adheres more closely to that of Redaction III and could thus be considered more likely to reflect the early

34 Mer & TriD5 retain ibant from the alternative version: <29> Et ibant quatuor demones in circuitu earum habentes cornua ignea increpantes eas et dicentes Agnoscite filium dei qui redemit mundum sanguine suo. Ro8C concludes the section with sanguine suo as do the other B2 mss. and Family D, but it has the B1/A+C word order (and its own variants): <29> et erant quatuor mali angeli increpantes eos habentes facies nigiores fuligine et ibant in circuitu earum dicentis (sic) ignoscite (sic) filium dei vivi qui creavit et redemit mundum sanguine suo.


form of Redaction IV. The variant word order and the addition of *et/qui ibant* in B and A/C would suggest the changes were made in an antecedent common to them (X) and that B2 regained the early version through δ as proposed above.

Further support for this proposition could be given by the noun forms *gemitum et suspirium magnum* in B1 and A/C (s. 44), against the probably authentic present participles *gementes et flentes* in B2 and D. Thus:

(figure 1)
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(figure 2)
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However, against this the variants in the problematic description of the Fastbreakers in s. 34 should be considered. As discussed above, Families A and C share the variants *canelia/canalia* against a range of variants in B and D, which does not include either of the A/C variants. From the presence of *canelia* in A/C
and *canellas* in D, it could be argued that *canelia* and *canelas*\(^{37}\) were each a separate variant of the Long Latin *canela* and that the other variants in A/C and D proceeded from them; thus *canalia* in A/C developed from *canelia*, the vowel change (but not the ending) under the influence of the Classical Latin *canalis* (m),\(^{38}\) and (?)*canulos/camilos* and *camelos* in D developed from *ca(n)elas* through an incorrectly resolved abbreviation with consequent adjusted gender ending.\(^{39}\)

In Family B, the variant *in quodam loco* is found in both B1 and B2,\(^{40}\) and indicates that a problem existed in B for which this phrase was a neutral solution. However an internal cluster of B1 mss., Bo2, Bal and Mi, has *super camelos* and this appears also, together with *in quodam loco*, in Ro8C (=B2).\(^{41}\) The problem in B may have been *camelos* which survived in the B1 cluster, but for which an ancestor of both the B1 and B2 texts, finding this as incongruous as later readers do, proposed the *in quodam loco* solution; Ro8C, having access here to both variants, and having a tendency to doublets as evidenced elsewhere,\(^{42}\) combines the two. The variant *camelos* could have resulted from a misreading of *ca(n)elas* as has been suggested in the case of StJD (=D) above.\(^{43}\) If this did occur,

---

\(^{37}\) Only TriD6 (=D) has 'll' (*canellas*). On the evidence of the other variants in red. IV, the common antecedent had a single 'l'.

\(^{38}\) The same influence can arguably be seen in two instances in the other *alpha* redactions, i.e. Göttingen <31>, where the second and third vowels are reversed (*super canale aque*), and also, with the grammar adjusted to a singular accusative, in red. Illa (*super canalem aque*; Silverstein 1935, [11], p. 176: 6). Cf. also the new Long Latin L 3 ms. (Arnhem) *super canale aque* (Silverstein & Hilhorst 1997, [39], p. 147, line 18). This Arnhem ms. is based "in considerable part" on the L 1 tradition (ibid., p. 16).

\(^{39}\) It may be argued too that the startling corruptions of the phrase in D (Ro8E: *super alenantes aque*; Pem2: *superba voluntes atque*; Ro8F: *superbos volantes et*) can also be traced to an antecedent *super canell[las] aque*. Silverstein (1935, p. 114 n. 54) considered that *alenantes* [which he read here as *alenantis*] was "evidently a form of 'alenhare', a variant form of 'anhelare'; see Du Cange, Glossarium (Niort ed., 1883, I, 174), s. v.: 'Alenhare. ...'. If *alenantes* is a corruption of *canell[las]*, the present participle of this verb could be the result of misreading *-as as a(n)s* and then adjusted to the plural after the suppression or loss of the initial 'c'. However the form *anhelare* would better explain the variants in Pem2 (*volantes*) and Ro8F (*volantes*) i.e. that 'n' was read as 'v' after initial 'a' was either dropped or separated and added to *super* (giving rise to the scribe's conjectured *superba*/*superbos*).

\(^{40}\) Add, Pa10 & Ro11 (=B1); Mer & TriD5 (=B2). in quodam loco quasi super camelos sedentes: Ro8C (=B2). Pra (=B2) omits ss. 34-5.

\(^{41}\) Arun in Family E (which derives from B1 in the first half of its version of red. IV) also has *super camelos*.

\(^{42}\) e.g. both *resurrectionem* and *bonitatem* in s. 65, also *angeli* and *deo cum omnibus sanctis* in the transposed s. 69. See Appendix F, IV Apparatus ad loc.

\(^{43}\) However StJD later has connections with Family E and, given the disastrous state of s. 34 in several of the D family, it may have borrowed *camelos* later and applied it retrospectively. On StJD and Family E see chapter 6 above.
it would suggest the association of the B and D families as in fig. 2, with *canela* in (Z) and *canelas* in (Y). However, *camelos* could also have resulted from *ca(n)elos*, the masculine noun *canellus* being one of the three variants in each of the three genders, *canella -um -us*, given in the Dictionary of Medieval Latin from British Sources. It has been proposed above that both the neuter plural *canela* (A/C) and feminine plural *cane(l)las* (D) derived from the original Long Latin *canela*. If, instead of either of these variants, B independently chose the masculine plural, then all three genders would be represented in the extant Redaction IV texts. In the context of figure 1, this would mean that the Long Latin form *canela* appeared in both (X) and (Z).

Another example of a possible discrepancy for figure 1 is the grammatical structure of s. 7, describing the sinners hanging in the Fiery Trees. Families B and D use *per* plus the accusative to list the parts of the body by which the sinners are suspended, Family A and the subgroup C2 use ablatives, and the principal C group, C1, mainly has *per* plus the accusative for the first item of the list and uses the ablative for the rest. Of the sources of Redaction IV, only Redaction III has the hanging sinners and this uses the ablative for the list: the Redaction III list, however, is dependent on *ligati* rather than on *pendebant* as in Redaction IV. This could suggest that the early form of Redaction IV had ablatives, and that the alternative structure in B and D was due to a change made by a common antecedent (hence fig. 2). However, if *per* plus the accusative is a simplification of an original ablative construction to a more popular form, the change could have occurred independently as presumably happened in the case of *descenderunt* in C and D against the verifiable *exierunt* in A and most of B in section 4. Conversely, the ablative construction in A might be a correction, to a more classical form, of the more popular construction introduced into the early form of the redaction together with the change to *pendebant* from Redaction III's *ligati*. Either process (simplifying or 'improving') could account for the presence of both constructions in C1, and for the only example of the ablative

---

45 Also Family E which depends on B in its first half.
46 Red. III <9>: alii pedibus (erant) ligati, alii manibus etc; red. IV <7>: alii pendebant pedibus/per pedes etc.
47 Mu14 & Pa32 have *per pedes, alii manibus* and ablatives in the remainder of the list; TriD2 has *per pedes* for the first item, ablatives for the following two, then *per* accusative for the final two; Pem1 has all ablatives, but the presence of *ligati* in s. 7 and the red. III passage <4-8>
construction in B, i.e. Pra(=B2), where for one of the items in the list, the form *linguas* is deleted in favour of *linguis*, suggesting that the scribe was either correcting a *per* + accusative list in his copy or (perhaps less likely) slipping into a simpler form.

The above discrepancies while not, perhaps, conclusively contradicting the interrelationship of B to the other families indicated in figure 1, nevertheless at least question its reliability. On the other hand, the evidence adduced above, supporting figure 1, would raise questions about figure 2. No firmly based overall interrelationship of the five families has therefore emerged here; however, some patterns of family convergence and divergence have been established on the evidence of the variants considered. The full range of the variants indicating the complex family interrelationship of the extant Redaction IV texts, is given in the Apparatus in Appendix F.

**A Base Text for Redaction IV**

In Appendix F, the Redaction IV texts are collated against a hypothetical base text devised for this purpose. This is proposed as a more neutral template than the Brandes edition of a text of the A family, against which to map the agreements and disagreements of variants in the surviving witnesses of Redaction IV, and thus to illustrate the affiliation of groups of texts and to enable, as a practical outcome, the identification and classification of any new texts of the redaction which may come to light. This base text is not a critical text since conclusions for a firm theoretical basis for such a text have not been reached. It is instead eclectic, and for the choice between variants, it takes account of the interrelationship proposed in figure 1 above, and of readings in the sources of the redaction postulated by Theodore Silverstein, which may support a particular variant. These two factors provide limited guidance, however, and do not account for all decisions made for the base text. For example an emendation, *canela*, is proposed in s. 34 to account for the variants

*Oportet...cochiton*; Silverstein 1935, [1] & [2], p. 160: 8 - p. 163: 6) in s. 5, suggests that Pεm1 was using red. III in the first seven sections of its text, after which it is clearly red. IV; Bm11 has only 3 items in its list, all of which use *per* + accusative - although this may be due to a desire for consistency of structure after the initial *per pedes* found in other C1 mss. (The edited version of C1, Mel, has the same 3 items and the same structure.)
which figure 1 would not otherwise explain (as discussed above), and two particular variants are included primarily, but not wholly in the case of the first, on the basis of their significance as further evidence for the Irish origin of Redaction IV which has been argued persuasively elsewhere; these are bardigium magnum in section 14 and etanael in section 66.

The first of these occurs in various forms in the Admonition (s. 14) which is exclusive to Redaction IV and thus its contents cannot be verified from any of the redaction's sources. In the A family version of this warning about the things to be feared in Hell, four texts have bargidium magnum after gemitus cordis in the list, another A text and the two C2 texts have bragidium magnum and one B2 text has bardigium magnum; the error brachium magnum in this position in Mu14(=C1), is probably a corruption of bragidium magnum.

In none of its forms is this noun to be found in dictionaries of classical or medieval Latin. However one form of it appears in number 1, 26 of the Irish Canons in Ludwig Bieler's *Penitentials*, "Poenitentia bardigi #capalbiae post laicum vel laicam .l. dies in pane et aqua (Hi I. 26)", which Bieler translates as:- "The penance for wailing ....after (the death of) a layman or a laywoman, fifty days on bread and water." Later in the Bigotian Penitential, 6 De Clamore Canones Patrum, concerning the "clamour aroused by grief" ("clamore dolore excitatus"), number 2 reads:- Penitentia bardicationis glandellae post obitum laici vel laicae .l. dies et noctes in pane et aqua (Bi IV. 6,2), which is translated as:- "The penance for the wailing of a female dependant after the death of a layman or laywoman, fifty days on bread and water." Bieler lists bardicatio and bardigium (the latter with an interrogation mark) as "distinct Hibernicisms"
among other words which he describes as "common Celtic words that were known also to the ancients."\(^{56}\)

The form *bardigium* is found in Pra(=B2) and the forms of the word in the other mss. of Families A and C, are close variants of it. The meaning of "wailing" assigned to *bardigium* by Bieler, is appropriate in the context in which it appears in Redaction IV, and is reflected in what is apparently a substitution for the term in Bm11(=C1), which has *clamor magnus*. A closer translation of the term is to be found in Redaction V, which is mainly a version of Redaction IV of the Family B type: .. *in quo est dolor et gemitus, in quo est ululatus et planctus* etc.\(^{57}\) The presence of the term or its probable substitutions in A/C and B would indicate that it must have appeared in (Z) and (X), if figure 1 is followed; there is no trace of it in the extant texts of the D family, but the Irish origin of the term suggests that it may well have figured also in the original form of the redaction.\(^{58}\)

Irish or insular influences in Redaction IV have been identified by several scholars. For example a Celtic source - the *Apocrypha Priscillianistica* - has been suggested by Theodore Silverstein for the interpolation of the fiery wheel.\(^{59}\) Also, two stylistic features of this redaction have been proposed by C. D. Wright, as evidence of Irish influence;\(^{60}\) they are, firstly, the resemblance of its characteristic opening sentence *dies dominicus dies est electus* or *dies letus* to a phrase in one of the *Dies Dominicus* lists classified by R. E. McNally as Hiberno-Latin,\(^{61}\) and secondly, the question and answer *Interrogandum est quis primus rogavit ut anime haberent requiem in inferno* etc. in sections 2-4, which reflects the formula classed as an Irish symptom by Bernard Bischoff.\(^{62}\) (The question and answer form for the number of the pains of Hell (s. 70) may be added to this.) The *Interrogandum* sentence appears also in Redaction III and it has been proposed by the present writer elsewhere that the origin of several features of

---

\(^{56}\) Bieler 1963, p. 37.


\(^{58}\) The phrase *tristicia sine leticia* occurring in the same list in s. 14, can also be noted in the examples of enumerating antitheses in Hiberno-Latin works, given by R. E. McNally, 1979, pp. 129 & 130.

\(^{59}\) Silverstein 1935, p. 76.

\(^{60}\) Wright 1993, p. 109, n. 15.


\(^{62}\) Bischoff 1976, pp. 84, 88 & 102.
Redactions III and IV can be traced to the pre-alpha Redaction XI (also showing Irish or insular influence\(^\text{63}\)) through the second hypothetical source \(\textit{Beta}\), proposed for them by Silverstein in 1935.\(^\text{64}\)

In the light of these established Irish connections for Redaction IV itself, it would seem very probable that \textit{bardigium} was not first introduced by a particular ancestor of A/C and B (i.e. X), but was inherited from the original form of the redaction. The strangeness of the word would account for its omission, not only by the generally more conservative Family D,\(^\text{65}\) but also in a large number of mss. in the other family groups.

The second significant variant, \(\textit{etanael}\), occurs in the badly corrupted \textit{hostiarius} section (s. 66), and although it is found in only one text, the possible Irish origin of the word and the parlous state of the section in the extant texts of Redaction IV could perhaps justify its inclusion in the Base Text as the best, even if flawed, witness to the original form. Section 66 evidently had a troubled passage through the tradition, and the name of the \textit{hostiarius} is given variably across the families. At times his name is confused or substituted with the name of his dog, thus he is called \textit{Cerberus}, or \textit{canis}, or both i.e. \textit{canis cerberus}. In other cases he is named separately from his dog as \textit{ac(h)aron, erner, eternalis} etc.\(^\text{66}\) Two of the names given in this latter group are of special interest, i.e. \textit{etanael} in \textit{TriD6(=D)}, and (?)\textit{hestronel} in \textit{Ro8C(=B2)}.\(^\text{67}\)

The name \textit{etanael} could be derived from Satanaël, which was the name of Satan before his rebellion and fall.\(^\text{68}\) The name does not occur widely, but it has

\(^{63}\) See e.g. C. D. Wright (1990).

\(^{64}\) These features are the sinners hanging in the fiery trees in redactions III and IV, the addition of the furnace, also in III and IV, and a particular phrase in red. IV describing the \textit{bestie dyabolice} in the horrible river, \textit{quasi pisces in medio maris} (Dwyer 1988, pp. 134-6).

\(^{65}\) D's conservative tendency is witnessed, for example, by the preservation of a version of the Long Latin \textit{cum exierint de ecclesia} in s. 21, and the \textit{Scimus enim} sentence in s. 55, also traceable to the Long Latin (see LLx 5 & LLx 28 or James 1893, [31]. p. 28: 35-6 & [43], p. 35: 2-3).


\(^{67}\) TriD6(=D): cui nomen etanael et nomen canis eius serberus; Ro8C(=B2): cui nomen (?)hestronel et canis eius cui nomen cherberius.

been found in texts with strong Irish connections, notably the 8th-century ms. of the Question and Answer series, the *Joca Monachorum*, believed to have been written in the Irish monastery of St Gall. In this text Q. 43 is *Quis de thronum descendit*, and the answer is: *Satanaël, et Iudae infelix.* It has been pointed out by C. D. Wright that the name also occurs in another 8th-century text, a fragment on creation in a ms. classified as Hiberno-Latin, where it is stated that: *factus est primus satanahel.*

It is possible therefore that the name *etanael* in TriD6(=D), although corrupted in transmission, could be further evidence of an Irish or insular influence on Redaction IV which has survived only in this area of the redaction. On this argument *etanael* would be the closest form of an original name Satanaël, and would be echoed, but further corrupted, in Ro8C(=B2), (?)*hestronel*. The strange word would soon have been conjectured to be *eternal* and then *eternalis* or *eternaliter* as the scribes struggled to make sense of the passage, as witnessed by the versions in some of the extant texts, e.g. in Family A *cui nomen canis cerberus eternal/eternalis est* and *cui nomen canis et cerberus eternaliter (elevavit caput suum).* The name of the *hostiarius* is given as *eternalis* in one C1 text and also in two D texts, and what is possibly a corruption of it appears in C2, i.e. *certnal/?(?)ceternalis*. Elsewhere it is either dropped as in Family B (except for TriD5(=B2) where it is further modified: *cui nomen est canis scilicet cerberus tria habens capita canina eternalia*), or it is further corrupted as in Bm11(=C1): *erner*; in desperation perhaps, it is arbitrarily replaced in Mu14 and Pa32(=C1) with *ac(h)aron.*

---

69 Dando 1979, pp. 16–21, at p. 16 & p. 19. Dando claimed that the *Joca Monachorum* texts are probably Irish productions (1981, pp. 27–8 and 1979 p. 17), and although C. D. Wright is somewhat less convinced of this (Wright 1987, p. 137), he has demonstrated the strong Irish connections of other texts in the St Gall ms. 908, in which this version of the *Joca Monachorum* is found (Wright 1987, pp. 124 145).

70 Wright 1987, pp. 142–3, n. 94.

71 Wright further suggests that the name Sathiel is a variant of Satanaël, and that this is one of the indications of an Irish background for the *Pater Noster Dialogue*. He notes that it appears also as a gloss - identified as Irish - for the *draco* of Psalm LXXIII (14) in the Southhampton Psalter (Wright 1993, p. 255 & p. 255 n. 147).

72 Vat, Bru.

73 Vi; Mu12(=D) which is related to Family A at this point has: *cui nomen cerberus canis ubi eternaliter est.*

74 TriD2: *qui vocatur eternalis*

75 Ro8F and ?Pem2.
The proposition that Satanaël, or a corruption of it similar to etanael, lies behind the array of corrupted or substitute variants in the extant mss. of Redaction IV, is supported by the form of the name given to the hostiarius in the earliest form of one of Redaction IV's sources, Redaction IIIa. There it appears as Tenal: *et ostiarius inferni, cui nomen est tenal (et nomen canis eius Cerberus)*,76 which can easily be related to Satanaël, and the whole Redaction IIIa phrase is reflected in TriD6(=D) *et ostiarius inferni cui nomen etanael et nomen canis eius serberus*.77

A third feature of the base text, which is influenced by a possible Irish origin for the redaction, is likely to be more controversial. This is the change in the opening sentence from *dies est electus*, which has become so familiar over the more than 100 years of the Brandes edition, to *dies letus*. The latter appears only in the D family against *electus* in Families A and B and the subgroup C2; the first section is omitted in C1. Palaeographically the two words or their abbreviated form are very similar and one could easily give rise to the other. However the inclusion of *letus* in the base text was influenced by two factors, the connection with the Irish *Dies Dominicus* lists noted by C.D. Wright,78 one of which has *dies letus*,79 and the presence of this variant in a Brno ms. which contains what may be an antecedent version of Redaction IV, and which will be discussed in chapter 9.

Apart from what may be called its Irish elements, the text proposed on the basis of figure 1 and with reference to the redaction's sources, differs in some respects from the Brandes edition, most notably syntactically. The published version of Redation IV is, with few emendations, a Family A text whose use of subordination, compression and varied word order distinguishes it from the paratactic style of the texts in the other families. The base text in Appendix F reflects the plainer language of the other families and, on the evidence of the other redactions, this may be closer to the original linguistic

---

76 Silverstein 1935, IIIa [20], p. 192; 1-3. No name is given in any other red. III text, except for Corpus Christi Cambridge, 20, f. 67v, col. b, lines 31-32, where it is corrupted: *est nomen Hay*. Cf. Appendix E <70>.

77 As noted earlier, Ro8C had a habit of borrowing from red. III, and the name ?hestronel may also have come from there and reproduced as found or further garbled.

78 Wright 1993, p. 109, n. 15.

form. Thus, although not a critical text, and although its primary purpose here is as a reference for the apparatus of variants, it may yet give some idea of the early form of Redaction IV.
PART III

THE COMPOSITE REDACTIONS

The composite redactions are those versions of the *Visio Pauli* in which two redactions are combined to form a new redaction. Theodore Silverstein identified five such compilations, Redactions V, VII, VIII, IX and X.¹ The sources from which Redactions V, IX and X are drawn are Redactions III and IV, while those used for Redactions VII and VIII are Redactions I and IV.

The Redaction I and Redaction III components in these combined redactions have been discussed with the other mss. of those source redactions above.² The classification of the Redaction IV families now permits the versions of Redaction IV used in these later redactions to be identified also.

---

¹ Silverstein 1935, pp. 56-7 (red. V), pp. 54-46 (red. VII), pp. 57-88 (red. VIII); Silverstein 1959, pp. 219-223 (red. IX), pp. 218-219 (red. X).
² See chapter 1 (red. I) and chapter 3 (red. III).
Chapter 8
THE III/IV REDACTIONS V AND X, AND TWO FURTHER III/IV TEXTS

1. Redaction V

The text of Redaction V, based on its two mss. and on "a fragmentary printed edition," was published by Theodore Silverstein in 1935. In his analysis of its contents, Silverstein identified the main components of this version of the Visio Pauli, i.e.:-

a) a new introduction describing an upper and a lower Hell, the former being purgatorial and the latter eternal,

b) a text of Redaction IV with some variations, and

c) the addition to the conclusion of the hymn Veni Creator.

Among the variations, he noted two passages which are inserted between the description of the Furnace and the Admonition, i.e. sections 13 and 14 of the Redaction IV text. These passages, together with the explanatory comment on the immortality of the soul added to the preceding section 13, comprise the most substantial variation of the text of Redaction IV used in Redaction V (S.197: 10-21). The first is a list enumerating septem penas which St Paul saw in Hell; this replaces the list of seven 'plage' in Redaction IV, which occurs earlier, however, at the beginning of the description of the Furnace (s. 9). Silverstein identified the seven forms of punishment given in Redaction V as "closely parallel [to] those of III especially those as found in S3 (IIIc)."

This passage is followed in the text of Redaction V by the Oportet nos (here vos) phrase which appears at the beginning of Redactions I and II, and after the new Interrogandum opening of Redaction III. The connection of the

---


2 The section numbers given here are those of red. IV; locations in Silverstein's edition of red. V which is not divided into sections, are referred to by page and line number, preceded by S.; e.g. the explanatory comment is at S.196: 10-13.

3 Silverstein 1935, p. 57.

4 Red. V: Oportet nos, fratres carissimi, amare deum et delicias paradisi et metuere penas inferni, que ostendite fuerunt Sancto Paulo apostolo, quando missus fuit carcere (5.196: 19-21). Cf. e.g. red. IIIa <4>: Oportet nos timere penas inferni et amare delicias paradisi que ostense sunt Paulo quando in carne fuit (Silverstein 1935, [1], p. 160: 8-11).
preceding list of punishments with Redaction III would suggest that this
passage too was borrowed from the same source. However, in noting the word
order of the phrase in Redaction V, amare ... metuere..., which is the same as that
in the Redaction I version of the phrase, amare ... timere, Silverstein asked: 'Has
V borrowed also from Redaction I, or is the order of its phrases accidental in a
passage which otherwise it might be expected to have drawn from III?' The
answer would seem to be that, unless the redactor was using a lost version of
Redaction III, he was drawing here on Redaction I. In both Redaction V and
Redaction I the order of phrases is the same, and in both it is stated that St
Paul’s vision took place while he was in carcere; in Redaction III the order of the
phrase is reversed, timere ... amare, and the vision took place while St Paul was in
carne.6

The text of Redaction IV begins at section 6 with the Fiery Trees (S.196: 17), and proceeds through to section 72 with the following omissions: section 9
listing the seven plage,7 section 19, the first and third part of section 47,8 and the
whole of section 54.9 As noted above, the comment on the immortality of the
soul (revealing again the didactic tendency of the redactor, already evidenced in
the new introduction) and the two borrowed passages (the septem penas and the
opertet phrase), are interpolated before section 14,10 and the opening dies
dominicus sentence, displaced by the new Redaction V introduction, is inserted
between sections 68 and 69, to preface the reward for Sunday observance.11
The effect of two further internal omissions may also be noted. The first is the
reduction of the latter part of s. 17 to a bald statement by the elimination of the
detail included in the Redaction IV version (S.198: 6-7), and secondly, the
omission of se with maculaverunt in s. 31 makes infantes suos the object of this
verb as well as necaverunt (S.199: 14). Otherwise, with the exception of the
change from chagrin to giving thanks in hostiarius section which will be

---

5 ibid., p. 116 n. 77.
6 In red. II, although St Paul is in carcere, the order of the phrase is timere ... amare.
7 S.197: 5.
8 The omission of these parts of s. 47 and the rephrasing of what remained, has reduced it to
just 'quare/quasi non custodisti mandata dei' (S.200: 23).
10 S.197: 10-21.
11 S.202: 15.
discussed below, the few alterations to the text of Redaction IV consist of several small expansions and some minor rephrasing. 12

The linguistic texture of the version of Redaction IV used in Redaction V shows that it belonged to the B family. 13 The following features in particular, demonstrate this:- the construction *per* plus the accusative (but not the word order) 14 in the list of ways in which the sinners are hanging from the fiery trees in s. 7 (S.197:1-2), *ponebantur* and *seculo* in s. 10 (S.197: 5 & 7), *unusquisque* in s. 11 (S.197: 7), *requirunt* in s. 27 (S.199: 6), *qui igne urebantur* and *frigebant* in s. 32 (S.199: 17 & 18), *super humanum genus* in s. 38 (S.200: 6), *numquam fiet* in s. 41 (S.200: 11), *baptizantur* and *communicantur* in s. 42 (S.200: 14 & 15), *quid fecisti* in s. 46 (S.200: 22), *auditus est sonus* in s. 58 (S.201: 16-17), *habentem* in s. 58 (S.201: 19), *rursum* in s. 59 (S.201: 20), *ad potandum* in s. 61 (S.202: 1), *set iniqui ... vestra* added to s. 61 (S.202: 4-5), *propter preces and concedo* in s. 65 (S.202: 7-8 & 9), the full text of s. 68 (S.202: 13-15), the short form of the transposed opening sentence, s. 1, but with *et omnes sancti* added (S.202: 16), *ceteras* in s. 71 (S.202: 21) and *tanta tormenta*, but without *gehenne* in s. 72 (S.202: 23). 15

Several features indicate also that this version of IV belonged to the B1 subgroup of Family B; they are: *pontem habet* in s. 17 (S.198: 6), *non revertuntur ad penitenciam* in s. 22 (S.198: 18), *reliqui* in s. 23 (S.198: 18), *aperuit os* in s. 40 (S.200: 9), *flebimus* in s. 56 (S.201: 12), *voce* in s. 58 (S.201: 17), the omission of *quid ... requiem* in s. 60 (S.201: 22), and *angeli milia milium* in s. 64 (S.202: 6).

Within B1 several variants would seem to ally this version of IV in particular with two mss. of the small internal cluster, Bo2, Bal & Mi. The first was pointed out by Silverstein in his discussion of Redaction V, 16 i.e. the

---

12 e.g. S.197: 2-3 (*cumque ... habuit*) & 16-18 (*Post ... potest*); S.198: 5 (*rodunt*) & 16 (*id est ... consensunt*); S.199: 11 (*circundabant eas*); S.201: 7-8 (*ubi erant ... sequi*); S.202: 17 (*Qui vero ... condempnabitur*) & 24-25 (*ut dignetur ... eternam*).

13 Cf. the description of this family in chapter 5 above.

14 The word order, 3, 4, 5, 2, 1, is peculiar to redaction V. See the IV Apparatus ad loc.

15 It may be observed also that in s. 64, all of Family B except Ro8C (=B2) substitute *orantes* for *ante* before *dei filium* [the word order of the latter is typical of the majority of B: see IV Apparatus ad loc.]. Red. V has *rogaverunt dei filium* which may possibly be the result of the paraphrase of the first part of this section: *quando audivit Sanctus Michael, Sanctus Paulus et angeli milia milium rogaverunt dei filium etc.* (S.202: 5-6).

16 Silverstein 1935, pp. 56-57.
reading Quando hoc audivit hostiarius inferni qui vocatur Cerberus, et qui cum eo erant in inferno, gracias egerunt deo et dixerunt Benedicimus te (S.202: 11-13) which he connected to the version in the ms. here referred to as Bo2, i.e. Et ostiarius inferni, qui dicitur Serberus qui canis est exaltavit capud suum super omnes qui erant in inferno, et clamaverunt una voce dicentes Benedicimus te ...(ss. 66 & 67). In both the hostiarius appears to be giving grateful praise to Christ for the granting of the respite to the souls in Hell. Silverstein did not comment further but it would seem likely that the Bo2 version occurred by homoeoteleuton in a full version reading: <66> ...exaltavit caput suum super omnes penas inferni/ omnes qui erant in inferno [et contristatus est valde <67> et letati sunt omnes qui erant in inferno ] et clamaverunt una voce dicentes benedicimus te etc.17 As such, it could have occurred independently, however the redactor of V would seem here to be paraphrasing a text in which it had already happened.

A further connection between the IV text used in Redaction V, and the internal B1 cluster, is the variant veniretis instead of viveretis in s. 62 (S.202: 2), which would seem to link it with another of the B1 texts, Bal, which has veneritis. Other Bo2 and Bal connections with Redaction V may also be noted: Bo2 also has in celum et terram in s. 45 (S.200: 20) where all the other B texts have inter celum et terram, and Bal also has auditus est sonus voces in s. 58 (S.201: 17)18 where the other B1 texts (Mi, Add, Pa10) have voces. Outside this cluster but still within B1, Redaction V shares the reading non vidisti adhuc in s. 38 (S.200: 6-7), with Pa10 which is the only B1 text which has this; all the others have variations of nam videbis adhuc (see the IV Apparatus ad loc.). However, no extant text of B1 could have been the source for Redaction V since the version of IV used in Redaction V contains authentic text in s. 31 which none of the B1 texts retain, i.e. vel posuerunt in fluminibus aut aliis perditionibus et postea penitenciam non fecerunt (S.199: 15-16).

Three other variants in Redaction V are of some significance. The first is the apparent translation of bardigium in the Admonition in s. 14, ululatus et planctus (S.197: 22-3), which was noted in the discussion of this word in chapter 7; the only B family text which has bardigium or a variant for it is Pra (=B2). The

---

17 See IV Apparatus ad loc.
18 The variant vocis from the fragmentary printed edition is given in Silverstein's apparatus, p. 201:17.
second variant of interest is the inclusion of the verbalisation of St Paul's lament in s. 38 (S.200: 5): Ve peccatoribus et qui nati sunt. No other B1 text has this, but it is one of the phrases which two of the B2 group (Ro8C & Pra) appear to have borrowed from an antecedent of Family D. 19 Although this would seem to link Redaction V with B2, it should be noted that the phrase also appears in both Redaction III and Redaction I, with one or both of which Redaction V has had other contact, and thus one or other of these may have been the source here. This possibility is strengthened by the phrase added to this section in V, i.e. modo videbis (S.200: 7). In both Redactions I and III, as well as in the Long Latin, the angel's reply consists of two sentences, Nondum vidisti maiora penas inferni and Sequere me et videbis maiora (tormenta), and therefore this may be another instance of the influence of Redaction III or Redaction I in Redaction V. The third variant of interest is camena or ?camona for the tortured phrase super canela aque in s. 34 (S.199: 19). No other text in Family B or in any of the Redaction IV families has this, the nearest perhaps being super arenam in two texts of Family E (Erf & StJF).

The conclusion would seem to be therefore, that the Redaction IV text on which Redaction V was based was a text of the B family which has not survived; it had some characteristics of B1, but it was one in which all the changes in the extant versions of B1 had not yet taken place. 20

2. Redaction X

The composition of Redaction X is the opposite of that of Redaction V, being, in the words of Theodore Silverstein who identified it in 1959, "essentially ... a text of III into which have been introduced four passages from the popular Redaction IV, borrowed whole or with slight alterations." 21 Silverstein published the text of this redaction 22 from the 14th-century ms.

---

19 See the discussion in chapter 7 above.
20 e.g. the change from per septem flammas to septem flammis in s. 8 (cf. S.201: 4), the omission of the last part of s. 31 after escam (cf. S.199: 15-16) and the omission of tunc dyaboli susceperunt eam in s. 48 (cf. S.200: 23-4). The absence of orantes in s. 64, which the B family itself substituted for ante before filium dei, may be the result of redaction V's paraphrase of the first part of this section: quando audivit Sanctus Michael, Sanctus Paulus et angeli milia milium rogaverunt dei filium etc. (S.202: 5-6).
22 Silverstein 1959, pp. 244-247.
which is its only witness.\textsuperscript{23} The Catalogue of the University Library of Uppsala identifies a text in the early 15th-century MS. C. 77, ff. 91r-93v, as "Visio Pauli. Red. X."\textsuperscript{24} However, this is a text of Redaction III which does not contain the interpolations from Redaction IV which characterise Redaction X.\textsuperscript{25} It is however a text with a close relationship to the text of Redaction III which is used in Redaction X. The latter was identified by Silverstein in his 1959 discussion as being of the IIIc type and in particular a "form close to the combination of M3 and S2."\textsuperscript{26} It has been shown above in chapter 3, that the Redaction III text in Redaction X (referred to as 3/10) shares a proximate antecedent with S2 and the Uppsala C. 77 text in the IIIc group.\textsuperscript{27}

The passages from Redaction IV used in Redaction X were identified by Silverstein in his discussion; they are:-

a) the opening sentence,

b) the Admonition and the Fiery Wheel (IV: ss.14-15; X: [3a]),\textsuperscript{28}

c) the Horrible River and the Bridge (IV: ss. 16-19; X: [3b]), and

d) the Number of the Pains in Hell (IV: ss. 70-71; X: [15a]).

To these may be added:

e) the last sentence of the Reproaches in IV (s. 63), which is inserted before the first sentence of the Redaction IIIc reproaches in X: [15],

f) the \textit{hostiarius} section (IV: s. 66) at the beginning of X: [20], which is lacking in IIIc, and

g) the conclusion of IV (s. 72), which is added to the IIIc conclusion in X: [21].

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{23} Venice, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, lat. VI. 30 [Zanetti, lat. D VII], ff. 79r-80v.
\item \textsuperscript{24} \textit{Mittelalterliche Handschriften der Universitätsbibliothek Uppsala}, Stockholm 1988, Band 2, pp. 90-96.
\item \textsuperscript{25} The Uppsala Catalogue is the source for the reference to the \textit{Visio Pauli} in MS. C. 77 as redaction X in Silverstein & Hilhorst, 1997, p. 39, n. 37. where the hand of this ms. and that of the early 15th-century Arnhem ms. of the Long Latin text of the \textit{Visio}, are described as "remarkably similar."
\item \textsuperscript{26} Silverstein 1959, p. 219.
\item \textsuperscript{27} See e.g. the proposed redrawn stemma of red. III at the end of chapter 3.
\item \textsuperscript{28} Silverstein's sections in red. X reflect the corresponding sections in IIIc with the exception of [21]; there are the same omissions i.e. of [12] & [16] (although both in red. X and IIIc the last part of [15] should be in [16]). The interpolated passages in red. X are indicated as subsections, i.e. [3a] etc.
\end{itemize}
The source of these Redaction IV passages is immediately recognisable from the distinction of major and minor punishments in the version of IV: ss. 70-71 (maiores penas ... et de minoribus penas...) in X: [15a], as belonging to Family C1. This is confirmed in the same section by the three pluperfect subjunctives (fuissent ... habuisset and potuissent) and the doublet enarrare ... vel dinumerare, and by typical C1 features in other sections, e.g. O maledicti (IV: s. 64) in X: [19], qui vocatur (IV: s. 66) in X: [20], and converti debemus (IV: s.72) in X: [21]. Of the extant C1 mss., no one in particular can be identified as the direct source. Among the agreements of the Redaction X passages with the C1 mss., TriD2 recurs often, and in some cases is the only C1 ms. to agree with the Redaction X version, e.g. qui vocatur eternalis for the name of the hostarius (IV: s. 6; X: [20]) and cruciacionem dolorum animarum (IV; s. 14; X: [3a]. However, the characteristic C1 variants in the description of the Fiery Wheel (IV: s.15; X: [3a], mille cubitus or mille rotas instead of mille orbitas, which all the C1 mss share except one (Pem1), are not found in the Redaction X interpolation, which has the correct mille orbitas.

Among the other variants, in una hora instead of in una die, also in the description of the Fiery Wheel, is not found anywhere else in the Redaction IV mss. and may be attributable to the compiler of Redaction X, as perhaps also the variant secundum adventum suum instead of secundum meritum suum in the section on the Bridge (IV: s. 17; X: [3b]). Two other variants in the Redaction X interpolations are of some interest for the C1 group of Redaction IV. Firstly, the opening sentence; this is lacking in all the extant C1 mss. and was either present in the source text of Redaction X, or was added from another Redaction IV family. The form of this sentence is not that of Family A with which Family C is associated, but is the short form found in Family B, with the addition of et arcangeli. The second feature of interest is the word order of the Admonition (IV: s. 14; X: [3a]). The list of things to be feared in Hell begins in Redaction X with tristica sine leticia as it does in Family A, but not in Families B, D or E where it begins with the following item dolor sempiternus. Only two other C1 mss. (Mu14 & Pa32) are similar to Redaction X in this respect, the others omit...
the phrase from their list. The presence of this item and its position in Redaction X's source for the passage, which was undoubtedly a C1 text, would thus further support the case for the association of the C and A families.

TWO FURTHER III/IV COMBINATIONS

Two different combinations of Redactions III and IV which have not been previously studied are contained in the following mss.:

- Dublin, Trinity College, 218, ff. 133r-134v. mid xiii c.
- London, British Library, Add. 37787, ff. 18r-23r. early xv c.

Transcriptions of the text of the *Visio Pauli* in these two mss. are given in Appendix G and Appendix H.

3. Trinity Dublin 218 (=TriD3)

Although presented as a continuous unit, the text of the *Visio Pauli* in this ms. is composed of two parts; the first, as far as the arrival at the Great Well, is based on Redaction III, ss. 2-41,\(^{32}\) and the second on Redaction IV, ss. 39-72.

(i) TriD3 Part I: Redaction III, ss. 2-41.

The version of Redaction III in part one is characterised by a number of omissions within the sections. All the sections are represented except the characteristic opening *Interrogandum* sentence (an unusual omission shared by only three other Redaction III mss.),\(^{33}\) but a series of omissions within the sections points to an abbreviating tendency in the compiler of this text. This can be seen immediately in the first few sections where, after the omission of the opening sentence, s. 2 is rephrased and the detail of the place of St Paul's vision is suppressed. In s. 17 the list of the sinners in the mouth of the *draco* (which varies considerably between the mss. of this redaction) is altered and reduced from *omnes satrape terre et exauditores/exactores et mali ministratores et accusatores*

\(^{32}\) Silverstein 1935, [1]-[14], pp. 160-179, also 1959, pp. 229-232 (Brussels ms.). The section numbers used in this discussion and in the transcription of the text given in Appendix G are those of the relevant redaction as renumbered for this study; for red. III the section numbers in Silverstein's edition are also given (in square brackets) in the text of TriD3 in the Appendix, and cited by page and line number preceded by S. in this discussion.

\(^{33}\) The eleventh-century Brussels ms. and the two IIId mss., M4 & Vi.
cum aliis senioribus/servitoribus suis to the different and more succinct divites huius seculi et principes qui male iudicant. Similarly the list in s. 33 naming malefici et perfidi et periuratores et falsitores, is reduced to malefici malefactores. Other sections are abbreviated by the deletion of substantial units within them, i.e. the second part of s. 21, (nolunt/nec volunt audire verbum dei ... non sunt pacifici), the worms eating the souls in s. 30, and the places in addition to the river, where the bodies of the murdered infants were disposed of in s. 40; the whole of section 34 has been reduced to et adulterium fecerunt. Some smaller omissions may be the result of carelessness, but the overall effect of these consistent omissions is that of a planing away of detail; e.g. the omission of false describing the young women in s. 36, of semper (and the change of tense from the Imperfect clamabant) in s. 24. of non habens mensuram regarding the Abyss in s. 25, of avari in s. 31, of quatuor as the number of the punishing angels in s. 35 and of septies in describing the degree of the worse punishments not yet seen in s. 41.

On the other hand the composer of this version adds something of his own to his text, for example the comment about the furnace in s. 11, ille locus vitandus est a nobis, and the exclamation in s. 16, mirabilis est ille draco. Some of these changes may be the result of the desire, perhaps, to make better or clearer sense of his copy text, as for example the entirely new identification of the souls immersed in the fiery river ad os. This group is mentioned in a number of Redaction III mss. in the general list of the varying degrees of immersion, but no effort is made by the others to include this in the later explanation of the groups. The composer of the TriD3 version, however, has identified them as those who delighted in worldly vanities (s. 21a). Similarly the usually rather odd group of sinners immersed in the river up to their knees is simplified in s. 19 to detractores qui de proximis suis mala locuti sunt. The change in s. 39 from indute pannis to the more predictable in oleo ferventi, as well as the beating of the same souls by the demons cum virgis ferreis instead of cornibus igneis may be more of this rationalising but diminishing of the text. However, the addition of the twisting of the fiery chains (et eas torquebant) in s. 35, and the remodelling of the draco as the antithesis of the Trinity in s. 14 by the repetition of three instead of mille indicates some creative effort on the part of the composer of TriD3, but this is

---

34 Redaction II has only changed the number of heads to three. In his discussion of the draco, Silverstein sees the influence of Cerberus in the red. II figure "or the serpent in the Apocalypse of John." (Silverstein 1935, p.66).
not so strong that it defeats the overall levelling tendency with the change to *unusquique dens erat quasi gladius acutus* from the more memorable reading elsewhere in Redaction III, where it is the eyes of the *draco* which are like sharp swords. There seems to be no reason for the increase to 107 flames in s. 10, unless the paucity of the usual four seemed inappropriate for Hell. Taken overall then, the result of the compiler’s efforts in the first part of TriD3 is of a plainer, blander text of Redaction III.

The identity and affiliation of the source text on which the first part of TriD3 was based is made difficult by the changes and omissions which have evidently been wrought upon it. However, by using the process of elimination followed by Silverstein in identifying Brussels 67,\(^{35}\) it may be conjectured that TriD3 belongs to the same area of Redaction III as the Brussels text.\(^{36}\) Firstly, it does not have the omissions listed by Silverstein for IIIId, i.e. the omission of the *fundamentum celi* in s. 5, the name of the fiery river in s. 8, and of the description of the *draco*, in ss. 14-17; with regard to the last of the omissions listed, i.e. of the blackened sinners who should appear in s. 34, TriD3 has reduced that section to *et adulterium fecerunt*, with the result that the sinners seem to merge with the preceding group, but arguably the section is not omitted. In contrast to IIIc, TriD3 does not omit the persecutors of widows and orphans (s. 38) and it does not change the identification of the group in s. 33 to solely *incantatrices*. A distinguishing mark of IIIb is the change of the fiery river's name from Cociton to a variant of Phlegethon,\(^{37}\) but TriD3's version, *occidon* in s. 8, is related to the former. Silverstein also eliminated IIIa on the ground of the presence in Brussels 67 of particular changes which were made to the early text of Redaction III (of which IIIa is the best witness), by the subarchetype IIIU from which all the Redaction III versions descend except IIIa. Applying this to TriD3, some of the IIIU changes which can be seen in this text, are the wording of s. 20 *sine confessione erant usque ad mortem* (cf. e.g. IIIa & IIIb, S.168: 3-5), the omission of *super canalem aque* and the rephrasing *appositus erat cibus dulcissimus* in s. 37 (cf. e.g. S.176-177: 5-7), and the omission of *dederunt porcis vel canibus in escam* in s. 40 (cf. e.g. S.178-179: 4-7). Thus, upon these criteria, it would seem that TriD3 should be located, like Brussels 67, as directly descending from IIIU. One

---

\(^{35}\) Silverstein 1959, pp. 213-214.

\(^{36}\) See the red. III stemma at the end of chapter 3 above.

\(^{37}\) See Silverstein 1935, p. 44.
particular feature gives strong support to an association of TriD3 with Brussels 67: the name of the *draco* in TriD3, s. 15, is *parithimon* and in Brussels 67 it is *patimon*, while in the other Redaction III mss. which have it, the name is a variant of *patmot* or *patmor*. In his discussion of the dragon's name, Silverstein observed this split between the variants of the name in other redactions as well, and conjectured that "ambiguity and variation in the copies of *alpha* itself are suggested by the spread of these differences"; however he considered "Parthemon as the best and original reading." The form of the name in TriD3 is even closer to Parthemon than that in Brussels 67, and these two are the only representatives in Redaction III of this variant of the dragon's name.

(ii) **TriD3, Part II: Redaction IV, ss. 39-72.**

The change from Redaction III in TriD3 is indicated by the form of the angel's warning to St Paul on their arrival at the Great Well. In Redaction III, the angel begins his warning: *sta in hoc loco* but in TriD3 the words he uses, *sta a longe*, reflect the form of the warning in Redaction IV (s. 39) as well as Redaction I (s. 38) and the Long Latin (LLx24). This is not an isolated borrowing from another redaction because the text being used for TriD3 in the whole of the second part is recognisable as Redaction IV. Although all the episodes recounted in the second part of TriD3 are contained in both Redaction III and Redaction IV (with the exception of the last section which is in Redaction IV only), the order of the narrative in the account of the Coming of Christ, the Reproaches and the Granting of the Respite as well the verbal texture in the second part, identify TriD3's source as Redaction IV.

An examination of the verbal texture of part 2 of TriD3 reveals that the compiler used two versions of Redaction IV, ss. 39-72. The middle section of

---

38 Silverstein 1959, [4], p. 230: 3.
39 See e.g. S.166: 1-2.
41 Cf. discussion of the name in chapters 1 and 2 above.
42 James 1893, [41], p. 34: 1.
43 Red. I is eliminated as the source for TriD3, *inter alia* because it does not contain all the episodes, e.g. the Going-Out of the Souls; similarly the other direct derivatives of *alpha*.
44 In red. III the incidents in the narrative are re-ordered so that Christ's speech is presented in two parts, the Reproaches and the Granting of the Respite being separated by the transposed intervention of the Archangel (see Silverstein 1935, [19], pp. 184-191), whereas in red. IV the Granting of the Respite immediately follows the end of the Reproaches as it does in the original Long Latin (see LLx 32-33; James 1893, [44], p.36: 1-20).
part 2, corresponding to IV ss. 55-68, has the unmistakable hallmarks of a C1
text, as a comparison with the description of Family C in chapter 6 above makes
clear, e.g. the order of phrases in s. 57, the omission of s. 59, *O maledicti quare*
*petitis a me veniam* in s. 60, *propter benignitatem meam* in s. 65, etc.
Interestingly, the version of s. 55 is that of C2 rather than C1, i.e. the souls' appeal to the
archangel *et tu paulo dulcissime intercedite pro nobis ad dominum*. It is one of the
characteristics of C1 that the address to Paul in the first part of this phrase is
omitted, and that instead of the souls' appeal for intercession, it is the angel who
exhorts them *intercedite Paulum*; this is then followed by the last part of the
angel's authentic reply in s. 56: *ut suis orationibus det vobis refregirium*. In TriD3 s.
55 reflects C2 rather than C1, but, although both C groups have the
characteristic *orationibus* in s. 56 as TriD3 also has, it is clear that this section
again reflects C1 because the omission here of all but the last phrase of the
section is distinctive of C1 rather than C2. Within the C1 group, the TriD3
version may be linked to Bm11, *quare a me petitis veniam* (s. 60) and *benedicamus*
(s. 67), but also with Pem1, which is the only C1 text to have *cerberus* as the
name of the *hostiarius* (s. 66). Variations from C1 (and C2), either in the source
text or attributable to TriD3, are the singular subject for the verb *exaltavit* in s. 66
and *veniretis (?veneretis)* for *viveretis* in s. 62.

However, if it is clear that a C1 text has been used as the source of the
middle section of part 2 (IV: ss. 55-68), it is equally clear that the same or similar
text has not been used for the preceding section, corresponding to IV: ss. 39-54,
or for the last section, corresponding to IV: ss. 69-72. Apart from aspects of the
verbal texture which distinguish the C family texts, also absent from the TriD3
text are the characteristic C family transpositions of phrases in these sections,
i.e. the opening phrase of s. 45 is not inserted into s. 43, the challenge to the
wicked soul has not been moved from s. 46 to s. 47 (nor does it have the form
*que venis de terra*) and the angel's question in s. 49 has not been not moved to s.
41. The C family characteristics are lacking also in the final section of TriD3 part
2, notably the distinction of major and minor pains in Hell (ss. 70-71).

The text used in the first and last sections of TriD3 part 2, was, instead, a
text belonging to the B family. The opening of s. 40 *aperuit os putei* is typical of

*See the description of the C family in chapter 6 above.*
this group, and also *numquam fiat* (usually *fiat*) *commemoracio eius* in s. 41, the verb forms *baptizantur* and *comunicantur* in s. 42, the place in which the going-out of the wicked soul is witnessed i.e. *inter celum et terram* in s. 45, and the form of the challenge to the wicked soul *quid fecisti in terra* in s. 46. The Family B characteristics in the last section of TriD3 part 2, are quite evident, i.e. the present participle *habens* instead of the conjugated verb in s. 71, and *tormenta iehenne* in s. 72, as well as *dominium nostrum* and the insertion of *valeamus* also in s. 72.

Some distinctive B features may have been obscured by the rephrasing of s. 47 and the first part of s. 48. in favour of the pedestrian *et a carta sua in qua peccata sua erant scripta per confessionem non erant deleta et ideo deducitur in tenebras exteriore* etc. The original passage has been totally recast and the dramatic effect of the scene between the angels and the wicked soul eliminated by the compiler of TriD3, a much more radical diminishment of the original text than was noted for aspects of Redaction III in part 1. Otherwise there are only small innovations to the text, i.e. the worms and serpents eating the souls in s. 43 are replaced by *diaboli cruciantes eos* and *angeli* are added to *sancti* i s. 53; *gaudebant* however, at the end of s. 55, might simply be a paraphrase for the *cum magna leticia* found in many B texts and in Family D, rather than an innovation. The omission of the actual number of the pains of Hell in s. 70 is very unusual, and might be due to the rationalising tendency of the TriD3 compiler noted also in part 1. It would after all make sense not to give the number in view of the impossibility of numbering the pains of Hell asserted in s. 71. Other families have tried to correct the discrepancy by distinguishing major and minor pains (Family C) or by inserting *ceteras* before *omnes penas inferni* as the B family does; this B feature is, however, omitted in TriD3.

The B characteristics which can be identified in the first and last sections of TriD3 part 2 do not include any of the variants specific to the B2 group, for example TriD3 has the nouns *gemitus* and *suspiria* in s. 44 rather than the present participles, and *ululatus magnus* is not added to the end of s. 48. Thus it would appear that TriD3's source for these sections of his compilation came from the main B1 group; from what has been observed, however, it does not appear that any one of the extant B1 texts was that source.
4. Add. 37787 (=Add3)

The use of Redactions III and IV in the text of the *Visio Pauli* contained in Add. 37787 is more complex than in any of the versions described above. This text is composed of five parts which alternate the two source redactions to form a continuous narrative. The five parts are:

(i). Redaction IV, ss. 1-21,
(ii). Redaction III, ss. 20-41,\(^46\)
(iii). Redaction IV, ss. 36-44.
(iv). Redaction III, ss. 48-74,\(^47\)
(v). Redaction IV, ss. 70-72.

In each of the parts in which Redaction III is used, several phrases from the Redaction IV version of the same sections have been inserted,

The first part contains the introduction praising the Lord's day and the origin of the souls' respite, followed by the description of the fiery trees, the furnace, the souls crossing the bridge over the horrible river and the souls immersed to varying depths there. It finishes with St Paul's question about the group immersed up to their knees. Both from the content and the language it is clear that the source of this first part of Add3 is a text of Redaction IV, ss. 1-21, of the Family A type. It has the opening sentence typical of that group, the ablative construction and the inclusion of *auribus* in the list of hanging sinners (s. 7), *tristitia sine leticia* at the beginning of the Admonition (s. 14), the immersion of the souls crossing the bridge (*merguntur*) in s. 17, the repetition of *multe bestie dyabolice* at the beginning of s. 16 and the omission of *secundum sua opera* at the end of s. 19.\(^48\) The source of Add3 appears to have been close to two extant mss of the A family, Bru and TriC, sharing particular features now of one, now of the other. Like Bru it had the second part of s. 5, *et misit deus michaelum* etc., which is omitted in all the other mss. of the main body of Family A texts, but is found in St P; it also included the Bru form *bragidium magnum* in the list of things to be feared in Hell (s. 14), and had other smaller similarities, *homines* instead of *omnes* in s. 11, *cruciantur* instead of *(con)cremantur* in s. 15 and *tantum modo* at the beginning of s. 19. On the other hand, the text of ss. 1-21 in Add3 has several features which link it to TriC among the A family mss.,


\(^{47}\) Silverstein 1935, [17]-[20], p. 182; 3 - p. 193.

\(^{48}\) Cf. the description of Family A in chapter 5 above.
notably *frigus* instead of *fulgur* in the list of *plage* in s. 9 (TriC has *frigidus*) and *hostes* instead of *bestie* in s. 16 and the omission of *lupi* from the same section (although there is a space in the Add3 ms. before *oves*); other smaller features include the agreement of *ardentis* with *ignis* instead of with *fornacem* in s. 8 and *cotidie* in s. 20 instead of *perhenniter* (TriC and StP are the only A texts to have *cotidie*, but both have *perhenniter* as well). Although sharing a significant number of features with TriC, the Add3 text does not have the omissions of TriC in these sections nor its error *die* instead of *vice* in s. 15. Thus Add3's source cannot have been either Bru or TriC themselves, but a text associated with them and closer perhaps to TriC.49

The angel's answer to the question about the identity of the souls immersed up to their knees marks the beginning of the second part. However, the transition to Redaction III is defective, for the identification which is given for these souls is not that of those immersed to their knees, but that of the next group, namely those immersed to the navel. This is not simply an example of homoeoteleuton, it also indicates the change to Redaction III, because the identification of this group is typical of Redaction III, not Redaction IV, i.e. *hii sunt qui fornicantur et sumpserunt corpus et sanguinem christi in invidia* et *ita absque confessione vixerunt usque ad mortem,*50 instead of Redaction IV’s *hi sunt qui fornicantur et adulterant, et postea non revertuntur ad penitenciam usque ad mortem.*51 In addition the phrase identifies the version of Redaction III used in Add3, as one descending from the hypothetical subarchetype IIIU; in contrast, the form in Redaction IIIa which is descended from the archetype is: *qui fornicantur postquam sumpserunt corpus domini et sanguinem, non revertentes ad penitenciam usque ad mortem.*52

The second part of the Add3 text then gives the description of the other groups of suffering souls and their punishments; this is clearly the Redaction III version of the account both in content and order, for example the two groups of

---

49 Where relevant in the discussion below quotations will thus be from Family A mss.
51 Red. IV <22>.
52 Silverstein 1935, [5], p. 168: 2-5. Where relevant in the discussion below, reference will thus be to redactions other than IIIa. Some references to the Silverstein 1935 edition in the text of this chapter will be in the form used above, i.e. by page and line number preceded by S., as e.g. (S.168: 2-5).
unchaste girls and infanticides have not been merged as in Redaction IV (ss. 28-31), and they appear in the Redaction III order of narrative.\textsuperscript{53} Two sections are omitted, however, by homoeoteleuton, i.e. from \textit{et flevit} in s. 31 to \textit{(flevit) et dixit} in s. 33, thus omitting the identification of the \textit{mali divites} in s. 31 and the description of the punishment of the next group in s. 32 (it may be noted that the situation of the latter is somewhat similar to that of the preceding group and may have influenced the omission). A further omission occurs in the same way in s. 34, \textit{mulieres ... (mulieres) que fornicantur},\textsuperscript{54} and the whole of s. 38 (the oppressors of widows and orphans) is lacking. From the content of this part of Add3, the area of Redaction IIIU to which the Redaction III source belonged, can be identified more precisely by a process of elimination. Redactions IIIb and IIIId do not contain s. 34 (S.174-5), and Redaction IIIc identifies the group in s 33 as \textit{incantatrices} only (S.175). The remaining group is that directly descended from IIIU (Brus, Bonn, Buda, Bod) and Pa33.\textsuperscript{55} This is borne out by several links in this part of Add3 to some of those mss., i.e. \textit{in invidia} in Add3 and \textit{cum invidia} in Buda and Bod instead of \textit{immundi} in s. 20, the negative \textit{fidem non habent} in s. 22 of Add3, Buda and Bod, \textit{angeli quatuor} instead of \textit{angeli maligni} in s. 40 of Add3, Brus, Bonn and Bod, and the phrase in Add3, s. 39, \textit{indutas pannis et facies et sulphures et ignes} which would seem to be corrupted from Brus \textit{indutas pannis piceis et sulphureis et igneis}.

In the description of the Infanticides in the second part of Add3, however, some details are interpolated from the Redaction IV description of this group. First, in s. 39, \textit{viperas} (IV: s. 28) are added to the \textit{dracones et serpentes} around the souls' necks, followed then by the Redaction IV phrase \textit{et erant angeli maligni increpantes eas habentes cornua ignea et ibant in circuitu earum},\textsuperscript{56} instead of the Redaction III version: \textit{et angeli iniqui cornibus suis igneis percuciebant eas} (S.179: 2-3). The angel then identifies the group in s. 40, first in the Redaction III way,\textsuperscript{57} referring to \textit{stercoribus} as one of the places in which the dead infants were disposed of, but then adding others from Redaction IV's list:\textsuperscript{58} \textit{et dederunt eos porcis in escam vel canibus vel aliis perditionibus et postea non egerunt penitenciam}.


\textsuperscript{55} See the redrawn stemma of red. III at the end of chapter 3 above.

\textsuperscript{56} Cf. red. IV, s. 29; the number of angels \textit{(quatuor)} is omitted here in Add3.


\textsuperscript{58} Cf. red. IV, s. 31.
The account then returns to Redaction III, resulting in an awkward repetition because of the earlier Redaction IV: s. 29 insertion into Add3, s. 39: *et angeli quatuor in circuitu earum increpantes eas et dicentes Agnoscite filium dei qui nos (usually vos) redemit sanguine suo* (Add3, s. 40). The effect of this repetition is somewhat mitigated, perhaps, by the specification of four, presumably different, angels and the inclusion of the reproach they make, which Add3 had omitted from its version of the Redaction IV phrase in s. 39. A further link between Add3 and TriC may be seen in the language of the insertion in Add3, s. 40, i.e. the use of *egerunt* instead of *fecerunt* (as in TriC, s.31 and also in Ro13 and StP), but the form and content of the first phrase in TriC, s.31 is different; among the Family A mss., the word order of the whole inserted phrase in Add, s. 40, is closest to St P.

The lament of St Paul follows the episode of the infanticides and concludes the second part of Add3. The third part begins with the insertion of the episode of the negligent bishop, not found in Redaction III, and continues with the arrival at the Great Well and the description of the souls consigned there, finishing with the thunder of their groans and sighs. Although there are matching sections in Redaction III, the verbal texture of the sections here is recognisably that of Redaction IV, e.g. the angel's command *sequere me* is omitted here as in Redaction IV, s.38, but not in Redaction III (cf. e.g. S.179: 13), St Paul is advised *sta longeus* (cf. IV: s. 39) instead of *sta in hoc loco* (cf. e.g. S.178: 14), there will be no *commemoracio eius in conspectu domini* (cf. IV: s. 41) instead of *de eo memoria* (cf. e.g. S.181: 6), and nouns are used to describe the groaning and sighing of the souls in the pit (cf. IV: s. 44) instead of present participles (cf. e.g. S.182: 1). Again, some touches of language link this part of Add3 with TriC among the A families, e.g. *postea* at the beginning of s. 36 instead of the usual *mox, longeus* in the angel's warning in s. 39 (however, the following phrase in TriC: *ne sentes fetorem putei*, is quite different), *in hunc puteum* in s. 41, and notably the plural nouns *gemitus et suspiria magna* in s. 44, not found elsewhere. However, Add3 has *episcopus* in s. 37 where TriC and the other A texts, except Wor, Mont and StP, have *spiritus*, and Add3 also has *usque ad diem iudicii* where all the A texts, except Vi, have *in diem iudicii* at the end of s. 37.

For the episode of the Going-Out of the Souls, Add3 returns, in the fourth part of its text, to Redaction III and continues on with it to the end of that
version. This change of source is clear from the order of events in the narrative which follows that of Redaction III with the separation of the two parts of Christ's speech. The omission of sections 50, 55 and 73 are typical of all IIIU texts (cf. e.g. S.182-3: 10), but s. 72 usually appears in those mss. (cf. e.g. S.192-3: 5-9). The verbal texture here is also that of Redaction III, e.g. the plural verbs aspiciebant and viderunt in s. 48 (cf. e.g. S.183: 4), the form of the challenge to the wicked soul Que opera fecisti in terra (cf. e.g. S.183: 9), the inclusion of sponsa in the praise of the good soul in s. 54 (cf. e.g. S.184-5: 5-6), the description of the damned souls as anime moriencium in s. 59 (c.f. e.g. S.187: 4 +apparatus), et propicius sit deus in s. 65 (cf. e.g. S.188-9: 3-4), the reasons given by Christ for his grant of mercy which include et propter omnes frates meos qui offerunt oblaciones etc. in s. 68 and above all pro mea misericordia (cf. e.g. S.188: 13 - 190:1), the form of the acclamation of gratitude in s. 71 qui dignatus es nobis refrigerium dare (cf. e.g. S.193: 4), and cum deo in s. 74 (cf. e.g. S.193: 9), rather than Redaction IV's cum angelis dei (IV: s. 69). A particular feature in this part confirms the association of the Redaction III source of Add3 with the directly descended group of IIIU mss.; this is the insertion of et ait paulus miserere in Add3, s. 65, and et ait paulus/paulus ait misereatur in Bonn, Buda and Bod, which thus attributes to St Paul the second part of the Archangel’s exhortation to the souls in s. 65.59

Once again however, some elements of the Redaction IV version of these sections are inserted into the Redaction III narrative, a small touch in s. 48 and a rather longer passage between ss. 61 and 63. The first makes clear that the wicked soul was leaving his body ipso die (cf. IV: s. 45), a detail not specified in Redaction III (cf. e.g. S.182: 8). The second begins in Add3, s. 61, with the interpolation into Christ's reproaches of the acetum cum felle from IV: s. 61,50 replacing the usual Redaction IIIU vos non redemi auro nec argento etc. (cf. e.g. S.187: 11-12), and continues with his sacrifice even unto death in s. 62, the wording of which section is closer to Redaction IV, s. 62, than to Redaction III (cf. e.g. S.186: 12). The castigation of the souls' vices of avarice, pride and envy during life at the beginning of s. 63, could be either Redaction III or IV, however

50 Cf. red. III (ms. Brussels 67): Nunc flete et ego flebo vobiscum, et omnes angeli dei cum Paulo, ut misereatur et propicius sit vobis deus et misericors et det vobis refrigerium (Silverstein 1959, [19], p. 234). Note that M2 (=IIIb) does something similar to Add3 et al.: et paulus et omnes angeli dicebant misereatur etc. (S.188: 3-4).
51 Note that, according to their renumbering for this study, ss. 61-63 have the same numbers in red. III and red. IV.
the accusation regarding their lack of penitence, fasting and almsgiving which follows: *maledicti ... elemosinam*, comes from Redaction IV, s. 63 as no other IIIU text has it. The Add3 text, however, returns to the Redaction III castigation in the last part of s. 63, *sed mendaces ... celestibus* (cf. e.g. S.186-7: 14-15), and continues on with its Redaction III source, without further interpolation, to the end of this part. The language of the insertion in Add3, ss. 61-63, is of some interest; the form *potum* in the interpolation in section 61 is typical of a significant number of A texts, including TriC and Bru. but in s. 62, Add3 has *viveretis* instead of the highly characteristic A variant *vinceretis*. The word order and the variant *martirio* identify section 62 as interpolated from Family A of Redaction IV, but only St P has the correct *viveretis* instead of *vinceretis* here. Remarkably, TriC has both, i.e. *ut vinceretis et viveretis mecum*, a doublet which could again reflect the influence of the Redaction III source text, since Redaction III has *viveretis* (cf. e.g. S.186-187: 12); perhaps the compiler had the two source texts before him contemporaneously as he worked.

The Add3 text has the Redaction III conclusion at the end of the fourth part and in the fifth part, the added Redaction IV conclusion, comprising the question and answer about the number of the pains in Hell, characteristic of Redaction IV, and a final exhortation (IV: ss. 70-72). In these sections the question to the angel in direct speech and *cui angelus ait* prefacing the reply in s. 70, and *ista mala, ad dominum* and the final formula in s. 72, are consistent with, although not exclusive to Family A. On the other hand, the word order *unusquisque haberet* in s. 71 of Add3, which is usual in the other families, is not that of the A texts, the verb being transposed in these to follow *linguas ferreas*. Two recurring associations of Add3 with particular Family A mss. may however be noted; the first the hundred men with a hundred tongues of iron in s. 71 associating Add3 with StP (as well as Wor and Mont) and the second, *nos ergo fratres* in s. 72, associating it once again with Bru and TriC.

---

61 See e.g. red. IIb, IIIc & IIId (Silverstein 1935, [19], pp. 186-7: 13-15).
62 The last part of this phrase appears in other directly descended IIIU mss., i.e. CC. (S.188:1-5 apparatus), Born, Buda (and Bodl).
63 There is evidence too in StP of editing from red. III; cf. the discussion of this text in chapter 5 above.
64 See IV Apparatus ad loc.
It would seem, therefore, that for his version of the *Visio Pauli*, the composer of Add3 alternated a text of the Redaction IV A family, connected to Bru, TriC and StP but not copied from any one of them, with a text of Redaction III belonging to the group directly descended from IIIU (Brus, Bonn, Buda and Bodl) but, again, not copied from any one of them. Why the redactions should have been used in this way is not obvious, but the insertion of passages from the matching sections of Redaction IV into each of the parts where Redaction III is used is some evidence that the alternation may not have been due to the chance use of different exemplars as a transcription progressed, but rather to a conscious editorial intent. On the other hand these insertions may be the result of glosses on an earlier version, which a later copyist has incorporated into the extant text.
Chapter 9
REDACTION VII

The components of the 11th-century Redaction VII were discussed on two occasions by Theodore Silverstein, who identified this redaction and published its text in 1935.\(^1\) In his 1935 discussion he argued that the second part of Redaction VII, although close to Redaction I, was an independent witness to *alpha*.\(^2\) His revised view in 1959 was that it descended from a divergent group of Redaction I which he called Ia.\(^3\) However the analysis of this part of Redaction VII in the present study has tended to support his earlier view that it is close to, but independent of Redaction I; it has been argued above that Redaction I and the second part of Redaction VII are descended from a common ancestor designated B.\(^4\)

The second component of Redaction VII was also discussed by Silverstein in 1935 and 1959, and in this regard too, the later study modified the conclusion of the earlier work.\(^5\) Silverstein recognised at the outset that the first part of Redaction VII was "related to Redaction IV". This was indicated by the absence of the Oceanus section and of the *draco*, with the result that the vision begins with the fiery trees and the furnace with seven flames rather than the four of Redaction III; he noted also that, although with some omissions, the order of its contents "follows that of Redaction IV".\(^6\) Of crucial importance in his argument, however, was the absence of several of the most characteristic Redaction IV interpolations, the introductory sentence (*dies dominicus* etc.), the fiery wheel and the bridge. On this basis he argued that the first part of Redaction VII was

---

1 Silverstein 1935, pp. 204-208.
2 Silverstein 1935, pp. 54-55. In his 1959 article, p. 202 n. 7, Silverstein pointed out that the diagrams at pp. 60-61 of his earlier study, showed red. VII as directly connected to red. I and thus did not accurately represent his 1935 argument. In the diagram on p. 202 showing the 1935 affiliation of the *alpha* redactions which were then known, he corrected this discrepancy. However this diagram (on p. 202) was itself redrawn (on p. 225) to illustrate *inter alia* his subsequent work on the redaction I/redaction VII relationship.
3 Silverstein 1959, pp. 204-5, pp. 208-211 and p. 225.
4 See chapter 2 above.
6 The omissions in the description of the various groups of souls encountered are considerable, however, i.e. the group of souls immersed to varying depths in the fiery river, the oppressors of widows and orphans and the fastbreakers; also the group eating their own tongues, which should be of the usurers, is identified with elements taken apparently, in Silverstein's view, from the deleted group of those immersed in the river.
derived not from Redaction IV itself, but from an ancestor of IV which he
designated γ. This hypothetical antecedent had two sources, Redaction III and
alpha itself. It was "partly derived from III, and contained the basic elements
but not the special additions of IV," however he argued it must also have drawn
on alpha for the negligent bishop and the numbering of the pains of Hell, one of
which (the bishop) it passed to the first part of Redaction VII and both of which
it passed to Redaction IV proper.7

In his later study, Silverstein returned briefly to the conjectured
Redaction γ as the source for both IV and the first part of VII (=VII (i)). He noted
that the newly identified Redaction IX also lacked some of the same
characteristic features of Redaction IV and that this could corroborate the view
that a version without these characteristics (i.e. γ) existed at an earlier stage of
Redaction IV's textual history, and that this was the source of VII (i), not
Redaction IV. However, he also proposed the alternative view that the
omissions could have occurred in a copy of Redaction IV "through scribal error
or other circumstances arising with the multiplication of copies" and thus that
the source of IX and VII (i) could have been such a defective version of IV itself
and need not presume an earlier form of the Redaction as a separate antecedent.
Revising his 1935 position, he decided in favour of the alternative view, i.e. the
possibility of variant versions which Redaction IV's "own subsequent textual
history produced by accident." These conjectured versions of Redaction IV
which were in his view the source of the first part of Redaction VII and of
Redaction IX,8 he tentatively named IVa and consequently removed γ from his
1959 stemma, showing instead Redaction VII (by implication VII (i)) directly
dependent on IV.9

Hitherto, the content of VII has been described as consisting of two parts,
the first related to IV and the second to I. However the last passages of VII, i.e.
from line 16 of p. 207 in Silverstein's edition, include the descent of Christ and
the Reproaches, which are not present in any known version of the Redaction I;
this part therefore will be referred to here as VII (iii). The three parts of

7 Silverstein 1935, pp. 55-56.
8 This chapter will consider Silverstein's argument only in regard to redaction VII; the source of
redaction IX will be discussed in chapter 11 below.
9 Silverstein 1959, pp. 223-225.

Silverstein was prepared in 1959 to posit the existence of IVa, although "no single manuscript has been found in which [the omitted sections] have all disappeared together." However a version of the Visio Pauli contained in Brno, University Library Ms. 99, ff. 226rv (dated 1379), closely matches the first and last parts of Redaction VII in structure, content and omissions. In demonstration of this, a transcription of the Brno text is given below in parallel with the first and final parts of Redaction VII, both texts being divided here into numbered sections. The second part of Redaction VII is omitted, except for the first and last sections of it.

REDACTION VII

Paris, BN, lat. 2851, ff.34r-38v. xi c.
ed. T. Silverstein (1935, pp. 204-208)

VISIO SANCTI PAULI

<1> Placuit itaque domino ut isdem Paulus per Michahelem archangelum omnis qui erant in penis per eundem Michaelem cognosceret, sicut ipse testatu:

<2> Vidi, ego Paulus, spiritu ductus ante portas inferni, arbores igneas, et peccatores in his cruciari suspensos:

<3> alii pedibus alligati, alii manibus, alii linguis, alii uero capillis, alii brachiis, alii collis.

<4> Vidi iterum fornacem igneam ardentem per septem flammas in diuersis coloribus; et multi puniebantur in ea.

BRNO, University Library, MS. 99, ff. 226rv.
xiv c. (1379)

<1> Dies dominicus dies letus in quo gaudent angeli et anime requiescant in quacumque pena sunt Inquirendum est fratres karissimi quis prius rogaverit unde anime habuisseret requiem in inferno sicut scriptum est Paulus apostolus et Mychahel archangelus fuerunt in inferno eo quia voluit unde paulus videret penas inferni et misit deus michahelem cum paulo ut ei ostenderet peccatores qui erant ibi .

<2> Ante portam infernalem vidit paulus multas arbores igneas, arbores igneas, crucianes peccatores pendentes in eis:

<3> Alii erant pedibus ligati, alii manibus, alii linguis, alii capillis, alii brachiis, alii per colla.

<4> Iterum vidit fornacem igneum ardentem diuersis modis et coloribus et multi ibi puniebantur.
Prima flamma erat alba ut nix, secunda ut glacies, tercia ut pix nigra, quarta ut sanguis rubra, quinta ut emittens serpentes, sexta fetorem, septima ut fulgur.

Et in ipsam mittuntur peccatorum anime qui in hac uita neclexerunt penitentiam agere.

Alii autem flentes, alii ululantes, alii gementes; alii vero erant qui mortem de die in diem desiderabant, sed mori nequieuerunt, quia anime immortales existunt.

Et uidi, ego Paulus, alium locum plenum uiris ac mulieribus comedentibus linguas suas. Et interrogauqi qui essent.

Tunc mychahel ad paulum ait hii sunt isti qui uerbum dei detrahebant audita in ecclesia propterea sic cruciantur.

Et vidi ego locum in quo erant pene inferni; et in hoc viros ac mulieres acriter puniri

qui occiderunt infantes suos et dederunt porcis et canibus in escam, aut in fluminibus.

Et uidi quatuor angelos in circuitu earum, increpantes eas et dicentes; "Agnoscite filium dei, qui redemit mundum suo sancto sanguine!"

Et iterum uidi alium locum, et senem inter quatuor diabolos plorantem. Et interrogaui quis esset.

Cui mychahel episcopus negligens fuit nec custodiens legem domini nec castus in corpore,
sed avarus et ebriosus et commissor operum et superbus diabolus aliisque vicis dedit. Ideo sustinet penas innumerabiles ac sustinebit usque diem iudicii."

Tunc ego Paulus, flens, dixi, Ve, ue, ue peccatoribus: Vtquid nati sunt? Et ait angelus, "Nondum maiorem penam inferni uidisti."

Et uidi, ego Paulus, alium locum; in eo loco uiros ac mulieres nudos, uermes et serpentes commedentes eos.

Et erant anime eorum iuna super aliam quasi ouis in ouili et erat profunditas illius a terra usque ad celum

Et audiui eos gemente et flentes quasi tonitruum, ob commestionem uermium et serpentum.

Et aspexi in celum et in terram. Interea uidi animam peccatoris cuiusdam inter quatuor diabolos ducentes eam ululantem et flentem, et eodem die de corpore exeuntem.

Et audiui angelos dei ad inuicem dicentes, "Hec anima contempsit mandata dei in terris." Ipsa uero legebat acta sua in quibus peccavit, et se ipsam iudicavit.

Diaboli suscipientes eam, miserunt in tenebras exteriores, ubi erat fletus et ululatus magnus.

flevit paulus et ait ve, ue peccatoribus cur nati sunt et ait Michael, cur ita dicis certe adhuc non uidisti maiores penas inferni. Post hoc ostendit ei igneum puteum et ait si potes stare super hunc puteum videbis fetores malos et peiores omnibus malis et iterum dixit si quis mittitur in hunc puteum numquam erit commemoratio eius in conspectu et domini et post paulus qui sunt hii qui mittuntur in eum et ait angelus qui non crediderunt in filium dei qui passus est pro hominibus

et uidi paulus uiros et mulieres parvos et serpentes commedentes eos

et audite sunt voces flencium quasi tonitruum

et aspexit in celum et uidi animam peccatoris inter iiijor dyabolos ululantem in illo die deducentes eam de corpore suo et clamaverunt angeli cum ea dicentes de celo ve ve tibi anima misera quia mala opera in terra fecisti

et dixerunt ad inuicem ista anima vidit predicatum verbum dei et etiam contempsit mandata dei in terris. illa autem lege cartam suam ibique inveniet peccata sua et se ipsam iudicabit.

iterum adduxerant eam et miserunt in tenebras exteriores ibi eri stridor dencium et fletus gemitusque magnus
<23> Et dixit mihi angelus, "Credis, Paule, et agnosce quia ut homo egerat in terrestri seculo, sic recipiet in futuro?"

<24> Post hoc uidi, ego Paulus, angelos dei cuiusdam animam defuncti deportantes ad celum.

<25> Et audiui uocem milium angelorum letantium pro ea, et dicentium, "O anima felicissima, O beata, leta sis hodie, quia fecisti voluntatem dei uiui et ueri!"

<26> Et angeli letantes pre ea, portabant earn ante deum. Et ecce apertus est illi liber, et legit opera bona que fecerat.

<27> Post hoc Michaeli tradita est et ad paradisum deportata et inter sanctos annumerata.

<28> Et clamauerunt anime que erant in inferno uidentes animam iustam ab angelis in paradisum delatam.

<29> Et clamor magnus factus est ita ut celum et terra mouebantur.

<30> Et fleuerunt anime infernales, et fleui, ego Paulus.

<23> dixitque angelus, ad paulum crede et agnosce quod sicut homo iste fecit sic accipient omnesque angeli secundum opus suum

<24> Post hoc adduxerant angeli de corpore animam iusti hominis ad celum. deportantes

<25> et uoces angelorum milia milium letantium pro ea et dicentium O anima felicissima beatissima, letare quia fecisti voluntatem patris tui

<26> Dixerunt angeli levemus eam ante deum et lege in cartam suam ubi sunt omnia opera sua bona

<27> et postea deducemus eam in paradysum ubi sunt sancti dei

<28> et clamauerunt omnes qui erant in inferno uidentes animam sanctam et angelos dei cum ea in paradyso.

<29> et clamor magnus factus est quasi celum et terra mouerentur.

<30> et cepit sanctus paulus flere
...... Et inde ductus in septentrionem. Ostendit mihi puteum ex quo fetor omnibus peior processit, et per girum eius ducabantur muri ignei ex utraque parte candentes. Et dixit mihi angelus, "Qui hic intus mittuntur, alienati sunt a misericordia dei et alienabuntur, nec memoria eorum erit ante dominum." Et ego, "Qui sunt illi?" Et respondit angelus, "Qui non crediderunt in carne uenisse, nec nasci ex Maria uirgine Christum, et corpori et sanguini non communicauerunt." [p. 207: 13-16]

Postque uidisset et audiendo intellexisset hec, flens amare super peccatores, uidi sumus ab eis. Et una quasi sonitus bucinarum innumerabilium uoce extollentes, "Miserere nobis, iniquiunt, "Michahel archangele et Paule dei dilectissime!"

Ad hanc uocem fundamentum terre contremuit, et celi fundamentum commotum est, et ego uelho expauescebam et flebam. Illi uero flentes rursum exclamauerunt in penis, dicens, "Miserere nobis, Michael cum Paulo."

At Michael sanctus et ego prostrati sumus ante dominum, necnon et milia milium angelorum.

Exaudita est uox nostra in septimo throno dicens, "Miserere, miserere, Christe fili dei uiui!"


Et uidentes qui erant in penis filium hominis, rursum exclamauerunt, "Miserere, fili Dauid!"

Et uxo filii dei audita est super omnis qui erant in penis, dicens, "Quid a me postulatis requiem inferi? Quid boni fecistis?

et ipsi fleverunt exclamaverunt de omnibus penis inferni dicentes Miserere nobis michahel et paule

exclamaverunt sumul michahel et paulus et milia milium angelorum

et audita est vox eorum in septimo throno dicens miserere christe miserere filius hominum

et tunc viderunt moveri celum filiumque dei in celo et dyadema in capite eius

et exclamaverunt omnes qui erant in inferno una voce dicentes miserere nobis fili dei

et in excelsis audita est vox super omnis dicens qui boni fecistis a me quam requiem petiistis et quesivistis
Crucifixus fui pro uobis, perforatus lancea, clauibus fixus, spinis coronatus, in facie percussus, aceto et felle potatus, et ad ultimum mortem subi.

Et uos a contrario fuistis mendaces, periurii, fures, raptoreos, auari, inuidi, superbi, malefici, homicide, sacrilegi, maledicti, fornicatores,

detrahentes proximos suos, mihil boni sacerdotibus meis facientes nee pauperibus misericordiam a uobis petentibus, sed in omnibus prevaricatores legis mee exstitistis, nec penitentiam nec ieiunium nec elemosinam ad delenda peccata in uobis uidi. Primicias et decimas mihi non dedistis. Esurientibus, sicientibus, hospitibus, nudis, infirmis, captius ob mei amorem non ministrastis."

His dictis, iterum prostauimus non humiliter ante tremendam maiestatem dei cum fletibus, postulantes ueniam miseris, ut mererentur habere requiem die dominico.

Tunc pius dominus ait, "Numquid maiorem in illis feci misericordiam, proprium et voluntatem dedi eis arbitrium. Voluntatem suam fecerunt, non meam; sed a me declinauerunt." Rursum peccatores clamauerunt, "Miserere! A penis libera nos, Christe pius!"

letati sunt qui erant in inferno et exclamaverunt omnes una voce dicentes benedicimus tibi fili dei qui nobis die dominico requiem contulisti

et qui custoderit diem dominicum habet partem cum deo in paradyso et omnibus sanctis in secula seculorum amen

Like VII (i) and (iii), Brno has a number of Redaction IV features apart from the introduction. As Silverstein noted for the first part of VII, the Oceanus and draco sections are omitted, the number of furnace flames is increased to
seven and it contains the punishment of the negligent bishop. Although omitting several groups of sinners in the first part, the order of the narrative is that of Redaction IV, notably in the last part recounting the descent of Christ and the reproaches. In Brno, the angel’s summons sequere me is omitted as in IV: s. 38, and likewise the corrupted phrase referring to the muros igneos seen in the Great Well (IV: s. 40).\(^{10}\) Both texts also contain a version of the Redaction IV detail that the sound of the cry for mercy was heard in heaven - the fourth heaven in IV (s. 58), the seventh in VII and Brno (s. 33).

In their language the two texts show some difference. Common to them both seems to be a basic text which VII has modified at certain points not only to ”improve” it stylistically, but also for the purpose of heightening and expanding its inherent dramatic qualities. A major change is the use of the first person, returning, whether consciously or not, to the original form of the Visio in the first Long Latin texts. This dramatising tendency further manifests itself in the first part with the exclamation in s.18, Et ego mecum Quis scit mensuram nisi solus deus, and in the reading of the soul’s wicked deeds Et ecce apertus est illi liber (s. 26). But it is most marked in the later section where apocalyptic earthquakes etc. are inserted into s. 30b and s. 34, the reproaches are expanded in s. 37 (again reflecting the original Long Latin\(^ {11} \)), and the number of vices in the accusation is increased and worked up to a crescendo (ss. 38-39), until all prostrate themselves ante tremendam maiestatem dei (s. 40). The last section (s. 40a), which is apparently the redactor’s own invention, was obviously intended to prolong the drama, but the narrative breaks off unresolved. Beside this version the Brno text, which reflects the standard language of Redaction IV and the other redactions, seems rather sober.

The structure of Brno, however, mirrors that of VII (i) and (iii), differing at only three main points, s.1, s. 16 and ss. 41-43. In each case Brno is closer to Redaction IV. First, in the introductory section Brno reflects the opening sections of IV (ss. 1-5),\(^ {12} \) but VII (i) omits the dies dominicus sentence and the

\(^ {10} \) Cf. e.g. red. IIIa <41> & <43> (Silverstein 1935, [14], p. 178: 13-15 and [15], p. 180: 4-5); also red. I <37> & <40> (Silverstein 1935, [9], p. 154: 4) and LLx 24 (James 1893, [41], p. 34: 7-8).

\(^ {11} \) Cf. LLx 32; James 1893, [44], p. 36: 8-9.

\(^ {12} \) Two aspects of its formulation are of interest, the adjective letus and the added phrase et anime requiescunt in quacumque pena sunt, the first as the only instance of this variant outside the
question as to the origin of the respite, stating only, in a paraphrase of IV: ss. 4-5, that it pleased God for St Paul, in the company of the Archangel, to gain knowledge of the souls in Hell. Secondly, the arrival at the Great Well and the identification of the forgotten souls within it, appear in Brno in their usual place in the narrative, i.e. following St Paul's lament and the angel's rebuke (s. 16), although with some internal omission. In VII (i) however they are lacking in s. 16, but appear towards the end of the second part (s. 30a). This is only a temporary divergence from the common narrative sequence, probably due to the need to avoid duplication later, and from s. 17 both texts move on in parallel until the insertion of the second component in VII at s. 30a. The third difference between Brno and VII is at the end of each text. After the plea to Christ for the Sunday respite (s. 40), Redaction VII has a further reproach from Christ and a renewed appeal from the souls for mercy; the text then breaks off, apparently unfinished. Brno on the other hand omits the actual grant of respite which in the Redaction IV sequence should follow at s. 41 and moves straight to the grateful acclamation of the souls and then the reward for Sunday observance as its conclusion. Three further small omissions in VII are *verbo, cogitacione, opere* from the bishop's list of failings (s. 14), the angels' challenge to the wicked soul (*Ve ve etc.*) in s. 20, and the purpose of Christ's suffering (*ut vos mecum essetis - usually vivaretis*) at the end of s. 37.

But despite these differences it would seem that unless there has been a quite singular coincidence of omissions, Brno and VII (i) and (iii) descend from a common source which may be designated Σ. On the joint evidence of Brno and VII, that text contained the introduction, fiery trees and furnace (ss. 1-7; cf. IV: ss. 1-10 & 12-13), the punishment of the detractors, infanticides and the negligent bishop (ss. 8-15; cf. IV: ss. 26, (28-31), 36-37), St Paul's lament, the angel's rebuke, the Great Well and the heretics, the going-out of the wicked and good souls, the appeal to Michael and St Paul for mercy, the appeal to Christ for mercy, the descent of Christ, the Reproaches, the appeal to Christ for respite, the first part of the grateful acclamation of the souls and the reward for Sunday observance as its conclusion.

---

D family (cf. IV apparatus ad loc. and also chapter 7 above) and the second for its similarity with Pa28 & Pa29 (=C2). The latter perhaps may be coincidence.

13 The usually separate warning to stand off from the Well, then the opening of the Well and the stench that rises from it are telescoped into one phrase, <16> : et ait si potes stare super hunc puteum videbis fetores malos et peiores omnibus malis.

14 See the discussion of this below.
observance (ss. 16-41; cf. IV: ss. 38-39, (40), 41-55, 57-64, 67, 69). The omissions in relation to Redaction IV are mainly in the first part, i.e. the Admonition, the wheel of fire, the bridge scene and the souls immersed to varying depths in the river (IV: ss. 14-25) and the punishment of the usurers, oppressors of widows and orphans and the fast breakers (IV: ss. 27, 32-35). In the second part the Archangel’s reply to the soul’s appeal is omitted (IV: s. 56), also the formal grant of respite (IV: s. 65, the hostiarius inferni (IV: s. 66), the second part of the grateful acclamation (IV: s. 68), the numbering of the pains of Hell and the conclusion (IV: ss. 70-72).

It would appear that Σ changed the identification of the souls devouring their tongues from the usurers\(^{15}\) to the detractors (s.9 ). In VII they are those who disparage others in church and do not attend to the word of God. In Brno they are those who disparage the word of God in church. Silverstein remarked that the identification of this group in VII appeared to be based on several elements from the deleted groups immersed in the river.\(^{16}\) Among those groups in Redactions III and IV, the souls immersed up to their knees inter alia disparaged others, with Redaction IIIa adding that this took place both in and out of church, and in both III and IV those immersed to the lips quarrelled in church and did not attend to the word of God.\(^{17}\) Thus it may be, as Silverstein suggested, that these two elements from two separate groups are combined in the VII identification.\(^{18}\) Either this or the Brno version presumably appeared in their common antecedent. The different identification of the group in Brno could possibly be the result of a modification of the VII version, but it is more difficult to see how the opposite could have occurred. However, if the phrase in Brno was a modification of the VII version, it was one which resulted in a striking similarity to the group of those who mocked the word of God in church in the Long Latin, hii sunt qui detrahunt in aeclesia verba dei, non intendentes eo.\(^{19}\)

\(^{15}\) Cf. red. BR <26> (Silverstein 1959, p. 236 [5]), III, <31> (Silverstein 1935, [7], p. 172: 15 ff.) and IV: s.27; also LLx 13 (James 1893, [37], p. 30: 36).
\(^{16}\) Silverstein 1935, p. 115, n. 65.
\(^{17}\) Silverstein 1935, [5], p. 166).
\(^{18}\) Red. IIIa <91 & 21> (Silverstein 1935, [5], p. 166); red. IV; ss. 21 & 23.
\(^{19}\) LLx 14 (James 1893, [37], p.31: 6-7)
This group apparently did not survive in the alpha redactions\(^\text{20}\) and the Brno definition is the only echo of it among the versions of the Visio descended from alpha.

In the terms of Silverstein’s 1959 argument, the text behind Brno and VII (i) and (iii), here \(\Sigma\), would be IVa, the variant version of Redaction IV which he conjectured was one of the sources of Redaction VII. However, several features of \(\Sigma\) suggest that, although very similar, it was independent of Redaction IV. The group of the infanticides in VII (i) and Brno (ss. 10-12), and hence in \(\Sigma\), is not the merged group of infanticides and false virgins which is characteristic of Redaction IV. It resembles instead the unmerged group in Redaction III, one of Redaction IV’s sources,\(^\text{21}\) although it does have one of the details of the IV version: i.e. the introductory reference in s. 10 *alium locum in quo erant pene inferni* \(^\text{22}\). If \(\Sigma\) (or IVa), was dependent on Redaction IV, it would presumably have contained the merged version of the group.

Several other differences from Redaction IV may also be observed. In the description of the furnace and its flames of different colours in VII and Brno, ss. 4-5, a set of afflictions is associated with the seven flames of the furnace, *prima flamma sicut nix* etc (Brno, s. 5); this indicates, to use Silverstein’s words, “the variation in the tormenting quality of its fire.”\(^\text{23}\) In Redaction IV the same afflictions are described as *plage* and located around the furnace, apparently separate from the previously mentioned seven flames, *et septem plage erant in circuitu fornacis, prima nix* etc. (IV: 8-9). Although the number of flames and the types of affliction are the same, the association of the afflictions with the flames in VII and Brno indicating the diverse tormenting quality of the flames themselves, is closer to the version in Redaction III:-

\[
\text{et iterum vidit ignem 'urentem [*al. ardentem] per quatuor flamm} \\
\text{as in diversis coloribus et} \\
\text{multi puniebantur in eo *alii [*al, pri} \\
\text{mi fame, alii siti etc.}\] \(^\text{24}\)

than to the Redaction IV version of flames and separate ‘plage’.

---

\(^\text{20}\) See the Introduction above.

\(^\text{21}\) Cf. red. IIIa & IIIb \(<40>\) (Silverstein 1935, [13] p. 178: 2-8); also red. I.

\(^\text{22}\) Cf. IV: s. 28: et vidit alium locum in quo omnes pene erant.

\(^\text{23}\) Silverstein 1935, p. 72; see also p. 74 “According to the Church authorities the Judgement Fire was one, but its purgatorial qualities accomodated themselves to the fault of the erring soul.”

\(^\text{24}\) Red. IIIa \(<10-11>\) (Silverstein 1935, [3], p. 162: 11-14. note: ‘urentem’ is a correction here from ‘incendentem’.)
Immediately preceding the furnace is the list of the ways in which the souls are hanging in the fiery trees, and here too VII (i) and Brno are closer to III than to IV; they retain (al)ligati which is dropped in IV in favour of pendebant, and the order of the list is that of Redaction III, which is not replicated in IV.\textsuperscript{25}

The above observations would seem to support Silverstein's 1935 conjecture rather than his later view, and to suggest that Redaction IV developed in two stages. In the first stage, γ, some but not all of the characteristic IV changes were made, and this version was the source of Σ, the common antecedent of Brno and VII (i) and (iii). Redaction IV proper then introduced the remainder of its characteristic features at a later stage separately from Σ. On this argument, in terms of content γ would have omitted the Oceanus section, the draco and the fovea alta from its Redaction III source, also the angel's summons before the arrival at the Great Well and the muros igneos, changed the number of furnace flames to seven and devised a new list of afflictions: it would also have reduced the number of groups of souls encountered. From its alpha source γ would have introduced the punishment of the negligent bishop and the correct order of the narrative in the scenes of the descent of Christ and the reproaches, and included the number of pains in Hell; as its own contribution, it would have added the dies est letus opening sentence and the cry of mercy being heard in the seventh heaven. Inheriting the γ version, Σ deleted most of the groups of souls being punished, changed the usurers' group to the detractors, and omitted the Archangel's reply to the souls' appeal for mercy, the formal grant of respite, the hostiarius and the second part of the grateful acclamation and the number of pains in Hell; it may also have compressed the warning to stay some way off from the Great Well with the following phrase.\textsuperscript{26} On the other hand Redaction IV proper would have made the following changes to the version inherited on its part from γ: it would have separated the list of afflictions from the furnace flames, added the Admonition, the wheel of fire and the bridge scene, merged the infanticides with the false virgins, and changed the cry heard in the seventh heaven to the fourth.

\textsuperscript{25}The closest is in Family C; cf. red. IV: 7 and IV Apparatus ad loc; also red. III <9> (Silverstein 1935, [3], p. 162: 9-11).

\textsuperscript{26}There is only the evidence of Brno for this (s.16).
If this was so however, it raises another problem. For in its merged group of infanticides and false virgins, Redaction IV blended details from the descriptions of the two originally separate groups. However the phrase *et in suis/sanctis parentibus maculaverunt se et necaverunt infantes suos* (IV: s. 31) could not have been based on the version of the two episodes in Redaction III.27 Nevertheless it does reflect authentic phrases found elsewhere. In the Long Latin the false virgins *inquinaverunt virginitates suas nescientibus parentibus suis*.28 This seems to have been corrupted in *alpha*, for it appears in one of *alpha’s* direct descendants, Göttingen, as *non servaverunt castitatem ad nupcias in sanctis parentibus.*29 In the Long Latin also, the infanticides *commaculaverunt plasma dei*,30 which in *alpha’s* direct descendants became *maculaverunt et necaverunt infantes suos.*31 For the two components of its composite phrase, *parentibus* and *maculaverunt*, Redaction IV must have had access to versions of the two original groups containing them, and on the extant evidence, these could only have been in texts directly descended from *alpha*, not Redaction III.32 Such access could have been through γ on Silverstein’s 1935 theory, or direct according to his 1959 view. On the evidence of Brno and VII(i), their common antecedent Σ had the Redaction III version of the infanticides description and thus, if the 1935 proposition is followed, two alternatives present themselves. If γ also had the Redaction III version of the infanticides and presumably also of the false virgins, Redaction IV must have accessed an *alpha* version when merging the two groups at stage 2 of its development. On the other hand, if γ had introduced the *alpha* versions with its other borrowings from *alpha*, then Σ must have drawn separately on Redaction III and passed this version on to VII(i) and Brno; the

---

27 Red. III <36>: *iste sunt false puelle que non servabant castitatem nec virginitatem; <40> iste sunt que occiderunt infantes suos* (Silverstein 1935, [10], pp. 176-7: 1-3 and [13], p. 178: 4-5).
28 LLx 17 (James 1893, [39], p. 31: 29-30).
29 Gött. <29>.
30 LLx 20 (James 1893, [40], p. 32: 36).
31 Red. BR <34> (Silverstein 1959, [10] p. 237); cf. Gött. <34> and red. I <35>. The Vienna ms. of redaction I has *maculaverunt se* (Silverstein 1935, [7], p. 154: 26), but in the light of the Long Latin, this would seem to be a later and predictable addition, repeated also in redaction IV.
32 Red. III does not have *parentibus* in the false virgins description and only one red. III ms. has *maculaverunt* in the infanticides episode, i.e. IIId <40>: *maculaverunt infinites suos in utero* (Silverstein 1935, [13], p. 179: 3), a phrase which is strikingly similar to the other Long Latin phrase describing the infanticides: *mulieres commaculantem plasmam dei preferentes ex utero infinites* (LLx 20; James 1893, [40], p. 32: 33). It should be recalled perhaps that in Silverstein’s analysis (1935, p. 54), redaction IV was based partly on a version of redaction III "in character intermediate between IIIa and IIId," but the rest of the description of the infanticides in IIId is not reflected in redaction IV.
same would be true if, in Silverstein's revised view, Σ was a variant version of Redaction IV itself. The creative energy evident in Redaction IV's changes and additions might tend to favour, tentatively at least, the first alternative, albeit at the risk of complicating still further the stemma of the *alpha* redactions.

In the argument above much rests on the integrity of Brno, i.e. that it was free from contamination by additions such as the introduction and the conclusion. But even allowing for this, its similarity with the very early VII (i) and (iii) is compelling and its evidence is of interest not only in identifying the source of its 11th-century predecessor, but also for the textual history of Redaction IV.
Chapter 10
REDACTION VIII AND TWO OTHER COMBINED TEXTS

1. Redaction VIII

Redaction VIII is a version of the *Visio Pauli* consisting of alternating sections of Redactions I and IV. It was identified in the 15th-century Berlin ms., Preussische Staatsbibliothek, lat. 422 [elec. theol. lat. qu. 61], f. 226 rv, (=Be), by Theodore Silverstein, who published the text of it in 1935.¹ This has long been thought to be the only witness of the redaction; however, another copy is contained in the mid 13th-century section of Hamburg, Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek, Jacobi 1, ff. 132r-133v (=Ham).² A transcription of the Hamburg text is given in Appendix I.³

The structure of these two texts is identical. In both, the sections from Redactions I and IV alternate in the following way:-

2. I: ss. 1-2 S. 209: 4-7
3. IV: ss. 6-15 S. 209: 8-22
4. I: s. 3 S. 209: 23
5. IV: ss. 16-18 S. 209: 22-27
6. I: ss. 3-31 S. 209: 27 - 211: 12
7. IV: ss. 36-7 & 34-35 S. 211: 13-17
8. I: ss. 34-45 S. 211: 18 - 212: 8
9. IV: ss. 44-54 S. 212: 8-24
10. I: ss. 46-55 S. 212; 25 - 213: 10

From the above schema, it can be seen that Redaction VIII contains a full text of Redaction I (i.e. ss. 1-55) except for ss. 32-33,⁴ and substantial extracts from

¹ Silverstein 1935, pp. 209-213.
² See Katalog der Handschriften der Staats und Universitätsbibliothek, Hamburg (Hamburg, 1957), vol. IV, pp. 149-151 at p. 149, e) 64-133.
³ The transcription is presented in 10 parts in which the two sources are identified; the section numbers are not consecutive but are those of the relevant redaction. The cross reference to the printed edition of the Berlin text is given at the head of each part.
⁴ References to Silverstein’s edition are by page and line number, preceded by S.
⁵ ss. 32-33 appear to have been replaced by the matching sections of redaction IV; see discussion of this below.
Redaction IV. This would suggest that Redaction I was the base text and provided the frame for the combined redaction, and that Redaction IV was used to give a more complete version of the Visio.\(^6\)

The two source redactions figure in the double opening of Redaction VIII; first the Redaction IV praise of Sunday, followed by the Interrogandum sentence enquiring about the origin of the soul's respite (1),\(^7\) and then the opening sections of Redaction I (orum nos etc.) which provide, albeit not very smoothly, something of an answer to the preceding question (2). The text returns to IV for the description of the fiery trees, the furnace with the septem plagae, the Admonition and the wheel of fire, none of which are part of the Redaction I narrative (3). The river which St Paul next encounters (4) is the more restrained flumen magnum aque of Redaction I, rather than the flumen horribile and the bestie diabolice of Redaction IV; over it, however, is placed Redaction IV's characteristic bridge (5). The bridge passage is inserted into the middle of the Redaction I sentence (I: 3), which then continues (6) with the identification of the flumen magnum as Oceanus, and is followed by the description of Redaction I's fiery river, Cochiton, with the monstrous draco beside it and the souls immersed to varying depths within it. The identification of these groups is that of Redaction I and the narrative follows Redaction I's sequence with the bottomless pit and the group of oppressors of widows and orphans merged with the normally separate group of usurers which is characteristic of Redaction I (6).

The episode of the negligent bishop is then inserted from IV, although the soul is not identified as such, but simply as ipse fuit negligens. The fastbreakers who follow him would seem also to be from Redaction IV rather than Redaction I. Although the sections are very similar in both redactions, the location super canalia which Redaction I lacks,\(^8\) and the absence of St Paul's enquiry before the

---

\(^6\) This overall view of red. VIII differs from the Silverstein analysis where red. VIII seems to be seen as primarily red. IV with "frequent borrowing of extensive passages from Redaction I with which [red. VIII] augments the corresponding parts of IV or substitutes for them" (Silverstein 1935, p. 57). In that discussion also, the return to red. I in the last part (10) of red. VIII, is not specified. However it is clear from the wording of the sections common to IV and I, as well as from the absence of the descent of Christ and the Reproaches, that this is the red. I version.

\(^7\) The references in parentheses here are to the part numbers in the Hamburg transcription in Appendix I.

\(^8\) No specific location is given for the souls in red. I; only ms. Barcelona (s. 32) has super prata virentia (Silverstein 1959, [6], p. 228).
angel's identification of the group, would suggest that this as well as the preceding section are from Redaction IV, albeit in reverse order (7). The next group of infanticides (8) is clearly not that of Redaction IV, however, because, apart from its position in the narrative sequence (i.e. preceding the Great Well), it is not merged with that of the false virgins as in IV.

Redaction I continues with the arrival at the Great Well, and its history as the Limbus Patrum. After the identification of the souls within it (8), the account of the Going-Out of the Souls, which does not figure in Redaction I, is incorporated from Redaction IV (9). However, the appeal to Michael and St Paul which follows, and the granting of the respite by Christ in response to their appeal, are again in the Redaction I form, i.e. without the descent of Christ and the Reproaches before the granting of relief. The text remains with Redaction I for the concluding sections: the grateful rejoicing of the souls, the command to St Paul to preach, the reference to the number of pains in Hell and the exhortation to salutary fear (10). In these last sections two differences between Berlin and Hamburg may be noted; the first is the insertion by Berlin into I: s. 50 (S.212: 35-36), of the precise duration of the respite (ab hora ... ferie), from IV: s. 65; this does not appear in Ham. On the other hand, Ham has the full form of the final section, while Berlin has only the first word Expavescite.

The Redaction I component of the Berlin and Hamburg texts has been discussed in chapter 1 above; the Redaction IV interpolations (i.e. parts 1, 3, 5, 7 & 9) will be examined here.

The version of the Redaction IV passages found in Ham and Be is largely identical; in both there are the same changes, omissions and additions to the Redaction IV text. In the first sentence of part 1, omnibus diebus is inserted after electus (prelectus: Be), s.1; in parts 3 and 5, the same four (only) items are in the list in s. 7 (and in the same order), intollerabilis is added to fetor in s. 9 and

---

8 Red. I does not specify the time of the respite, cf. ms. Paris <50>: dabo vobis dominicis et noctibus refrigerium qui estis in penis usque in diem iudicii. This is reflected in Ham, I: s. 50: donabo (?dabo) vobis refrigerium dominics diebus et noctibus qui estis in penis tenebrarum usque in diem iudicii, but Be has: ab hora nona sabbati usque ad horam primam secunde ferie instead of the qui estis clause, retaining, however, the last red. I phrase usque ad diem iudicii, which is not in red. IV. As this whole last section of redation VIII is from redaction I and Ham reflects this source faithfully, it would seem likely that the insertion was an independent alteration by the later Be.
rejigerantur to s. 15; in uno die replaces in unaque vice in s. 13, followed by mille vicibus anime instead of mille anime, and legitur replaces dicit dominus in s. 18. All but one of the list of things to be feared in Hell in s. 14 are omitted, as are also half of the 'like with like' sinners in s. 18, mille orbitas in s. 15 and in hoc mundo/seculo at the end of s. 10.\(^{10}\)

In the negligent bishop sections from Redaction IV in part 7, unam (animam) replaces senem in s. 36, the identification of the soul is simply ipse fuit negligens in s. 37, verbo is omitted from the list of his failings and the reference to the day of judgement at the end of the same section is also lacking. The sections describing the going-out of the souls in part 9, comprise the last of the Redaction IV interpolations, and in these sections Ham and Be share the following features peculiar to them: respiciebat and ducta(m) in s. 44, the insertion of caro/care into the challenge to the wicked soul in s. 46,\(^{11}\) the omission of an introductory verb before quomodo in s. 47, perlegit/prelegit, conscripta & diiudicabat also in s. 47, cum cachinno (maximo) added to s. 48 and in terra inserted before fecerit in s. 49, iusti or iustam omitted after animam and ferentes instead of portantes in s. 50, tui omitted at the end of s. 51, the major change of the first part of s. 52 from the angels' recommendation in direct speech to a narrative statement et levata est/anima ante conspectum dei, the adding of que fecit/gessit after opera sua bona in s. 52, pre gaudio replacing the first part of s. 54 and ita ut introducing the last clause of that section instead of quasi.

There are several features in the Berlin text, however, which show that it was not copied from the earlier Hamburg ms. but from a common ancestor. In the description of the wheel of fire in part 3, s. 15, Be has habens mille vicibus and Ham has only mille vicibus: the full form in Redaction IV is habens mille orbitas mille vicibus. While both have the same omission, probably by homoeoteleuton, Be retains the original habens which must have remained in the ancestor after the inadvertent omission of orbitas mille. Secondly, in the list of vices which afflicted the negligent bishop in part 7, s. 37, Be has the well attested et superbus which Ham has omitted. Again, in part 9, s. 54, Be has the usual commoverentur

\(^{10}\) Other similarities in these sections are: inter cos instead of iterum <8> and the plural merita sua <17>.

\(^{11}\) caro: Ham; care tua: Be. Silverstein emends this to carne tua (S.212: 13).
which Ham has altered to *commoverent se*. These readings in Be are supported across the Redaction IV texts, indicating that in spite of the many similarities between Ham and Be, the later Berlin codex could not have been copied from Ham, but from a shared ancestor which also had these authentic readings not retained in Ham. Some, if not all, of the other differences between Ham and Be may be ascribed to later changes by Be, as for example *precantem* instead of the usual *plorantem* in part 7, s. 36, and the addition of *supplicium* in part 3, s. 11. Two of these differences are, however, of some interest. The first is the change of the number of furnace flames from seven to twelve in Be, part 3, s. 7. Silverstein noted that a misreading of vii for xii could easily occur, but he observed that since the word *duodecim* is written out, it was unlikely to have been due to a slip of the pen, but may have been "the result of an error in, or a misreading of, the scribe's original." If Be's original was the common antecedent it shared with Ham, it could not have contained the error *duodecim* since Ham has seven, the correct number of flames. The second difference is *suspiria* (Be) and *suspirium* (Ham) in part 9, s. 44, the possible significance of which is noted below.

The source of the Redaction IV passages in Hamburg and Berlin was a text of the A family of Redaction IV. This is immediately clear from the long version of the opening sentence in the A form (*gaudebunt angeli et archangeli magis ceteris diebus*) in Ham, which is only slightly altered in Be (*preelectus* for *electus* and *plus* for *magis*). Other A variants in the early IV sections (parts 3 & 5) are: *vidit vero* at the beginning of s. 6 and *in eis* at the end, the use of the ablative in the list in s. 7 and *omnes* in s. 11. Although the truncated list in the Admonition (s. 14) contains only one item, it seems likely that that item was the first of the series, which in the A family is typically *tristicia sine leticia*.

---

12 Other smaller more correct features in Be are *anime iuste* against *iusti* in Ham (s. 17) and the omission in Be of Ham's added *quidem est* in s. 2. The more correct word order in s. 44 (part 9) cannot probably be regarded as significant; it would be unlikely that any copyist would repeat the odd jumbling of the words of that section in Ham, and the rearrangement of them would require only common sense.

13 The same conclusion was reached after an examination of the redaction I component of Ham and Be; see chapter 1 above.

In the later Redaction IV interpolations, a number of small features confirm the A family source of these extracts, even if, because of omissions and changes, not all the A characteristics, as listed in chapter 5, are present. The majority of A texts identify the soul in ss. 36-7 (part 7) simply as a *spiritus negligens* rather than an *episcopus negligens*, and he is not identified as a bishop either in Ham/Be. However, while in some of the A family cases this may be due to a misreading of very similar abbreviations for *episcopus* and *spiritus*, in the Ham/Be case it seems a deliberate obscuring of the soul's ecclesiastical station: *ipse fuit negligens*. The location of the fastbreakers *super canalia*, as noted earlier, suggests Redaction IV rather than Redaction I as the source of ss. 34-5 (also part 7), and *super canalia* is consistent with an A family text; however it should be noted that *licebat* is the verb typical of the A family in this section, not *sinebantur*, which is found in Redaction I and elsewhere in Redaction IV. The omission of the last phrase of s. 37 removed also a possible identifying feature (in A this is *in die iudicii*, in other groups *usque in diem iudicii*).

There has been a more marked modification of the Redaction IV text of the going-out of the souls (part 9), however a number of small touches may still confirm the identity of its source, i.e. *mox* at the beginning of s. 47, the word order *eam... susceperunt* and *demones* in s. 48, as well as *milium* rather than *mille milium* and the omission of *pro ea* and *hodie* in s. 51. The altered first part of s. 52 in Ham/Be and the omission of part of the angels' comment in s. 46 has eliminated any A characteristics these phrases may have contained, such as the characteristic *deinde hec simul* at the beginning of s. 52 and *vide/videte istam animam* in s. 46. The typically compressed sentence in the A family's version of s. 54 cannot be confirmed here, but the absence of *contra animam iustam* after *factus est*, suggests that the original section may not have been in the A form, but was the second half of the two-phrase form. This is strengthened by the Ham/Be variant *pre gaudio* at the beginning of the section, which recalls the *cum magna leticia* found in the B and D groups, but not in A.

Several variants in the Redaction IV extracts in Hamburg and Berlin suggest that, within the A family, the Redaction IV source was closer to TriC (and to a lesser extent StP) than to others of the group. In parts 3 and 5, the first feature which differentiates Ham and Be from the main body of A family texts, is *numquam morientur* in s. 13, instead of the A version *mori non possunt*, which is
found in all the A texts except TriC and StP. The association with TriC is confirmed by the error in s. 15, *in uno die* instead of *in unaquaque vice*, which Ham, Be and TriC share (although it should be noted the variant which immediately follows this in Ham and Be, *mille vicibus anime* instead of *mille anime*, is exclusive to them). In all three also the characteristic A family insertion *merguntur* in the last part of s. 17 is lacking; Ham, Be and TriC have *et peccatrices secundum meritum suum/merita sua*, instead of *et multe (anime) peccatrices merguntur unaquaque secundum meritum suum*. The insertion is also lacking in StP which has: *et peccatrices unaquaque secundum meritum*. A further similarity between Ham and Be and the two A texts, is the absence of the distinctive repetition *multe bestie diabolice* at the beginning of s. 18; TriC and StP are the only ones of the A group which omit this phrase here.

In the later passages from Redaction IV, a comparison with TriC is not always possible as it omits several of these sections, i.e. ss. 34-5 and ss. 45 & 52. However a link to that text may still be observed. In part 9, s. 46, the angels' challenge to the wicked soul in Ham/Be contains its own peculiar variant *caro/care*,\(^{15}\) however it is otherwise closer to TriC's *quid operata es in terra* than to the A family form *que operata es in terra* which is found also in StP. The TriC variant *suspuria* in s. 44 (but not the plural *gemitus*) is present also in Be (part 9, s. 44), however Ham has *susprium* which is found in all the other A texts. If Ham has not corrected this from *suspuria*, *susprium* would presumably have been in the Ham/Be antecedent and the resemblance between Be and TriC would be coincidental here.

The date of the Hamburg ms. indicates that the version of the *Visio Pauli* known as Redaction VIII had been compiled by the mid 13th century or earlier. The Redaction IV source used in that compilation is thus one of the earliest A family texts of which some evidence survives, and the form of that source is therefore of significance for the textual history of the A family. If the similarities with TriC and StP, which have been observed in the Ham/Be Redaction IV extracts, are not due to a convergence of chance variants, the features these texts share, particularly the omissions of what are now characteristic aspects of the A family, may give some idea of that early form.

---

\(^{15}\) *quid operata es caro*(Ham)/*care tua*(Be) in *terra*. 
2. Venice B. N. Marciana, It I. 6 (=Ven)

The text of the Visio Pauli in Venice, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, It I. 6 (5015), ff. 161r - 180r, also has alternating sections of Redactions I and IV, and in addition, interpolations from the Visio Esdrae. If the criterion for classification as Redaction VIII is the alternation of passages from the two earlier redactions, this version too may be so described, and it has been referred to as Redaction VIII, together with the two texts of Redaction VIII, Hamburg and Berlin, in the discussion in chapter 1 of the Redaction I component of its text. However, in that discussion it was argued that the Redaction I component of Venice belonged to a different branch of Redaction I from that to which the Hamburg and Berlin Redaction I component belonged. Moreover, there are substantial differences in the overall structure of the Venice text and in the verbal texture of its Redaction IV component, when compared with Hamburg and Berlin. Therefore, although it may be classed as Redaction VIII by its alternation of Redactions I and IV, these differences would require for the Venice text some distinguishing designation within Redaction VIII, as for example VIIIa.

A transcription of the version of the Visio Pauli in the Venice ms. is given in Appendix J. The text has been divided into numbered sections, to which reference is made in the discussion below.

The three sources of the Venice compilation are alternated as follows:

<1> I: s. 1
<2-3> IV: ss. 1-5
<4> I: s. 2
<5-12> IV: ss. 6-15
<13-23> Esdra: ss. 3, 8-10, 13-14, 48-9, 50a, 40-1, 45.
<24-33> I: ss. 3-11
<34-42> IV: ss. 20-27

---

17 The Venice text has not been noted or discussed previously and hence has not been classified among the other known redactions.
18 These section numbers, are cited either as <1> etc. or as Ven:1 etc.
<43-47> I: ss. 30, 23-4, 26-7
<48-51> IV: ss. 28-31
<52-53> Esdra: s. 57B
<54> I: s. 35
<55> IV: s. 32
<56-64> Esdra: ss. 19-21, 23, 27-32, 36d, 37-8
<65> I: s. 36
<66-67> IV: ss. 34-35
<68-70> Esdra: ss. 53, 53a
<71-74> IV: ss. 36-40
<75-78> I: ss. 40-43
<79-108> IV: ss. 42-71
<109> I: s. 52
<110> IV: 72

The Hamburg/Berlin text has been described above as a version of Redaction I with interpolations from Redaction IV; as may be seen from the schema above, the Venice text is the opposite. It is basically a complete text of Redaction IV, with only one significant omission, i.e. the bridge scene (IV: ss. 16-19),19 and into this text of Redaction IV, passages from Redaction I and Esdra have been interpolated. The passages from Redaction I do not make up a complete text of that redaction as they do in the Hamburg/Berlin text, but for the most part they restore original sections of the Visio excised from Redaction IV, as well as adding Redaction I’s own contribution of the Limbus Patrum. The interpolations from the Visio Esdrae expand categories of sinners already in Redaction IV or add new ones; the sections from this source, however, are often reproduced only partially and do not appear always in their original sequence.

The distinction of a different prime source for Ham/Be and Venice does not simply recognise the different proportion of each redaction used, but it also explains the difference in structure between Ham/Be and Venice in one part of

---

19 Also omitted are firstly, IV: s. 33 in its correct place (see Ven: s. 56; the phrase has already appeared in Ven: s. 43, although it is difficult to judge whether it was taken from IV or I at that point of transition to red. I) and secondly, IV: s. 41; a similar phrase is also at the end of the Limbus Patrum in the Barcelona ms. (<43>, Silverstein 1959, [9], p. 228) with which the red. I component of Venice is associated (see chapter 1 above and diagram), however this also appears to have been omitted (Ven: ss. 77-8).
the narrative. For the most part however, and allowing for the Esdra interpolations, the structure of the Venice text runs basically parallel to Ham/Be. Venice too begins with the opening sentences of both its main sources as do Ham and Be, but in reverse order, beginning with the Redaction I Oportet phrase (here (A)vertet), followed by Redaction IV's Dies dominicus etc.; it adds however, the answer to the interrogandum sentence (Ven: 1-3). Like Ham/Be it begins the journey with the Redaction I: 2 overview of the heavens and the abyss (Ven: 4) and then continues, as they do, with the first scenes of the IV journey, the fiery trees, the furnace, the Admonition and the wheel of fire (Ven: 5-12). At this point the first structural difference from Ham/Be may be observed. Instead of the Bridge scene, Venice interpolates passages from Esdra which expand on the furnace and add some new groups of sinners including emperors, princes and potentates, who suffer in the presence of the poor whom they exploited, and an odd group of those qui viam alienam errantibus monstraverunt (Ven: 13-23). In a strange shift, the narrative moves into the first person in this section, reflecting its source the Visio Esdrae; in other interpolations from that source, however, there is some oscillation between first and third person, which is a feature also of the original. Making an awkward transition at Ven: 24, the text moves to the Oceanus and rivers sections of I, followed by the draco ingesting the iniquitous satraps of the earth (Ven: 24-33), thus parallelling Ham/Be: 15-25.

With the description of the souls immersed to varying depths in the fiery river (Ven: 34-44; Ham/Be: 26-32), the influence of the differing prime redactions shaping these versions becomes evident, not just in the different identification of these groups, but in the sequence of the following narrative. Venice gives the standard identification found in Redaction IV and elsewhere;

---

20 The omission of the Bridge scene and the bestie diabolice is curious as it must have been a striking feature of red. IV and well known; the Visio Esdrae too has a bridge scene, and its bridge has the magic power to transform itself from a broad highway to a mere thread (Esdra 36a-36e), so if the compiler of the Venice text had wished for a variation on the red. IV bridge scene, his third source could have supplied it.

21 The effect of this as narrative, both here and in its source, is somewhat disconcerting, but not only does it appear not to have concerned the compiler of the Venice text, but either he or a later copyist has used the first person in several sections from red. IV, i.e. Ven: 42 & 81-82.

22 The transition to red. I appears to take place in mid sentence i.e. between et dixit hii (which seems to relate to the previous section), and fluvii which leads into the following red. I section.

23 Ham/Be has the version peculiar to red. I (Ven: 24).
however the compiler seems to have had both redactions before him and to have felt the need to amalgamate the two versions to some extent. A phrase from I, \textit{postquam corpus et sanguinem domini nostri Ihesu Christi assumpsperunt} (here \textit{superant}) (I: 16), is inserted between IV’s \textit{fornicantur} and \textit{vel adulterant} (Ven: 37); similarly the \textit{falsi testes} in the following section probably also came from Redaction I (I: 17). However, in order to augment the last group i.e. of those immersed to their eyebrows (Ven: 39), the compiler added a group from Esdra 57B, \textit{qui testimonium falsum dixerunt qui terminos mutaverunt}, and others, apparently his own contribution, \textit{omicides traditores} \textsuperscript{24} et \textit{periurii}.

From here to the arrival at the Great Well, the sequence of the Venice text differs from that in Ham/Be, the latter reflecting Redaction I and the former Redaction IV. Thus, immediately following the immersed souls, Venice has the usurers as in Redaction IV, but under the influence of Redaction I, it merges these with the oppressors of widows and orphans, and then adds in also the separate group in Redaction I of those who despaired (Ven: 41-44). This shift to Redaction I continues with the passages on the abyss, St Paul’s lament and the angel’s rebuke (Ven: 45-47), but then, returning to Redaction IV (ss. 28-31), Venice has that redaction’s characteristic merged group of infanticides and false virgins (Ven: 48-51), augmented by an interpolation from Esdra, ss. 53 & 53a, describing the accusations of the infants against their mothers,\textsuperscript{25} and adding a new group of women who were not willing to feed babies not their own (Ven: 52-3). The description of this composite group concludes with the charge of making \textit{augurias et divinationes} which Redaction I (I: 35) characteristically adds to its (unmerged) group of infanticides (Ven: 54). The subsequent group in the region of fire and ice (IV: 32) is not identified as the oppressors of widows and orphans (perhaps because this group has already appeared earlier, merged with the usurers; cf. Ven: 43), but, in a passage recalling Esdra: 7 & 26, they are identified as those who did not clothe the naked poor (Ven: 56). Further groups of sinners are then added by the inclusion of a number of sections from Esdra (Ven: 57-64).

\textsuperscript{24} Cf red. IV C, s. 24, however, in the IV Apparatus ad loc.

\textsuperscript{25} The accusations of the infants in the Esdra passage added here, has the effect of restoring, albeit probably not knowingly, an aspect of the original Long Latin version of the episode; cf. LLx 20 (James 1893, [40], p. 32: 34 - p. 33: 4).
At the end of this lengthy interpolation comes a lament from St Paul (Ven: 65) in a form typical of I alone among the redactions, i.e. with the addition of melius esset illis si nati non fuissent (I: 36). However, immediately recognisable as drawn from Redaction IV: 34-5, are the fastbreakers who follow super camelos (Ven: 66-7), and the last to be encountered before the arrival at the Great Well are Herod on his fiery throne, introduced from Esdra (Ven: 68-70), and Redaction IV's negligent bishop (identified only as hic est negligens, however, as in a number of IV texts and Ham/Be) (Ven: 70-71).

While much of the basic content of this part is found also in Ham/Be, the sequence of the narrative here is determined by the underlying Redaction IV structure, although this is obscured somewhat by the interpolations from Esdra and Redaction I. This can be seen in the table below, in which the Ham/Be sequence reflects that of Redaction I (except for the negligent bishop insertion), and Venice (shorn of its interpolations) reflects that of Redaction IV.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ham/Be</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>Venice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>•fovea alta &amp; those who despaired,</td>
<td>•usurers</td>
<td>•usurers + oppressors of widows &amp; orphans + those who despared,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the Abyss,</td>
<td></td>
<td>the Abyss,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>•St Paul's lament &amp; the angel's rebuke,</td>
<td></td>
<td>•St Paul's lament &amp; the angel's rebuke,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>•oppressors of widows &amp; orphans + usurers,</td>
<td>•infanticides merged with false virgins,</td>
<td>•infanticides merged with false virgins, [Esdra],</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>•region of ice &amp; fire,</td>
<td>•region of ice &amp; fire</td>
<td>•region of ice &amp; fire, [Esdra],</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[inserted negligent bishop]</td>
<td>•oppressors of widows &amp; orphans,</td>
<td>•region of ice &amp; fire, [Esdra],</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>•fastbreakers,</td>
<td>•fastbreakers,</td>
<td>•fastbreakers,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>•infanticides.</td>
<td>•negligent bishop,</td>
<td>•[Esdra], negligent bishop.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The arrival at the Great Well is preceded by the angel's rebuke to St Paul (Ven: 72-74). Although there are matching sections in both Redaction I (ss. 37-39) and Redaction IV (ss. 38-40), a number of small features show that these sections in Venice are identifiably from Redaction IV: the angel in his rebuke refers to the torments yet to be seen as penas rather than supplicia, and there is no mention of the sevenfold quality of their severity; also the angel's summons sequere me is omitted and he did not take (tulit) St Paul to the puteum, but showed it to him (ostendit). Again, the angel's warning (Ven: 73) is from IV not
I, because it has the *ut possis* clause, instead of I's explanatory *non possis*. However, after the opening of the Well, Venice reverts to a form of Redaction I for the *flammas sulfureas* (Ven: 75). Although this phrase only parallels I: 40, there is no equivalent in IV. Redaction I continues with the Limbus Patrum (Ven: 76-78), but after that, the rest of the Venice text is the uninterrupted Redaction IV version of the souls in the Great Well, the going-out of the wicked and good souls, the descent of Christ, the grant of respite, the *hostiarius inferni*, the reward of Sunday observance and the number of pains in Hell (Ven: 79-108). Only for the penultimate section (Ven: 109), does the compiler of this version return to Redaction I: s. 52, for the blessing of St Paul and his mission to preach what he has seen. The text then ends with Redaction IV's concluding section (Ven: 110).

The interweaving of Redactions I and IV is more complex in Venice than in Ham/Be, and is the work of a different hand from that which shaped the Ham/Be version. But not only was the Redaction IV source used in a different way in Venice, it was itself different from the source used in Ham/Be. The source of the Redaction IV passages in Hamburg and Berlin was identified above as an A family text but there is abundant evidence in the verbal texture of the Venice text to show that its source came instead from the B family.

In the early sections the following features may be noted which are exclusive to the B group. The opening sentence, s. 2 (IV: 1) is the short form found in B texts and the structure of the list of hanging sinners in s. 6 (IV: 7) is *per + the accusative with per colla* included in the list; while both these latter features are found also in Family D, the order of the list is that of the B group. Similarly the position of *dolor* as the first item in the Admonition list is the same in D, but the D group does not have *et dolorem animarum* at the end, s. 11 (IV: 14). Other B family features in these sections are: the ablative *flammis* in s. 5 (IV: 8), *ponebantur* in s. 9 (IV: 10), and *unusquisque* in s. 10 (IV: 11). In the later sections the following indicate a B family source: *requirunt* in s. 42 (IV: 27), *abentes* at the end of s. 49 (IV: 28), *igne* (here *igni* *urebantur* in s. 55 (IV: 32), *nam videbis adhuc*

---

26 Cf. e.g. red. I< 40>: (ms. Barcelona) Et vidit ignes animas exire ex utraque parte; (ms. Vienna) Et vidit muros igneos elevantes se ex utraque parte (Silverstein 1959, [9], p. 228 and 1935, [9], p. 154: 34).
27 Although shared at times with its dependent Family E.
in s. 72 (IV: 38), *baptizantur* in s. 79 (IV: 42), *inter celum et terram* in s. 81 (IV: 45),
*quid fecisti in terra* in s. 83 (IV: 46), *vidimus* in s. 84 (IV: 47), *rursus clamaverunt* in s.
96 (IV: 59), *orantes dei filium* in s. 101 (IV: 64), *propter preces michaelis* and *pro
resurrectione mea* followed by *concedo* in s. 102 (IV: 65), the full section in s. 105
(IV: 68) and *tanta tormenta geenne* and *valeamus* in s. 110 (IV: 72).

The Venice text has none of the features which distinguish the B2
subgroup of the B family, showing instead some particular characteristics of B1:
*ceteri* in s. 37 (IV: 22), *reliqui* in s. 38 (IV: 23), *assolvunt* in s. 67 (IV: 35), the
omission of the second part of s. 51 *in fluminibus ...fecerunt* (IV: 49), *flebimus* in s.
93 (IV: 56) and the omission of the Christ’s first question in s. 98 (IV: 60). Within
B1, the Venice source appears to have been close to the internal cluster Bo2, Bal
and Mi, notably with *super camelos* in s. 66 (IV: 34),28 but also with *quasi
exaltabitur celia terra* in s. 81 (IV: 44) and *quia ipsa elegit* in s. 89 (IV: 52): it also
apparently had the Mi variant *foribus* instead of *sigillis* in s. 73 (IV: 39).

Only one touch in the Redaction IV passages of the Venice text seems to
have been the contribution of the compiler, possibly as a result of the somewhat
confusing grammar of IV: 45. This is the exclamation of the wicked soul in s. 82
(IV: 45), whose voice is not heard anywhere in Redaction IV or elsewhere,
except in Redaction IX: *ego animas odie egressa sum de corpore.*

It may be that the differences in content, structure and language in the
Venice version of the *Visio Pauli*, are such that it should be classed as a separate
redaction. However in order to avoid the multiplication of redactions for what
are essentially cut and paste compilations, a subgrouping such as VIIIa
suggested above, would seem to be sufficient.

28 Although Ro8C in B2, StJD in the D family and the dependent E family Arun also have this.
In Redaction IX "innovation and change [are] nearly everywhere," Theodore Silverstein observed in his engaging discussion of the new redaction in 1959. "But the change is in the hands of a writer who succeeds in making his work, though late, one of the most extraordinary of the Latin descendents of the ancient Vision of St Paul." The highlight of this version is the re-worked dramatic scene of the judgement of the wicked and good souls played out here at the dangerous bridge, but there are also other memorable new details, for example the bridge has the breadth of a single hair, the demons are like fiery unicorns etc. The text of the redaction which Silverstein edited from the version in the 15th-century ms. Naples, Biblioteca Nazionale, lat. VIII, A.A. 32 is incomplete however, finishing just after the translation of the good soul to Paradise and thus lacking the final scenes of the descent of Christ, the Reproaches and the grant of respite.

A second witness to Redaction IX is the text in Uppsala, Universitetsbibliotek, C. 22, ff. 130r-131v. This text, as it now stands, is also incomplete, beginning with the last letters of the first sentence of Silverstein's section [10], -cebat (? frigescebat), and then the identification of the religious hypocrites of various types. This section, as Silverstein pointed out, compresses the separate groups of the oppressors of widows and orphans and the negligent bishop, so that in the region of ice and fire there is, in Redaction IX, this larger group of ecclesiastical hypocrites. The narrative then proceeds, paralleling the content and language of the Naples text, but continues beyond it to the end of the Visio with the descent of Christ, the Reproaches and the

---

2 For further detail see Silverstein's analysis of the content of this redaction.
3 Silverstein 1959, pp. 239-243.
5 On the previous page the hand is different and lower part of the page is blank. The missing part (probably one page r & v) is not elsewhere in the ms.
grant of respite. The Uppsala text thus supplies the missing part of the redaction as well as giving a second version of the middle section.

Further, more limited evidence of the text of Redaction IX is provided by the three interpolations in the text of Redaction I contained in the 15th-century St Omer, Bibliothèque Municipale de St Omer, 349, ff. 179r-181v. These consist of a phrase from the identification of the Fastbreakers, the description of the Infanticides, and the final scenes of the descent of Christ etc. In the three passages there are distinctive phrases which identify the source of the interpolations as Redaction IX; the first two may be paralleled with the Naples text and the third with the Uppsala text.

The additional evidence from the Uppsala and St Omer mss. is given below according to its place in the narrative sequence of Redaction IX, and the new texts are subsequently compared with both Naples and each other. The whole account can be reconstituted from Naples and Uppsala and this has been divided into numbered sections; for the first part of the redaction (ss. 1-30), Naples is the only witness and for the last (ss. 106-108) only Uppsala. The new texts are presented first in parallel with the Naples text i.e. Naples and St Omer (ss. 31-43) and then Naples and Uppsala (ss. 44-99). For the later sections not contained in Naples, Uppsala and St Omer are presented together (ss. 100-105), and finally Uppsala alone (ss. 106-108). The Naples text given here is a transcription from the ms. without emendation.

REDACTION IX

2. Naples and St Omer (ss. 31-43)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Naples</th>
<th>St Omer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[7] &lt;31&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;31&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nap:</strong> Vidit postea Paulus alium locum tenebrosum plenum virorum et mulierum in quo erant pene et dolores sempiternae</td>
<td><strong>StO:</strong> et postea uidit paulus alium locum terribilem et tenebrosum plenum viris ac mulieribus in quo omnis dolor erat sempiternus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;32&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;32&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nap:</strong> Erant ibi puelle nigre indute pice et sulphure</td>
<td><strong>StO:</strong> Ibique erant puelle nigerrime pice et sulphure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Silverstein's divisions in square brackets are given also.
Et in igne erant ornate serpentibus et dragonibus. Ubi erant diaboli habentes cornua in medio frontium sicut bestia que dicitur unicornus percutientes eas dicentes Ignoscite Christum filium dei vivi. Paulus interrogavit angelum que essent iste puellae nigre Respondit Hec sunt que se maculaverunt. Vidit Paulus iterum unum locum tenebrosum plenum virorum et mulierum qui commedebant linguas suas sicut canes exurientes commendentes ossa mortuorum. Interrogavit Paulus angelum qui essent Respondit angelus Hii sunt feneratores qui pecuniam suam dederunt ad usuram. Falsi advocati et falsi Iudei propter hoc sustinent hanc penam inferni. Vidit postea Paulus viros et mulieres valde exurientes fortiter rudientes propter famem. Multosque fructos habentes circa se et non poterant sumere quicquam ex eis fructibus. Interrogavit Paulus angelum dicentes Illi miseris qui sunt qui ieiunium patiuntur. Respondit angelus Hii sunt qui ieiunia et vigilias apostolorum non solverunt nec quatuor temporae que constituta sunt a sanctis patribus voluerunt ieiunare nec quadragesima. Et ideo moriuntur fama Quia non habent panem illum quem dominus dixit Ego sum panis vivus qui de celo descendii qui commederint ex hoc pane vivet in eternum.

3. Naples and Uppsala (ss. 44-99)
Naples

[10] <44>
Nap: Vidit Paulus innumerabiles viros in loco glaties et ignis medium partem frigebat Interrogavit Paulus angelum qui essent

<45>
Nap: Respondit Hii sunt sacerdotes et levite Monachi et hermite Religiosi ostendentes custodire legem dei sicut sicut ypocrite
<46>
Nap: et non fuerunt casti in cordibus suis sicut domino promiserunt et fuerunt avari invidi superbi

<47>
Nap: Paulus audito hoc cepit amare flere

Nap: Dixit ei angelus Paule cur fles Adhuc non vidisti maiores penas inferni

<49>
Nap: Ostendit ei puteum cum viim sigillis sigillatum

<50>
Nap: Et dixit angelus Sta a longe ut ferre possis feterum putei

<51>
Nap: Et aperuit puteum Surrexit inde innumerabilis feter et orribilis

<52>
Nap: habens in se multa mala centies milies peiora que vobis nescio dicere

<53>
Nap: Et dixit angelus Paulo Si quis mictetur in hoc puteo non fiet de eis commemoratio in conspectu deialtissimi

<54>
Nap: Et ait ei Paulus qui sunt miseri qui mictuntur in eo

<55>
Nap: Respondit angelus Hii sunt proseliti falsi [word deleted] Cristiani Iudei Sarraceni

<56>
Nap: et omnes qui non credunt firmiter Christum venisse in carne humana

<57>
Nap: et non sunt communicati de corpore et sanguine domini nostri Ihesu Christi

<58>
Nap:

[12] <59>
Nap: Vidit postea Paulus unum locum tenebrosum plenum viris et mulieribus

Uppsala

<44>
Upp: -cebat Interrogavit paulus qui essent

<45>
Upp: Et ait angelus Hii sunt episcopi sacerdotes et levite monachi Et hermite fingentes se custodire legem dei sicut deo promiserunt quod faciunt ypocrite

<46>
Upp: Et non fuerunt casti corpore set fuerunt avari invidi iepo tales penas usque in diem iudicij paciuntur

<47>
Upp: Paulo audiencie cepit flere et susspirare cum gemitu magno

<48>
Upp: Angelus ait Quid fles paule nondum vidisti maiores penas inferni

<49>
Upp: et ostendit ei pueum septem sigillis sigillatum

<50>
Upp: et ait illi sta a longe ne noceat tibi feter putei

<51>
Upp: Aperto ore putei quod aperiri fecit surrexit inde intolerabilis fetor et horribilis

<52>
Upp: cunctis malum inferens innumerabile et ineffabile

<53>
Upp: et ait angelus Scias paule quod si quis mittatur in huc puteum non proderit ei commemoracio nec aliquod beneficiun

<54>
Upp: Ait paulus qui sunt hij

<55>
Upp: ait angelus hii sunt proseliti falsi cristiani apostate et iudei

<56>
Upp: et omnes illi qui firment non crediderunt in Ihesum Christum filium dei nec illum venisse in carmen humanam

<57>
Upp: et qui non sunt baptizatj et communicati cum corpore Christi et sanguine

<58>
Upp: Audiens hec paulus suspitans et gemens aspiciebat in celo et in terra

<59>
Upp: [r]ursus vidit paulus alium locum tenebrosum plenum viris ac mulieribus
Nap: in quo stabant anime unam super aliam sicut oves in ovili

Nap: et audivit gemitus cum suspicia eorum corum quasi tonitrua innumerabilia
Nap: Vidit tunc paulus unam peccatricem animam a diabolis viam portatam et plorantem
Nap: eodem die erat egressa de corpore suo
Nap: Et deposuerunt eam

Nap: et dicebant Transi si potes
Nap: Videns autem angelus anime dixit Veni anima que venisti de terra
Nap: dicentem
Nap: Ego vestra sum quia omnibus diebus vitae mee servivi
Nap: et propter hoc ad infernum vado
Nap: Diaboli gaudentes Illa stridendo dentibus suis
Nap: ligaverunt manibus

[14] Nap: Vidit Paulus post hec aliam animam iustam et bonam ad angelum ferentem
Nap: tunc erat egressa de corpore
Nap: et vidit milia milium angelorum dicientum

Upp: Et erant anime ibi congregate una super aliam quasi oves in ovile cruciantes innumerabilia tortoribus hec sunt anime illorum qui confessionem vilipendebant et qui firmiter in deum non crediderunt
Upp: quorum gemitus audivit paulus et suspicia horribilia quasi tonitrua
Upp: et vidit vii demones portantes animam peccatricem ullulantem et gementem
Upp: et eo die de misero corpore egressam
Upp: quam ducentes ad pontem sevissime stimulabant
Upp: et dicebant transi si potes
Upp: Tunc venerunt quidam angeli dei de celo dicentes videamus quomodo anima ista contempsit mandata dei in terra
Upp: Videntes autem angeli eam ream modibus dixerunt inter se Ve Ve Ve anima que venisti a terra sine beneficio
Upp: deinde anima illum cartam suam legit in qua erant scripta omnia peccata sua
Upp: ab initio navitatis sue usque ad finem vite
Upp: et iudicavit se qualis fuerat ita dicens
Upp: Ego omnibus diebus vite mee vobis servivi
Upp: et super omnes voluntates vestras operata sum
Upp: et ad hoc veni ut infernum me recipiat
Upp: Tunc dyaboli gaudentes atque tristes phalanges stridendo dentibus atque fremendo
Upp: ligando manus et pedes proiecerunt in tenebras exteriores ibi erit fletus et stridor dencium
Upp: Protinus in uno momento adduxerunt angelis dei aliam iustam
Upp: statim de corpore egressam
Upp: ad supradictum pontem
Upp: et audivit paulus milia milium letancium posteae et dicencium
Nap: O sancta et felicissima anima que fecisti voluntatem dei tui

Nap: Tunc dixerunt videamus si potest transire pontem

Nap: Illa incepit legere cartam suam

Nap: in qua erant scripta omnia bona que fecerat

Nap: Tunc diabolus hostiarius

Nap: incepit vociferare et plorare tanquam canis

Nap: et alii demones clamantes et dicentes

Nap: Angeli dei oramus vos

Nap: ne permicitatis anima hinc transire

Nap: ut ipsa apud nos maneat usque adventum Ihesu Christi

Nap: Et angeli dixerunt Cur tantum moramur in istis verbis otiosis

Nap: et levaverunt eam cum magno iubilo dicentes Christus vincit Christus regnat Christus imperat

Nap: Ilii appropinquantes deo dicabant Euge serve bone et fidelis intra in gaudium domini tui

Nap: Tunc suscepit eam Michael archangelus et vocavit eam in paradiso

Nap: Anime que erant in inferno clamabant et dicentes

Nap: Miserere nostri
4. Uppsala and St Omer (ss. 100-105)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Naples</th>
<th>Uppsala</th>
<th>St Omer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;100&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;100&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;100&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nap:</td>
<td>Upp: Tunc sonitus eorum auditus est super iiijor celos Statim vidit paulus celum moveri et filium dei et hominis descendentem de celo et diademata in capite suo habentem</td>
<td>StO: Auditus est tunc sonus eorum et super quatuor celos vidit celum movere paulus et filium dei descendem de celo et Diadema in capite eius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;101&gt;</td>
<td>Upp: atque vox eius audita est super omnes penas inferni dicens O maleicti quare petitis a me requiem</td>
<td>StO: Atque vox audita est super omnes qui in penis erant dicens maleicti Quare nunc petitis a me requiem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;102&gt;</td>
<td>Upp: ego pro vobis crucifixus fu et lancea perforatus clavis confixus et aceto cum felle mixto (?potatus</td>
<td>StO: ego pro vobis crucifixus fui et lancea vulneratus et clavis confixus acetum cum felle mixtum deditis michi bibere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;103&gt;</td>
<td>Upp: Ego meipsum pro vobis semi mortuis morti tradidit ut viveretis mecum omnibus diebus vite vestre</td>
<td>StO: ego memetusum pro vobis qui eratis semi mortui exposui ut viveretis mecum cunctis diebus vite vestre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;104&gt;</td>
<td>Upp: Set fures et dolosi superbi adulteri fornicatoros invidij et avarj maleicti nullum bonum pro me fecistis non decimas nec primicias deditis non ieiunastis nec eleemosiam deditis nec misericordiam in vobis habuistis</td>
<td>StO: O maleicti nullum bonum nullum bonum fecistis Nec divicias nec primiciam nec ieiunium atque eleemosinas et non habuistis aliquam misericordiam in vobis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;105&gt;</td>
<td>Upp: Set pro amore michaels et pauli quos rogastis et angelos meos et maxime propter bonitatem et dulcedinem meam atque dilectionem quam habui cum humano genero do vobis requiem ab hora nona sabbati usque ad primam horam secunde ferie</td>
<td>StO: Set propter michaelem et paulum quos vos rogastis et angelos meos Et propter fratres vestros qui in mundo sunt offerentes oblationes pro vobis et maxime propter magnam bonitatem et dulcedinem quam habui in humana generatione Dabo vobis requiem ab hora vespertina usque ad primam horam fere secunde usque ad diem iudicij</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Uppsala (ss. 106-108)

<106> Audiens hoc cerberus hostiarius inferni elevans tria capita canina latrans et ululans ait O fili david nonne sufficit tibi quod aures nobis iura nostra in celo et in terra nisi aures nobis iura nostra inferni que acquisivimus sine te et sine consilio tuo
<107> Jesus autem dedignatur eis respondere et tunc contristati sunt valde
<108> Ili enim qui erant in penis inferni et tenebrarum gaudebant et una voce dicebant Benedictimus te fili david qui concedisti nobis hinc refregirium per spaciun unius diei et duarum noctium super omne tempus vite nostre AMEN
The Naples and Uppsala Versions (ss. 44-99).

A comparison of Naples and Uppsala, ss. 44-99 above, shows clearly the similarity of the distinctive content and sequence of the narrative in the two texts. In the linguistic texture there are likewise many similarities but there are also a number of differences which lead to the conclusion that the two texts are independent of each other. The presence in each of authentic phrases which are lacking in the other, demonstrates this. At the Great Well, the angel’s warning in s. 50 and the identification of the lost souls within it, s. 53, reflect the standard language of the alpha redactions in Naples, *ut ferre possis fetorem putei* <50> (cf. IV: 39) and *non fiet de eis commemoratio in conspectu dei altissimi* <53> (cf. IV: 41). In Uppsala the equivalent phrases are *ne noceat tibi fetor putei* <50> and *non proderit ei commemoracio nec aliquod beneficium* <53>, therefore Naples could not have been copied from Uppsala. The Uppsala text too contains authentic details which could not have been copied from Naples, e.g. *casti corpore* and the extra phrase *ideo tales penas usque in diem iudicii paciuntur* (cf. IV: 37) at the end of s. 46, *quamdo anima ista contempsit mandata dei in terra* <66> (cf. IV: 47), *proiecerunt in tenebras exteriores etc.* <75> (cf. IV: 48), *hostiarius inferni qui vocatur cerberus* <85> (cf. IV: 87) and *collocavit* <96> (cf. IV: 53).8

The text of Naples is quite spare in comparison with Uppsala, which is richer in detail and contains certain passages which are lacking in Naples. The difference may be due either to abbreviation by Naples or to expansion by Uppsala. But how much of the extra material in Uppsala was in the text which lay behind itself and Naples, and which therefore may be attributed to Redaction IX, can only be conjectured. Some guidance may perhaps be given by the Italian vernacular versions of the *Visio Pauli*.9 These are clearly translated from a version of Redaction IX - the judgement scene at the bridge alone confirms this - but in this case it was a complete version (no later than the first half of the 14th century10), containing the first, middle and last parts of the

---

9 Ed. P. Villari in *Antiche leggende e tradizioni che illustrano la Divina Commedia*, Pisa 1865, pp. 77-81.
10 The ms. on which Villari’s edition is primarily based, Florence, Bib, Naz. Cod. MagI, cl. XXXVIII 127, is dated to the first half of the 14th century.
redaction which has now to be reconstituted in the Latin from Naples and Uppsala. Some of the detail which appears in Uppsala but not in Naples can be supported by the Italian texts; the phrase describing St Paul looking to heaven and earth, s. 58, which usually occurs before the going-out of the souls (cf. IV: 45), is brought forward in both Uppsala and the Italian versions, and the soul being deposited at the bridge in s. 64 is matched in the Italian, including the detail stimulabant, and similarly later in s. 78. In both, the demons wish to see if the good souls can pass the bridge sine... pavore, s. 81, (in Naples it seems this is still part of the angels’ speech), and in both the invitation to Paradise is expanded in s. 95; a version of s. 98 is also in the Italian and the repetition of the souls’ Miserere tribus vicibus in Uppsala s. 99, is echoed in the Italian alla terza volta fue odita. This would seem to suggest that this material at least was part of Redaction IX, and thus would indicate an abbreviating tendency in Naples. However, not all of Uppsala’s extra material is reflected in the Italian, i.e. ss. 61, 84 and 94; these passages may have been dropped by the Italian or added by Uppsala. It may be that the latter is the case in these instances, for there does seem to be a tendency at times in Uppsala to modify small details of the plainer language of Naples, e.g. phalanges in ss. 75 and 83, membranam and the rephrasing in ss. 51-54: ne noceat tibi, ineffabile and non proderit ei commemoracio nee aliquod beneficium (cf. also the doubling up in ss. 88-89, oramus vos et obsecramus valde and iustam et sanitam)

At two points Naples and Uppsala differ substantially and here again the Italian versions support Uppsala: first, in the mea culpa of the wicked soul in ss. 71-3, where the Italian matches s. 72 which is omitted in Naples, and follows closely the wording of s. 73 in Uppsala, and secondly, in the second part of the demons’ complaint to the angels in s. 90 where again the Italian reflects

---

11 E sancto Paulo, udito questo, incomincioe a piangere, e guardare in terra e vide in uno altro luogo homini e femine et anime che stava l’una sopra l’altra etc. (Villari, p. 80, in the first paragraph)
12 e menavalla a capo di quello ponte, et stimolavalla... (ibid.)
13 E incontenente l’angeli si menaro una buona anima a capo di quel ponte (Villari p. 80 in the second paragraph).
14 Intralloro dissero li dimoni: or vedremo come questa anima giusta passerae per questo ponte infernale, senza paura (ibid.).
15 ricevi questa gloria, la quale Cristo ae prestata a coloro che lui temono (ibid.).
16 Villari p. 80 in the third paragraph.
17 Oime misera! che tutto lo tempo della vita mia servii a voi dimoni, e feci le vostre voluntadi; or vegio che lo ‘nferno me riceve (Villari, p. 80 in the first paragraph)
Uppsala rather than the very different Naples version. The second passage in particular seems to be a case of editing by Naples, an attempt to make better sense of ss. 89-90; in the Naples version, the demons beg the angels not to let the good soul pass the bridge <89> so that it may remain with them in Hell until the coming of Christ <90>. In the Uppsala/Italian version s. 90 seems to contradict s. 89, since, logically, if the presence of the good soul has such a negative effect on the demons, they should wish that it may be taken away from them. It may be noted that the Italian does not have a negative in the first phrase, as the two Latin texts do (\textit{ne permittatis} <89>) so that, contrary to the Latin versions, the demons ask the angels to let the soul pass because of the negative effect described in terms similar to Uppsala s. 90. Either the Italian made the change or the Latin version on which the translation was based, was different in this respect from the antecedent of Naples and Uppsala.

The Naples and St Omer Versions (ss. 31-43).

A comparison between the Naples and St Omer descriptions of the Infanticides in ss. 31-35, shows first that the passage interpolated into the St Omer version of Redaction I was drawn from a text of Redaction IX. The evidence for this is the phrase describing the demons with their fiery horns: in Naples this is \textit{sicut bestia que dicitur unicornus} <34>, which by a misreading of 'uni' St Omer has rendered \textit{que septemcorni vocantur}. However, the text of Redaction IX used for St Omer contained a full version of the episode itself, including in particular the extended list of the souls' offences in s. 35 (cf. IV: 30-31); nearly all of this is omitted in Naples, which thus cannot have been the source for St Omer here. Other authentic details included in St Omer are the \textit{viperis...cira collo sua} in s. 33 (cf. IV: 28) and \textit{ibant in circuitu eorum} and \textit{qui redmit mundum} in s. 34 (cf. IV: 29). The tendency to abbreviate in Naples would seem thus to be confirmed here.

The short passage describing the fastbreakers, which is also interpolated into St Omer, is again identifiably from Redaction IX, since this redaction is the

---

18 imperciò ch'ella ci fae grande male, et ardiamo tutti del suo avenimento, sicome dello avenimento di Cristo (Villari, p. 80 in the second paragraph).
19 Angeli di Dio, noi preghiamo voi che lasciate valicare questa giusta anima (ibid.).
20 In the ms. the word 'septe(m)corni' is written out as such.
only one to refer to the appointed fasts (cf. e.g. IV: 35). The two texts have the distinctive phrase *que sunt constituta a sanctis patribus/ a patribus nostris et noluerunt ieiunare*, but the version in St Omer differs in some details from Naples; it differs at the end of s. 42 after *ieiunare* and does not include *et vigilias apostolorum* and *nec quatuor tempora* in that section or the error *non solverunt*. Also it does not contain the extension of the description in s. 43. If the Italian version is any guide, it is possible that Naples has made some additions here, although this would seem contrary to its general character. The Italian does not reflect *et vigilias ... tempora <42>*, nor the second part of the extension in s. 43. It would however support Naples' adjective *sanctis patribus* but, as it does not contain the last phrase of s. 42, it cannot confirm either the Naples or St Omer variants.22

The Uppsala and St Omer Versions (ss. 100 - 108).

In the last section of Redaction IX provided by the Uppsala text and supported in part by the third St Omer interpolation, there are several more of the distinctive phrases which characterise Redaction IX; these occur in ss. 103 and 105. The first is one of Christ's reproaches which elsewhere in the redactions is *Ego pro vobis dedi me ipsum in mortem ut viveretis mecum* (cf. IV: 62). Both Uppsala and St Omer add *cunctis diebus vite vestre* to the end, but vary in the other added phrase: *semi mortuus morti tradidi* (Uppsala) and *qui eratis semi mortui exposui* (St Omer). Although the Uppsala version *semi mortuus* might seem to make more sense, the St Omer phrase *pro vobis qui eratis semi mortui* (but not *exposui*) is supported by the Italian version *per voi che eravate morti, io mi diedi alla morte*.23 In s. 10 a reference to the souls' earlier appeal to the Archangel and St Paul is inserted *quos (vos) rogastis*, and to the usual prime reason for granting the respite, *maxime propter bonitatem [meam] (cf. IV: 65), is added *dulcedinem meam atque dilectionem quam habui cum humano genere* in both Uppsala, and, albeit with an omission, in St Omer, *dulcedinem quam habui in humana generatione*.

---

21 Silverstein notes (1959, p. 242 n. 241) that this occurs also in the Berlin ms. of redaction VIII. The Italian versions have *non asservaro*, (Villari, p. 79 in the first full paragraph) possibly reading *solverunt* as *servaverunt* or else paraphrasing.

22 Villari ibid. The published Italian text does not contain the first part of s. 43, however another of the mss. referred to by Villari (p. 77) does have this, i.e. Florence Bib. Naz, Cod. II/ IV / 56 (cited by Villari as Palch. IV. 56): che none oservarono i digiuni che furono ordinati da santi padri e perciò morano di fame e non averano del pane il qual pane e detto Cristo (f. 197r, col. b).

23 Villari, p. 80 in the third paragraph.
Both additions are supported by the Italian version. The extra phrases in the St Omer version of s. 105, *et propter frateres vestros ... vobis* and *usque ad diem iudicii* are incorporated from Redaction I, to which the text of St Omer returns immediately after this section.

The final scene of the redaction is given by Uppsala only in the Latin, but confirmed by the Italian texts. With the dramatic flair shown in the other extraordinary scenes which characterise his version, the redactor has the *hostiarius inferni*, who only expresses mute disapproval elsewhere for the grant of respite (cf. IV: 66), berate Christ in impotent fury for infringing on his jurisdiction in Hell: *O fili David none sufficit tibi quod aufers nobis jura nostra in celo et in terra nisi auferas nobis iura nostra infernij que acquisivimus sine te et sine consilio tuo* <106>. The Italian texts do not register Christ's disdainful silence at this (Uppsala s. 107), nor do they merge the *hostiarius* with Cerberus and his three heads, all barking abuse and then lapsing into sullen silence (Uppsala 105-6). It may be that these details were added to the Latin text, or else that they were omitted in the Italian translation. It is noteworthy that other colourful details are also lacking in the Italian, i.e. the angels' contemptuous dismissal of the demons in s. 91 (*Cur tantum moramur in istis verbis otiosis*), the demons rejoicing at the acquisition of another wicked soul in ss. 74-5 (*stridendo dentibus atque fremendo ligando manus et pedes*), the simile of the dogs crunching not just bones, but the bones of the dead in s. 36, and the fiery unicorns in s. 34. Either the Italian translation edited these out, or its Latin text did not include them, or they were added by the antecedent of the three extant Latin witnesses, responding to the creativity of the original redactor.

The Sources of Redaction IX

In his analysis of Redaction IX Silverstein pointed out that it was based on Redaction IV and two passages from Redaction III. He identified the use of Redaction III in the additional list of the torments of Hell which is inserted into

---

24 Ma per sancto Paulo, lo quale voi pregaste e per lumana generazione (Villari pp. 80-81). A more complete version is in Florence Bib. Naz, Cod. II/ IV/ 56: ma per la mia dolcitudine e per lo amore ch io ebi nell umana generacione (f. 198r col b).


26 Cf. Villari p. 81 penultimate paragraph.
the description of the bridge, and secondly, in the description which follows shortly after, of the chained *diabulum hostiarium* Belzebut at the head of the bridge, who was modelled partly on the *draco* of Redaction III. These borrowings however are "so brief or transformed that we cannot place them exactly within the orb of any of [Redaction III's] four subtypes."

In his notes to the text of the redaction Silverstein comments on individual features and details in relation to various redactions including Redaction IV, the latter mainly as represented by the Brandes edition but with occasional reference also to some manuscripts of the redaction. It is now possible, however, to identify more precisely the Redaction IV source which was used as the basis for the new version of the *Visio* in Redaction IX, as a text of Family C1. This is evident firstly from the re-ordering of certain episodes which is the main characteristic of Family C. In Redaction IV the usurers are the first group encountered after the souls immersed in the horrible river, and they are followed by the infanticides, the oppressors of widows and orphans the fastbreakers and the negligent bishop; in Family C the order is the infanticides, the usurers, the fastbreakers, the oppressors of widows and orphans and the negligent bishop. Redaction IX (ss. 31-46) follows the order in Family C but with the two last two groups merged into one (IX: 44-46). Two other smaller structural changes common to Family C1 texts and Redaction IX are the bringing forward of St Paul looking into the heavens and to earth, which usually immediately precedes the going-out of the souls (i.e. IV: 45 transposed to IV: 43; cf. IX: 58), and the postponing of the challenge to the wicked soul until after the comment about its contempt for the *mandata dei* (i.e. IV: 46 inserted into IV: 47; cf. IX: 66-67).

In addition, although the redactor has exercised considerable freedom with his basic material, characteristic features of the Family C texts, and in particular of the C1 group, are still identifiable in the linguistic texture of Redaction IX as evidenced in one or several of its witnesses. Among these in the first part are: *in ipsis penis* added to *in ipsa fornace* (IX: 8; IV: 10), *tristicia* as the first of the list of afflictions in the Admonition (IX: 11; IV: 14), and the inclusion of *traditores* among the group of those immersed to the eyebrows (IX: 30; IV: 24). Other later examples are in the infanticides section where St Paul

---

27 Silverstein 1959, p. 220.
28 For the above three examples see Silverstein 1959, [3], p. 239 and [6], p. 241.
sees not the usual *alium locum* but *alium locum terribilem et tenebrosum plenum viris ac mulieribus* (IX: 31; IV: 28), and the sinners who *non servaverunt castitatem nupciarum* instead of *non servaverunt castitatem usque ad nuptias* (IX: 35; IV: 30). At the opening of the Great Well, the stench is described as *habens in se multa mala* (IX: 52; IX: 40), the wicked soul is addressed as in the transposed C1 version *que venisti de terra* (IX: 67; cf. IV: 46) and the good soul, also as in C1, as *que fecisti voluntatem dei tui* (IX: 80; IV: 51). The souls' appeal and the Archangel's response are merged in IX: 97-98 as are ss. 55 and 56 exclusively in C1, and IX: 98 contains the distinctive C phrase *ut suis orationibus* (d. IV: 56). In the last sections there are again a number of features all typical of C1: the *miserere* of the souls is heard *super quatuor celos* instead of *in quarto celo* (IX: 100; IV: 58), the exclamation *O maledicti* replaces the opening question (*quid boni fecistis*) of Christ's address to the souls and the reproaches include lexical items such as *petitis* (IX: 101) and *vulneratus* (IX: 102) and the phrase *dedistis mihi bibere* (IX: 102); the omission of IV: 59 after IX: 101 and of IV: 64 after IX: 106 is also typical of C1. The final section, IX: 108, corresponds to IV: ss. 67-68 and here the C1 characteristics are: *gaudebant, fili david, refrigerium ... noctium* and the latter part only of IV: 68, *super ... nostre.*

Given the strong C1 element in the Redaction IX verbal texture, several variants in the Uppsala/St Omer section (ss. 100-105) are noteworthy. In the reproaches (s. 102) Uppsala has *perforatus* instead of *vulneratus* (St Omer) and *aceto cum felle potatus* instead of *acetum cum felle dedistis michi bibere* (St Omer). The Uppsala variants are found elsewhere including in individual mss. of C1. However, since these St Omer variants are typical of C1, they should therefore be given precedence for the text of Redaction IX which is clearly based on a C1 text, and the variants ascribed to changes made by Uppsala under the influence of what must have been variations of very familiar phrases, doubtless repeated often in religious contexts.

---

29 It may be noted that the Italian versions have a concluding paragraph to follow IX: 108, and this bears some resemblance to the redaction IV ending in general with one feature recalling *debemus converti* which is typical of C1: Onde noi, fratelli carissimi, udendo tante pene e cotanti tormenti allanime dello inferno, ..., doveremo tornare a dio con tutta la mente nostra etc. (Villari, p. 81). 30 The above are only a selection of such features; more may be observed using the list of characteristics in chapter 6 above. 31 See IV Apparatus, s. 61, in particular BM11(=C1) which has *potatus aceto cum felle mixto* in IV: 61 and also the variant *sonitus* in IV: 58 (cf. Uppsala, s. 100).
It is striking, however, that a version of the *Visio* based on Redaction IV, although extensively elaborated or modified, should lack the Sunday emphasis which is one of the prime characteristics of that redaction. Silverstein noted the absence of the opening *dies dominicus* sentence in praise of Sunday, as well as that of the fiery wheel and the numbering of the pains of Hell in the Naples text of Redaction IX; a further addition in the light of the Uppsala text of the redaction would be the absence of the reward for Sunday observance section *qui custodierit diem dominicum* (IV: 69) at the end. After considering the possibility of an earlier version of Redaction IV as the source of Redaction IX, Silverstein argued instead in favour of a variant version (with these omissions) of Redaction IV itself. As has been demonstrated above, Redaction IX is in fact based on a text of the C1 family of Redaction IV, but, although all the extant texts of this group lack the opening *dies dominicus* sentence, they all contain the fiery wheel (IV: 15), the reward for Sunday observance, and the numbering of the pains of Hell at the end (IV: 70-71). From what can be observed from the combination of the Naples and Uppsala texts, Redaction IX had none of these sections. The *Visio* opens with the *interrogandum* sentence (IV: 2) in Naples, which alone has the first part of the full text, and ends in Uppsala, the sole witness of the last section, with the grateful acclamation of the souls (IV: 68), which in Redaction IV immediately precedes the reward for Sunday observance.

The Italian versions of Redaction IX also omit the fiery wheel; however they open with praise of Sunday and an exhortation to Sunday observance followed by the numbering of the pains of Hell. Although differing in the number of men unable to count the pains, the Italian wording generally reflects the standard Redaction IV version (ss. 70-71), and in one detail, *le menori pene*, that of the C1 texts. The praise of Sunday and the exhortation to Sunday observance differ however from the usual Redaction IV versions; the first gives other reasons why the day is special, and the second warns of the punishment for non observance. Both figure as part of a "Sunday List", or the "Benedictions of Sunday" - a list of

---

33 Sancto Paulo dimandò l'angelo, quante fossono le pene del niferno. Et egli disse: Se fossono domila homini et avessero lingua di ferro, non potrebbero contare le minori pene del niferno (Villari, p. 77 in the second paragraph). In most of the other Italian versions the number of men is 40,000.
34 Cf. IV Apparatus, s. 71.
reasons why Sunday is a special day and hence must be observed as such: in a Latin list closely approximating the Italian one, published by A. Olivar from Barcelona, Archivo de la Corona de Aragón, Ripol 204, f. 103 rv. This is a fragment consisting of the opening section only of a version of the *Visio Pauli* as evidenced by its title *Incipit Liber Infernalis qui tractat de penis infernalibus quas sanctus angelus ostendit paulo apostolo* and by its final unfinished sentence *Et post hoc, ut dicitur, paulus interrogavit angelum dicens.* In Olivar's judgement, the passage was inserted by a later hand (possibly 14th-century) in a blank page of the codex. The basic structure of the two passages is the same, but each of the Latin sections is elaborated more than in the Italian. Also the numbering of the pains of Hell follows immediately in the Italian; this is lacking in the Barcelona fragment, but it is introduced by a phrase similar to the last sentence in the Latin. The two versions are given below (the Italian being better represented from one of the unpublished mss.).

[Barcelona, Archivo de la Corona de Aragón, Ripol 204, f. 103rv.]

Florence, B.N. Riccardiana, 1729, f. 69rv.]

Frater karissimi lo die dela dominica ei da temere e da gardare e guardare di tute li rie opere

La dominica e lo primo di di tutj li autre die En quel die Dio comandoe che fosse lusse e fo facto

[see below]

In illa ab angelo Christus nunciatus est propter peccatores natus est et resurrexit. In illa die finietur saeculum istud per ignem et resurgemus in carne ista quam gestamus in illa perfecta etate in qua Christus semetipsum resuscitavit. In illa die reddere racionem debemus de omnibus operibus nostri vel male gestis, et de omnibus cogitacionibus et verbis ociosis, et postea erit una dies tum bonus quam malis una dies dominica erit omnibus angellis et ceteris qui sunt bone voluntatis et qui fideliter et firmiter creduent in deum patrem et filium et spiritum sanctum,

---

37 Olivar, op. cit. p. 551.
38 Olivar (op. cit., p. 553 n. 10) noted a similar sequence in redaction V (Silverstein 1935, p. 202: 15-18).
Illi autem qui [sanctum] diem dominicum in saeculo perfecte non custodierint et in mane priusquam aliiud faciant regnum dei non quaesierint et qui se manibus vacuis deo in pauperibus Christi ostenderint, et ab omnibus operibus vel pompis diaboli et amore huius saeculi non se abstinerint, et [in] alio saeculo requiem non habebunt nec regnum paradisi et archangels gloriam dei visuri non intrabunt sed diabolus eos tolet,
et in nocte profundissima inferni inferioris atque obscurissima eos merget ubi est fames sitis frigus calor fetor vermes fumus piceus et sulphureus in omni odore.

Et post hoc ut dicitur Paulus interrogavit angelum dicens.

En la dominica dei si reposse quando abe facto il mondo
E tutj quill que non gardarano la santa dominica in questo seculo
e non si tigneno deli re opere del diabole
e non averano reqie in lauto seculo E qui non audirae la messa e lofficio dela dominica non averae parte en luy e lo diable lo menarae el fuacho denferne e non vederae la gloria de dio

Santo Paulo demandoe sancto michaelle angelo
quante sono le pene de linferno E langelo disse si fossono .xl. m. homini que avessanno lingue de ferro non poterono dire le mennore pene dellinferno

The association of versions of the Visio Pauli with either the Sunday List or the Sunday Letter is long standing, among them the 9th-century Redaction XI where a list of scriptural events, said to have occurred on Sunday, follows almost immediately after;\textsuperscript{39} it is also associated with Redaction III\textsuperscript{40} and several mss of Redaction IV.\textsuperscript{41} None of these has the passage copied into the Barcelona ms., however, or one similar to the Italian version, and there remains no clue in the Barcelona ms. as to what version of the Visio Pauli followed the introduction.\textsuperscript{42} On the evidence of the Italian translations, the missing text of the Visio could have been a Latin version of Redaction IX similar to the Uppsala text, since the Italian seems closer to that than to the Naples text. On the other hand, the Italian translator could have accessed the passage either freestanding or attached to another version of the Visio, and added it together with the

\textsuperscript{39} Vat. Pal. Lat. 220. f. 60v. The text is given in McNally 1973, at p. 183.
\textsuperscript{40} See Silverstein 1935, pp. 194-5; cf. also the discussion of Paris 3343 and the German version of red. III in chapter 3 above.
\textsuperscript{41} See Silverstein 1935, p. 54 and p. 115 n. 41. Also the last lines of red. IV St[I]F(=E) are "Fratres propter predicta custodite diem dominicum et quia die dominica creat sunt omnia In die dominica consum..." (f. 25v; the next page in the ms. appears to have been torn out and the present f. 26r has another text).
\textsuperscript{42} Olivar op. cit, pp. 552-3.
numbering of the pains of Hell to supply the familiar features missing in
Redaction IX. Against these conjectures, however, is the evidence of the Naples
text which begins with a version of the Interrogandum sentence and following
sections (IV: 2-5) as in the C1 group, but which do not appear in the Italian. The
awkwardness of the grammar and rephrasing of the Naples version of these
sections (e.g. Interrogandus est Sanctus Paulus etc and ut ostenderet eis deus penas
inferni per Michaelem archangelum) is not found in the opening sections of the C1
texts nor even in the comparatively smooth abbreviations of Naples elsewhere
and it might be that this too was perhaps a rather clumsy addition.

For want of further evidence at present, therefore, the early form of the
Latin Redaction IX may in some respects be considered still an open question.
Nevertheless the new witnesses of the redaction give an additional perspective
on the content and language of that form, the composition of which, on the
evidence of the 14th-century Italian versions, must be dated earlier than has
previously been thought on the evidence of the 15th-century Naples text alone.
CONCLUSION

Of the twenty-eight texts of the *Visio Pauli* listed in the Introduction, fourteen can now be added to the witnesses of Redaction IV, thus confirming the preeminence of this redaction in the textual history of the medieval redactions;¹ four can be added to Redaction III,² two to Redactions I³ and VIII⁴, and one to Redaction BR.⁵

Only one of these is a close copy of a text which has been already studied,⁶ the others all expand, enlarge and diversify knowledge of the internal configuration of the established redactions. In the case of Redaction IV these texts represent each of the five internal families of texts which an examination of all 45 witnesses of the redaction has now identified.⁷

The category of composite redactions has been expanded by the two additions to Redaction VIII and by two further combinations of Redactions III and IV.⁸ The mid 13th-century date of one of the latter (Dublin, Trinity College, 218) confirms that the practice of combining separate redactions began early and that the case of the 11th-century Redaction VII was not an isolated instance. However, the increasing examples of these compilations coming to light raise the question of determining a suitable identifying nomenclature without a multiplication of 'redactions' to account for individual but at times substantial differences in the handling of their sources.

---

¹ Bruges 162; Cambridge, Jesus 46; Cambridge, Trinity O, 8, 26; Dublin, Trinity 277 & 667; Erfurt, Amplon Fol 304; Graz 731; London, St Paul's 8, Melk, 97; Paris 3528 & 3529a; Prague IX, F 4; Schlägl, 226, Worcester Q. 27. (More precise locations are given in the lists of mss in the Introduction above)
² Budapest 231; Paris 2831 & 3343; Uppsala C. 77. In fact five, as a further text of red. III (Munich 9637) previously classified as red. IV has also been added.
³ Paris 2310; St Omer 349.
⁴ Hamburg Jacobi 1; Venice It I, 6.
⁵ Brussels 1367.
⁷ Family A: Bruges 162, Cambridge, Jesus 46 and Trinity O, 8, 26; London, St Paul's 8; Worcester Q. 27.
   Family B: Prague IX, F 4
   Family C: Melk, 97; Graz 731; Paris 3528 & 3529a; Dublin, Trinity 277.
   Family D: Dublin, Trinity 667; Schlägl, 226.
   Family E: Erfurt, Amplon Fol 304.
⁸ London, Add. 37787; Dublin, Trinity 218.
Important contributions are made to the textual history of the medieval redactions by the remaining three of the group of twenty-eight mss. examined here. One, Göttingen, Univ.-Bibl., Theol. 140, is witness to a new intermediary (A) between Redaction I and \textit{alpha}, and the second, Brno, Univ.-Bibl. 99, which has been identified as one of the components of Redaction VII, reopens the question of the existence of an early antecedent of Redaction IV. The last, Uppsala, C. 22, completes the text of the most creative of the redactions, Redaction IX, and also provides a second witness to the middle section of that redaction.

To record and reflect adequately the range of evidence thus furnished by this group of texts, critical editions of Redactions I and IX\textsuperscript{9} would be required and an expansion of Theodore Silverstein's synoptic edition of Redaction III. A synoptic edition of Redaction IV would also be more appropriate than a critical edition to reflect the diversity of the five families of texts within the redaction, only one of which is represented by the current edition.

This study has been conducted within the framework of the schema established for the medieval redactions by Theodore Silverstein. However, a possible review of this schema has been suggested recently.\textsuperscript{10} Should such a study be undertaken, the contribution of the texts examined here would ensure that it would be based on a wider range of evidence than has been available hitherto.

\textsuperscript{9} Possibly also of red. VIII.
\textsuperscript{10} Piovanelli 1993, p. 55 n. 87.
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