

The Authorship and Transmission of *De tribus habitaculis animae*

Elizabeth Boyle
University of Cambridge

This paper argues that Aubrey Gwynn's attribution of the Latin treatise *De tribus habitaculis animae* to Patrick, bishop of Dublin (d. 1084), is based on flawed argumentation. The manuscript evidence and the early transmission of the text suggest that it should be regarded as the work of an unknown pseudo-Patrick. Stylistic features are highlighted which argue against the author of *De tribus habitaculis animae* being identified with the author of the corpus of poetry also attributed to Patrick of Dublin. The English transmission of the text, and its ascription to a *sanctus Patricius episcopus*, is discussed in relation to English interest in the cult of St. Patrick in the late twelfth and early thirteenth centuries.

When Aubrey Gwynn attributed the Latin treatise *De tribus habitaculis animae* to Patrick (Gilla Pátraic), bishop of Dublin, whose death by drowning is recorded in Irish annals for 1084, he provided us with the reassuring co-ordinates of *tempus, locus, persona, and causa scribendi*.¹ Gwynn argued that Patrick had composed the text after becoming bishop of Dublin in 1074; that he had written it in Dublin; and that he had sent it to Worcester, where he had received his education, to his old friend Aldwin, and his bishop, Wulfstan, for it to be read and copied there.² Gwynn thus provided an intellectual and historical context within which the text could be studied. Scholars of Hiberno-Latin and historians of eleventh-century England and Ireland have generally accepted Gwynn's attribution of *De tribus habitaculis* as well as a number of Latin poems to Patrick of Dublin,³ and have not engaged critically with either the evidence or the argument put forward by Gwynn. If we compare the approach to *De tribus*

¹ On the difficulties of identifying medieval Latin texts and their authors, see Richard Sharpe, *Titulus. Identifying Medieval Latin Texts: An Evidence-Based Approach* (Turnhout, 2003).

² *The Writings of Bishop Patrick, 1074–1084*, ed. Aubrey Gwynn, *Scriptores Latini Hiberniae* 1 (Dublin, 1955). In what follows, all quotations from *De tribus habitaculis animae* are from Gwynn's edition; all translations are from "De tribus habitaculis animae: Concerning the Three Dwelling-Places of the Soul," trans. Elizabeth Boyle in *The End and Beyond: Medieval Irish Eschatology*, ed. John Carey & Emma Nic Cárthaigh (Aberystwyth, forthcoming).

³ Thus, for example, Richard Sharpe, *A Handlist of the Latin Writers of Great Britain and Ireland before 1540*, *Publications of the Journal of Medieval Latin* 1 (Turnhout, 1997), no. 1158, p. 414; Michael Lapidge and Richard Sharpe, *A Bibliography of Celtic-Latin Literature, 400–1200* (Dublin, 1985), no. 309–10, p. 88; *The Letters of Lanfranc Archbishop of Canterbury*, ed. and transl. Helen Clover and Margaret Gibson (Oxford, 1979), p. 67, n. 2 and p. 68, n. 4; Mark Philpott, "Some Interactions between the English and Irish Churches," *Anglo-Norman Studies* 20, *Proceedings of the Battle Conference* (1997), pp. 187–204 at 200–1; Martin Holland, "Dublin and the Reform of the Irish Church in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries," *Peritia* 14 (2000), 111–60 at p. 117, n. 23.

habitaculis taken by the authors of two major reference works, we can see that the attribution is not universally known or consistently applied. In Bloomfield's *Incipits of Latin Works on the Virtues and Vices* (and, indeed, in its 2008 supplementary volume), the text is simply listed as "Ps.-Augustinus; Ps.-Patricius, *De tribus habitaculis*."⁴ One can only presume that Bloomfield *et al.* were unaware of Gwynn's scholarship on the text, since it is not cited. By contrast, in the volumes which comprise the Corpus of British Medieval Library Catalogues series, wherever its various editors record an instance of the text being preserved in a medieval library catalogue, they give it as Patrick of Dublin, *De tribus habitaculis animae*, as though there were no question at all of the identity of its author. The volume for *The Libraries of the Cistercians, Gilbertines and Premonstratensians*, for example, lists *De tribus habitaculis* as the work of "Patrick of Dublin." However, where it would appear to be included as the sixth item (f) in a codex recorded in the first library catalogue for Rievaulx (ca. 1190–1200),⁵ the editor of the volume in fact gives the following information:

f) Patrick of Dublin, *Opera*: ed. A. Gwynn, *The Writings of Bishop Patrick* (Dublin, 1955). This *liber* has disappeared, but according to Gwynn, 8–9, 41–3, part of it was copied into BL MS Cotton Titus D. xxiv (s. xii^{ex}, Rufford) which contains a large collection of medieval verse.⁶

Although there is no reason to suppose that the "Liber sancti Patricij" is anything more than simply a copy of *De tribus habitaculis*, the editor alludes to Gwynn's hypothesis that this lost *liber* contained both the poetry and prose attributed to Patrick of Dublin. Not only has Gwynn's attribution of authorship been accepted, but Gwynn's argument regarding the contents of a codex which is no longer extant has been presented to the reader as essential information about this Rievaulx volume. Thus, in the volume of Bloomfield *et al.*, the attribution is not known at all; in the volume of Bell, it is taken as being entirely secure.

One further example should suffice to demonstrate the timeliness of a reconsideration of the question of the authorship of *De tribus habitaculis*. In a recent

⁴ Morton W. Bloomfield, *et al.*, *Incipits of Latin Works on the Virtues and Vices, 1100–1500 A.D.* (Cambridge, Mass., 1979), p. 526, no. 6082; Richard Newhauser and István Bejczy, *A Supplement to Morton W. Bloomfield, et al., 'Incipits of Latin Works on the Virtues and Vices, 1100–1500 AD,' Instrumenta Patristica et Mediaevalia* (Turnhout, 2008), p. 344, no. 6082. These two works, however, list only three of the one hundred or so manuscripts of the text which survive.

⁵ Cambridge, Jesus College, MS 34, fols. 1–5r.

⁶ *The Libraries of the Cistercians, Gilbertines and Premonstratensians*, ed. David N. Bell, Corpus of British Medieval Library Catalogues 3 (London, 1992), p. 120: Z19.222: a) *Quedam commenta philosophie*; b) *quedam sententie Pauli et Ysaie glosate*; c) *flores quorundam euangeliorum*; d) *Aurea gemma*; e) *epistola Carnotensis*; f) *liber sancti Patricij*; g) *collatio trinitatis*; h) *sanctus Augustinus a se ipso ad se ipsum*; i) *excerpsiones Pannormie Yuonis*; j) *Soliloquium Mauricij*; k) *quorundam uerborum interpretationes in i' volumine*.

monograph on conceptions of the mind in Anglo-Saxon literature, Leslie Lockett accepts not only Gwynn's attribution of authorship of the text, but also his proposed biographical narrative for Patrick of Dublin. Moreover, she uses that narrative (particularly Patrick's supposed education at Worcester) as a foundation for her interpretation of *De tribus habitaculis* as a product of eleventh-century English learning⁷ – this despite the fact that the biographical narrative proposed by Gwynn met with a serious challenge from Martin Brett in 2006.⁸ The inconsistency of scholarly approaches to *De tribus habitaculis* and the implicit acceptance of the attribution of authorship to Patrick of Dublin, despite its tenuous nature, argue for a fresh analysis of the evidence for the authorship and early transmission of the text.

Before we proceed to that analysis, however, a few words on the nature of the text itself are appropriate. *De tribus habitaculis* is a treatise or sermon focused on the eschatological kingdoms of heaven and hell, which it compares and contrasts with the third “dwelling-place” of the soul, namely the present world. It also ranges across a number of other theological debates and themes, including the problem of reconciling divine foreknowledge with free will, the convertibility of transcendentals, the nature of eternity, and the nature of the Trinity. Heaven and hell are portrayed as utterly antithetic, existing beyond language or understanding:

Bona autem regni celestis dicere uel cogitare uel intelligere ut sunt nullus potest carne uestitus: multo enim maiora et meliora sunt quam cogitantur uel intelliguntur ... Mala etiam inferni dicere uel cogitare ut sunt, nemo potest: peiora quippe sunt ualde quam cogitantur.⁹

The present world mediates between these two inexpressible extremes, as it to some degree resembles both, and supplies each with its population. A recurrent theme in the text is that of intellect, and the beatific vision is presented as an intellectual

⁷ Leslie Lockett, *Anglo-Saxon Psychologies in the Vernacular and Latin Traditions* (Toronto, 2011), pp. 430–34.

⁸ Martin Brett, “Canterbury's Perspective on Church Reform and Ireland, 1070–1115,” in *Ireland and Europe in the Twelfth Century: Reform and Renewal*, ed. Damian Bracken and Dagmar Ó Riain-Raedel (Dublin, 2006), pp. 13–55 at 33–35. Brett argued that the “Patricius,” listed among the community of Worcester in an addition to the Durham *Liber vitae*, must have been alive in ca. 1104, and therefore cannot be identified with Patrick of Dublin, who had died in 1084. If we accept Brett's arguments, this undermines Gwynn's hypothesis that Patrick of Dublin had studied at Worcester, and brings into doubt whether he can be the author of the corpus of poetry which is attributed to him. I leave the question of authorship of the poetry aside in what follows, and concentrate on the authorship of *De tribus habitaculis*.

⁹ “No one clothed in flesh, however, can speak of, or conceive of, or understand the good things of the heavenly kingdom, as they are: those things are far greater and better than can be conceived or understood ... Also, no one can speak or conceive of the evils of hell as they are: for they are far worse than can be conceived” (lines 20–22, 26–27).

process of “assiduous reading ... of the book of life.”¹⁰ Conversely, sinfulness is depicted as the result of childish ignorance, foolishness, or even insanity. For example, when contrasting the reality of the glory of heaven with the illusory nature of earthly glory, the author writes:

Quid stultius quidue insanius est quam umbra et imagine et similitudine uere glorie et uere delectationis, uere pulchritudinis, ueri decoris, ueri honoris more infantium decipi et superari, et ipsam ueram gloriam non querere, non desiderare? Quis imaginem auri in aqua ipso auro neglecto eligeret, et non statim a cunctis fatuus uel insanus esse crederetur? Quis orbem solis in speculo redditum uel in qualibet materia formatum plus diligeret quam ipsum solem, et non ab omnibus derideretur?¹¹

In this world, knowledge can be only partial: it is described as a dim light “infused through narrow cracks,” in contrast to the great illumination which will radiate from the “sun of truth” in heaven, where we will “recognise ourselves with true and certain knowledge.”¹² The ideas underlying these statements ultimately derive from Platonic thought, and the metaphors are somewhat reminiscent of Boethius, but the author seems to be expressing himself in an elegantly original manner. The author of *De tribus habitaculis* possessed rhetorical sophistication and advanced theological learning, but if we are not sure of his identity we cannot use the text as evidence for standards of learning and Latinity in eleventh-century Worcester or Dublin.

The complex history of the transmission of this text with its multiple attributions of authorship alerts us immediately to the wider problem of the instability of textual identity in the Middle Ages. *De tribus habitaculis* survives in at least one hundred manuscript-witnesses,¹³ dating from ca. 1100 onwards, none of which has an Irish provenance. Many of the manuscripts ascribe its authorship to one of a number of

¹⁰ Lines 107–8.

¹¹ “What could be more stupid, or more insane, than to be deceived and overcome like children by the shadow and image and similitude of true glory and true pleasure, true beauty, true decency, true honour, and not to seek after, or desire, the true glory itself? Who would choose the image of gold in water, neglecting the gold itself, and would not immediately be believed by all to be an idiot or a madman? Who would love the orb of the sun reflected in a mirror or formed in any other material, more than the sun itself, and would not be derided by all?” (lines 67–70).

¹² Lines 200–5, 228–29.

¹³ These are listed in Mario Esposito, “Notes on Latin Learning and Literature in Mediaeval Ireland–II,” *Hermathena* 22 (1932), 253–71 at pp. 263–67. Some additional manuscripts are identified in Walter Delius, “Die Verfasserschaft der Schrift *De tribus habitaculis*,” *Theologische Studien und Kritiken* 108 (1937–8), 28–39 at pp. 30–31. Delius’s argument that *De tribus habitaculis* is the work of Anselm of Canterbury is without foundation, since the “Anselmian” qualities which he identifies in the text are not indicative of authorship and are more likely to reflect a common Augustinian influence. Furthermore, his assertion that the text must be of English authorship because its earliest extant witnesses are English (p. 32) is insupportable.

well-known Late Antique sermon-writers: by far the most common author linked to *De tribus habitaculis* is Augustine of Hippo (d. 430),¹⁴ but at least eight manuscripts ascribe it to Caesarius of Arles (d. 542),¹⁵ and at least two to Eusebius of Emesa (d. ca. 359).¹⁶ In addition there are, so far as I am aware, seven manuscripts, dating from the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, which ascribe the text to a *sanctus Patricius episcopus*.¹⁷

An indication of the text's instability in terms of both authorial and textual identity can be seen in the sheer variety of ascriptions and titles given to author and text in the course of its transmission. To give just a few examples from manuscripts and medieval library catalogues, *De tribus habitaculis* is transmitted as:

Augustinus de gaudio electorum et dampnatorum supplicio¹⁸

Eiusdem [i.e. Augustini] de gaudiis electorum et suppliciis damnatorum¹⁹

Idem [i.e. Augustinus] de gaudiis electorum et penis reproborum²⁰

S. Augustinus de tribus habitaculis²¹

Sermo eiusdem [i.e. Augustini] ... de penis impiorum ...²²

Primus sermo Cesarii. Tria sunt sub omnipotentis dei manu ...²³

Given the variety of titles and authorial ascriptions under which this text was transmitted, it seems highly likely that *De tribus habitaculis* survives in more manuscripts than have been identified to date, and that medieval library catalogues contain hitherto unrecognized references to this work.

¹⁴ Esposito, "Notes," pp. 265–67; Sharpe, *A Handlist*, no. 1158, p. 414.

¹⁵ Esposito, "Notes," p. 274.

¹⁶ London, British Library, MSS Royal 5. E. ix (saec. XIII, St Augustine's, Bristol) and Royal 8. B. xiv (saec. XIII, English).

¹⁷ Troyes, Bibliothèque municipale, MS 1562 (saec. XII, English?); Cambridge, University Library, MS Ee.5.32 (saec. XII, Worksop, Nottinghamshire); Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Rawlinson C.33 (saec. XII, English?); Uppsala, Universitetsbibliotek, MS C. 250 (saec. XIII, English?); London, British Library, MS Royal 8. D. v (saec. XII, Rochester?); Oxford, Corpus Christi College, MS 212 (saec. XII, English?); Cambridge, Gonville and Caius College, MS 239/125 (saec. XIII, English?).

¹⁸ *The Libraries of the Augustinian Canons*, ed. T. Webber and A.G. Watson, *Corpus of British Medieval Library Catalogues* 6 (1998), A20.224y, p. 152.

¹⁹ Cambridge, University Library, MS Dd.11.83, fol. 19 (saec. XV).

²⁰ *English Benedictine Libraries: The Shorter Catalogues*, ed. R. Sharpe, J. P. Carley, R. M. Thomson, and A. G. Watson, *Corpus of British Medieval Library Catalogues* 4 (London, 1996), B120.25, p. 686.

²¹ Cambridge, University Library, MS Hh.1.4, fol. 59 (saec. XIV).

²² Sharpe *et al.*, *English Benedictine Libraries*, B120.113b.

²³ London, British Library, MS Royal 8. D. viii, fol. 133 (saec. XII, Llanthony Secunda?).

Mario Esposito, the first modern scholar to study *De tribus habitaculis animae*, included the text in a 1932 article on “Pseudopatriciana.” Having discounted the ascriptions to Caesarius of Arles on the basis of the text’s linguistic and stylistic dissimilarity to the sermons which at the time were thought to be securely attributed to him, Esposito suggested that *De tribus habitaculis* was “a Latin translation, going back to the fourth or fifth century,” of a homily by Eusebius or another “Arian or semi-Arian author.”²⁴ Esposito’s reason for locating the text within an Arian or semi-Arian milieu was the absence of any mention of purgatory within the text. However, this argument is difficult to sustain: the text is about collective eschatology, i.e. the events after the end of the world, and not individual eschatology, i.e. the events immediately after death, and therefore we should not expect to encounter any reference to purgatory. Indeed, the lack of any mention of purgatory would not of itself be a reason to remove the text from the eleventh-century Irish context later established by Gwynn: the eleventh-century vernacular eschatological homilies *Scéla na esérgi* and *Scéla laí brátha*, for instance, similarly concerned with ultimate, and not interim, judgement also contain no reference to any purgatorial state.²⁵ Other aspects of the text’s theology argue against an Arian or semi-Arian author, not least the statement that the Holy Spirit proceeds from both the Father and the Son, and not from the Father alone.²⁶ Another piece of evidence which suggests that we can dispense with Eusebius as a possible author is the fact that the biblical quotations cited in the text generally agree with the Vulgate.²⁷ Moreover, the author of *De tribus habitaculis* appears to quote Augustine’s *Soliloquies* in stating that “false evil is not evil, as false silver is not silver,”²⁸ which would therefore date the text to after the first decades of

²⁴ Esposito, “Notes,” p. 269.

²⁵ *Scéla na esérgi*, ed. and trans. Whitley Stokes, “Tidings of Doomsday: An Early-Middle-Irish Homily,” *Revue Celtique* 4 (1879/80), 245–57; *Scéla laí brátha*, ed. and trans. Whitley Stokes, “Tidings of the Resurrection,” *Revue Celtique* 25 (1904), 234–59. For a discussion of the eschatology of these texts, see Elizabeth Boyle, “Eschatological Justice in *Scéla laí brátha*,” *Cambrian Medieval Celtic Studies* 59 (Summer 2010), 39–54; Elizabeth Boyle, “Neoplatonic Thought in Medieval Ireland: The Evidence of *Scéla na esérgi*,” *Medium Ævum* 78 (2009), 216–30.

²⁶ See below, p. 61–62 (17)

²⁷ Although the author may have been using a mixed text: on the biblical quotations, see J. W. Gray’s sceptical review of Gwynn, *The Writings*, in *Irish Historical Studies* 10 (1956), 104–6, at p. 105; Esposito, “Notes,” p. 268, n. 76.

²⁸ Lines 191–92: “falsum enim malum non est malum ut falsum argentum non argentum est.” Compare this to Augustine, *Soliloquies*, I.15.29 in PL 32, col. 884: “et omnis falsa arbor, non est arbor, et falsum lignum non est lignum, et falsum argentum non est argentum, et omnino quidquid falsum est, non est” – “and every false tree is not a tree, and false wood is not wood, and false silver is not silver, and anything at all which is false, is not.”

the fifth century. Indeed, the palpable Augustinian influence throughout the text accounts for the later attribution of the text to him.

The earliest extant manuscript of *De tribus habitaculis* includes the text among a series of homilies ascribed to Caesarius of Arles.²⁹ The ascriptions to Caesarius and Eusebius seem to be interconnected, in that the ascription to one frequently occurs in manuscripts which contain texts ascribed to both. In some cases sermons ascribed to Eusebius directly follow sermons ascribed to Caesarius: for example, in British Library, MS Royal 5. F. x, an early twelfth-century manuscript, from the library of Wallingford priory near Oxford, we find ten homilies ascribed to Caesarius, of which *De tribus habitaculis animae* is the eighth,³⁰ immediately followed by a series of homilies ascribed to Eusebius. The British Library, MS Royal 8. D. viii, a late twelfth-century theological miscellany from the library of Llanthony Secunda, Gloucester, contains seven sermons by Caesarius *ad monachos*,³¹ immediately followed by four homilies ascribed to Eusebius.³² *De tribus habitaculis animae* is separated from these homilies within the manuscript, but is headed *Primus sermo Cesarii*.³³ In Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Tanner 6, the same four homilies which are ascribed to Eusebius in Royal 8. D. viii are ascribed to Caesarius.³⁴ In British Library, MS Royal 5. E. ix, an early thirteenth-century manuscript, formerly in the abbey of St. Augustine's, Bristol, in a series of twelve homilies, of which three are ascribed to Caesarius and nine to Eusebius, *De tribus habitaculis* is the last of the homilies ascribed to Eusebius.³⁵ It is easy to see how, at some point in the transmission of *De tribus habitaculis animae*, the ascription to Caesarius could have become an ascription to Eusebius of Emesa. One even wonders whether Eusebius of Caesarea may have provided an intermediary attribution (i.e. a confusion arising between Caesarius and Caesarea) before some scribes settled on his student, the later Eusebius, as the author.

Though named in the manuscripts, neither Caesarius, Eusebius, nor Augustine, can reasonably be accepted as the author of *De tribus habitaculis*. There remains one other ascription of authorship, which has drawn Irish scholars to the text, and that is found in seven twelfth- and thirteenth-century manuscripts. These give the title of the text as *Liber sancti Patricii episcopi*,³⁶ *Libellus sancti Patricii episcopi*,³⁷ *Sancti Patricii liber*

²⁹ Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Bodley 392 (ca. 1100, Salisbury).

³⁰ Fols. 26r–32r.

³¹ Fols. 82r–88v.

³² Fols. 89r–92v.

³³ Fols. 133r–135v.

³⁴ Fols. 44v–49r; 55r–57v.

³⁵ Fols. 81v–86r.

³⁶ Troyes, Bibliothèque municipale, MS 1562; Cambridge, University Library, MS Ee.5.32; Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Rawlinson C.33; Uppsala, Universiteitsbibliotek, MS C. 250.

de tribus habitaculis,³⁸ or *Liber sancti Patricii episcopi et confessoris*,³⁹ clearly indicating that some medieval readers considered it to be the work of St. Patrick. Again, on linguistic and stylistic grounds, the text is certainly not the work of the fifth-century missionary, but the choice of St. Patrick as pseudonymous author is intriguing. English manuscripts account for half of all the witnesses to the genuine works of St. Patrick,⁴⁰ but pseudonymous ascription to him is relatively rare; and works which are misattributed to St. Patrick in some manuscripts, such as *De duodecim abusivis saeculi*, a text widely ascribed to Augustine and to Cyprian, tend to have genuine Irish affiliations.⁴¹ In regards to the manuscripts which ascribe *De tribus habitaculis* to Patrick, it is perhaps significant that the cult of St. Patrick was at a high-point in twelfth- and thirteenth-century England: Lives of St. Patrick had been composed by William of Malmesbury (ca. 1090–ca. 1142) and Jocelin of Furness (fl. ca. 1189–1214), and the *Tractatus de Purgatorio Sancti Patricii*, composed in the 1180s by H. of Saltrey, was one of the most popular texts of the Middle Ages.⁴² Diffuse intellectual connections between Ireland and England, some of which were elucidated by Aubrey Gwynn in many important studies, facilitated the exchange of texts and textual traditions.⁴³ We might, for example, think of the twelfth-century Life of St. Monenna by Conchubranus (Conchobar), which is uniquely preserved in a manuscript from Burton-upon-Trent, Staffordshire, as a result of Geoffrey, abbot of Burton, procuring a *codex ex Hibernia*.⁴⁴ Twelfth- and thirteenth-century English interest in Irish culture was fuelled by the increasing Anglo-Norman presence in Ireland; and the role of Anglo-Norman noble families in fostering textual links between Ireland and England is exemplified by John de Courcy's commissioning of the Life of St. Patrick by Jocelin of Furness. The attribution of *De tribus habitaculis* to Patrick may, then, have arisen within the context of transmission of the text from Ireland to England, or – if the text did not come to England from Ireland – it may have arisen from an English source as a

³⁷ London, British Library, Royal MS 8. D. v.

³⁸ Oxford, Corpus Christi College, MS 212.

³⁹ Cambridge, Gonville and Caius College, MS 239/125.

⁴⁰ Ludwig Bieler, *Codices Patriciani Latini: A Descriptive Catalogue of Latin Manuscripts Relating to St. Patrick* (Dublin, 1942), pp. 1–3.

⁴¹ On these manuscripts see Bieler, *Codices Patriciani Latini*, pp. 3–4, 8–16.

⁴² I am currently preparing a study of the interconnections between the transmission of the texts attributed to Patrick of Dublin, the *Tractatus de Purgatorio Sancti Patricii*, and the cult of St. Patrick in England.

⁴³ See the essays in Aubrey Gwynn, *The Irish Church in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries*, ed. G. O'Brien (Dublin, 1992).

⁴⁴ Marie Therese Flanagan, *The Transformation of the Irish Church in the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries*, Studies in Celtic History 29 (Woodbridge, 2010), p. 16.

result of twelfth-century localised English cults of St. Patrick,⁴⁵ or of the more general association between St. Patrick and eschatological literature, as witnessed in the *Tractatus*.⁴⁶

Gwynn adduced one piece of evidence to link *De tribus habitaculis* with the corpus of Latin poetry which he and others had attributed to Patrick, bishop of Dublin, namely the fact that one of the poems is given as a verse prologue to *De tribus habitaculis* in Troyes, Bibliothèque municipale, MS 1562. This poem, “Perge carina,” is also found in British Library, Cotton MS Titus D. xxiv, along with the other poems attributed to Patrick. Of the one hundred or so manuscripts of *De tribus habitaculis* which survive, the Troyes MS is the only one which includes “Perge carina” as a verse prologue, and in that manuscript it does not contain the numerous interlinear glosses which are found in Cotton Titus D. xxiv, and which connect the poem with Aldwin and Wulfstan and thus with Worcester.⁴⁷

The presentation of “Perge carina” in Gwynn’s edition of the works attributed to Patrick of Dublin is therefore potentially misleading. Rather than publish it as an independent poem, as it is found in Cotton Titus D. xxiv, he printed it as the prologue to *De tribus habitaculis*, despite the fact that, as noted above, it appears as such in only one out of some one hundred manuscripts. Furthermore, Gwynn incorporated the interlinear glosses from Cotton Titus D. xxiv into his translation of the poem. Comparing the relevant sections (lines 67–80) of the unglossed prologue to *De tribus habitaculis* in Troyes 1562, the glossed independent poem in Cotton Titus D. xxiv, and Gwynn’s translation, we can observe the problematic nature of the latter:

Troyes 1562	BL Cotton Titus D. xxiv	Gwynn (trans.)
Christicolisque	Christicolisque i. wlstani	To all Christ’s faithful
Presulis almi	Presulis almi	Of kind Bishop Wulfstan,
Omnibus eque	Omnibus eque	To them all equally
Solue trigenas	Solue trigenas	Bring, as is fitting,
Rite salutes	Rite salutes	Thrice ten greetings
Ordine pulcro.	Ordine pulcro.	In fair order!

⁴⁵ On St. Patrick’s cult in the context of the political developments of the north of England, see Fiona Edmonds, “Personal Names and the Cult of Patrick in Eleventh- and Twelfth-Century Strathclyde and Northumbria,” in *Saints’ Cults in the Celtic World*, ed. Steve Boardman, John Reuben Davies, and Eila Williamson, *Studies in Celtic History* 25 (Woodbridge, 2009), pp. 42–65.

⁴⁶ I owe this latter suggestion to Dr. John Carey.

⁴⁷ For British Library, MS Cotton Titus D. xxiv, see J. Mozley, “The Collection of Mediaeval Latin Verse in MS. Cotton Titus D. xxiv,” *Medium Ævum* 11 (1942), 1–45. See also above, n. 8, for Martin Brett’s questioning of the connection between Patrick of Dublin and the Worcester community.

Perge libelle ⁴⁸	Perge libelle .i. uili	Onward, my book,
Carmine claudio	Carmine claudio s. episcopi	With halting verse:
Patriciique	Patriciique	And from me, Patrick,
Mente fidelis	Mente fidelis s. alduino	Loyal in memory,
Rite sodali	Rite sodali	Ask, as is fitting,
Mille coronas	Mille coronas	For my comrade Aldwin
Posce salutis.	Posce salutis.	A thousand crowns of blessed life!
Explicit prologus.		Here ends the prologue.

The text as it is found in the Troyes manuscript gives no indication of any connection with Wulfstan or Aldwin. Indeed, if we were to read it without the testimony of the Rufford Abbey manuscript, we might think it a pseudonymous verse in the voice of St. Patrick, such as we might encounter in Middle-Irish poetry attributed to St. Columba or to Cormac Mac Cuilennáin.⁴⁹ Rufford Abbey was a Cistercian house in Nottinghamshire, and the Troyes manuscript is from an unidentified English Cistercian house. I suggest that the scribe of the Troyes manuscript had access to the verses attributed (by modern scholars) to Patrick of Dublin and thought “Perge carina” particularly suited to precede *De tribus habitaculis animae*, which was independently circulating as the work of a *sanctus Patricius episcopus*.

Unlike the poems attributed by Gwynn to Bishop Patrick, there is nothing in the Latin of *De tribus habitaculis animae* which strikes one as characteristic of “Hiberno-Latin” (notwithstanding the problematic nature of that term).⁵⁰ Furthermore, one might note the stylistic dissimilarity between the poetic corpus attributed to Patrick

⁴⁸ Other Latin poems also use the “Perge libelle” topos: *Initia carminum Latinorum saeculo undecimo antiquiorum: Bibliographisches Repertorium für die lateinische Dichtung der Antike und des früheren Mittelalters*, ed. Dieter Schaller and Ewald Könsgen (Göttingen, 1977), p. 530, no. 90–93, 95, and *Supplementband* (Göttingen, 2005), p. 334.

⁴⁹ See, for example, Máire Herbert, “Becoming an Exile: Colum Cille in Middle-Irish Poetry,” in *Heroic Poets and Poetic Heroes in Celtic Tradition: A Festschrift for Patrick K. Ford*, ed. J. F. Nagy and L. E. Jones (Dublin, 2005), pp. 131–40.

⁵⁰ The criteria by which Hiberno-Latin texts are identified have been the subject of much debate: see Bernhard Bischoff, “Wendepunkte in der Geschichte der lateinischen Exegese im Frühmittelalter,” *Sacris Erudiri* 6 (1954), 189–281, trans. Colm O’Grady, “Turning Points in the History of Latin Exegesis in the Early Irish Church: A.D. 650–800,” in *Biblical Studies: The Medieval Irish Contribution*, ed. Martin McNamara, Proceedings of the Irish Biblical Association 1 (Dublin, 1976), pp. 74–164; Michael M. Gorman, “A Critique of Bischoff’s Theory of Irish Exegesis: the Commentary on Genesis in Munich Clm 6302 (Wendepunkte 2),” *JMLat* 7 (1997), 178–222; Charles D. Wright, “Bischoff’s Theory of Irish Exegesis and the Genesis Commentary in Munich clm 6302: a Critique of a Critique,” *JMLat* 10 (2000), 115–75.

and the prose treatise. The poetic works, including “Perge carina,” are rich in “Hisperic” vocabulary, but not so the prose text: indeed, we find only one example of what, according to Bieler, was “Hisperic,” namely *flammivomus* which, as Michael Lapidge has noted in a discussion of the lax usage of the term “Hisperic,” was in fact a common compound adjective in Late Latin.⁵¹ “Perge carina,” by contrast, contains distinctive “Hisperic” words, such as *glaucicomos* and *tithis*, amongst others.⁵² Similarly, the taste for Greek and Greek-derived vocabulary displayed by the author of the poetry is not witnessed in the prose: in “Perge carina” we see *celeuma* and *dindima*, in addition to the aforementioned *glaucicomos* and *tithis*.⁵³ Other works in the poetic corpus attributed to Patrick of Dublin contain *cosmi*, *craxare*,⁵⁴ *dogmata*, *mentio* to mean “memory,”⁵⁵ *odas*, *pictor* to mean “writer,”⁵⁶ *plasma*, *plasmator*, *polis*, *psalterium*, and *ymnos*.⁵⁷ *De tribus habitaculis* employs no such vocabulary. Furthermore, as Ludwig Bieler notes, “in his earliest poem [i.e. *De mirabilibus*] Patrick seems to use the

⁵¹ Michael Lapidge, “The Hermeneutic Style in Tenth-Century Anglo-Latin Literature,” *Anglo-Saxon England* 4 (1975), 67–111, repr. in his *Anglo-Latin Literature 900–1066* (London, 1993), pp. 103–49 at 106. See, however, also Michael Herren, “Hisperic Latin,” in *Dictionary of the Middle Ages*, ed. Joseph R. Strayer, 13 vols (1982–89), VI, 236–37, who argues for a broader definition of the term.

⁵² *The Writings*, ed. Gwynn, p. 102; Ludwig Bieler, “Bishop Patrick’s Latinity and Style,” in *The Writings*, ed. Gwynn, pp. 48–53 at 49.

⁵³ On *tithis* see Michael Herren, *The Hisperica Famina: I. The A-Text* (Toronto, 1974), p. 122.

⁵⁴ A distinctively Irish spelling of *c(h)araxare*: Bieler, “Bishop Patrick’s Latinity,” p. 49. On the Insular usage and development of *c(h)araxare* see Michael Herren, “Insular Latin *c(h)araxare* (*craxare*) and its Derivatives,” *Peritia* 1 (1982), 273–80, with its appearance in the verses attributed to Patrick of Dublin noted at p. 279.

⁵⁵ The word *mentio* means “a calling to mind,” “mentioning” or “naming,” although to a Romance-speaker the primary meaning may have been “lie,” “deceit.” However, this may be an indirect Grecism: see *Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum*, ed. G. Goetz et al., 7 vols (Leipzig, 1888–1923), II, 327.19: “μνήμη memoria mentio.” The glossary in which this entry is contained is preserved in Laon MS 444, a manuscript with strong Irish connections as it contains misplaced Old Irish quire signatures, and had a close association with Martin Hibernensis (d. 875) and his circle; see Paul Russell, “Graece ... Latine: Graeco-Latin Glossaries in Early Medieval Ireland,” *Peritia* 14 (2000), 406–20 at pp. 413–15. This provides us with an Irish link to the use of *mentio* as equivalent to *memoria*, “memory,” which adds strength to the attribution of the poetic corpus to an Irish author. For discussion of *mneme*, *memoria* and *mentio* in the poetry attributed to Patrick of Dublin, see Elizabeth Boyle, “The Twelfth-Century English Transmission of a Poem on the Threefold Division of the Mind, attributed to Patrick of Dublin (d. 1084),” in ‘A Fantastic and Abstruse Latinity?’ *Hiberno-Continental Cultural and Literary Interactions in the Middle Ages*, ed. Wolfram R. Keller and Dagmar Schlüter, Studien und Texte zur Keltologie (Münster, forthcoming).

⁵⁶ As Bieler noted, this may be an indirect Grecism from *γραφεός*, which means both “painter” and “writer.” Compare *pictura* for “writing,” in the *Hisperica Famina*: Herren, *The Hisperica Famina*, pp. 148–49; Bieler, “Bishop Patrick’s Latinity,” p. 49.

⁵⁷ Bieler, “Bishop Patrick’s Latinity,” pp. 48–49.

three historical tenses almost indiscriminately; his choice would appear to depend on the demands of versification more than on any other principle ... This tendency is much less conspicuous in his later poems ..., and is entirely absent from the prose treatise.”⁵⁸ This sort of grammatical choice is perhaps less useful as a diagnostic tool in a comparison of poetry to prose, since the author of the poetry may have felt constrained by metrical considerations which would not have been a factor in the composition of the prose text. All the same, the linguistic and stylistic evidence seems to point to the conclusion that the author of *De tribus habitaculis* is not the author of the poetic corpus.⁵⁹

Therefore, we are left with Gwynn’s only piece of evidence, namely the use of “Perge carina” as a prologue to *De tribus habitaculis* in the Troyes manuscript. From this alone he argued that the author of the poem, i.e. the eleventh-century bishop of Dublin, must be the author of the prose text. We can see the unfortunate results of this decision in the following remarks:

The manuscripts of ‘De tribus habitaculis’ that have been examined for the purpose of the present edition fall clearly into two main groups: those of the oldest recension which must derive from the text sent by Patrick to Worcester, and those of a later recension which seem to derive from the author’s revised master-copy at Dublin. In the earlier and larger group the treatise is either anonymous or has been attributed to Caesarius or Eusebius; only one manuscript of this group (I [= Oxford, Bodleian Rawlinson C. 33]), has preserved the true name of the author. In none of these manuscripts is the prose text of ‘De tribus habitaculis’ connected with the prefatory verses ‘Perge carina’ – though these verses must have accompanied Bishop Patrick’s original text, sent by him to Aldwin at Worcester. Very soon after its arrival in Worcester, anonymous copies seem to have been made which were gradually incorporated in a collection of homilies, wrongly ascribed either to Caesarius or Eusebius.⁶⁰

If Gwynn is right, all this must have occurred within twenty-five years, which is (at most) the time which would separate Bishop Patrick’s writing of the text and the earliest manuscript witness. And yet the earliest witness, written in the late eleventh century, or by ca. 1100 at the latest, has no verse prologue and attributes the text

⁵⁸ Bieler, “Bishop Patrick’s Latinity,” p. 51.

⁵⁹ Given the similarity of the subject matter and the shared Platonist worldview of *De tribus habitaculis* and the verses beginning “Constet quantus honos humane condicionis,” for example, we cannot ascribe the different lexical choices to variation in topic or audience. It is certainly possible that a different register, with a more unusual lexicon, was thought more appropriate for poetry than for prose – perhaps in the treatise the clarity of exposition was more important, whereas in poetry its meditative qualities allow for the use of more difficult vocabulary – but it seems more likely to me that the poetry and the prose have different authors.

⁶⁰ *The Writings*, ed. Gwynn, p. 47, my italics.

implicitly to Caesarius.⁶¹ There is no manuscript evidence that *De tribus habitaculis* was sent from Dublin to Worcester and no evidence for a “revised master-copy at Dublin.” Indeed, I have as yet been unable to identify a single copy of *De tribus habitaculis* with a Worcester provenance.⁶² Therefore, Lockett’s recent citation of *De tribus habitaculis* as a product of an eleventh-century Worcester education is based on dubious evidence. The citation by the editors of the Corpus of British Medieval Library Catalogues of a hypothetical manuscript which, according to Gwynn, must have contained both the prose and poetic works attributed to Patrick together, i.e. the lost Rievaulx *Liber sancti Patricii*, is equally problematic.

With Gwynn’s attribution to Bishop Patrick thus in doubt, can we offer anything to put in its place? The problems inherent in identifying the author of *De tribus habitaculis*, or even the intellectual milieu in which it might have been composed,⁶³ can be highlighted by a brief examination of two theological and doctrinal issues raised in the text which seem to have a particular eleventh-century resonance: the *filioque* clause, and legitimate marriage. The problem of the *filioque* pertains to whether the Holy Spirit proceeds only from the Father, or from both the Father and the Son.⁶⁴ *De tribus habitaculis* states:

Tunc iustis manifestum erit quomodo deus est inuisibilis incommutabilis, sine initio et sine fine, ante omnia et post omnia: et quicquid inter nasci quod ad filium pertinet, et procedere quod ad spiritum sanctum, excepto quod unus ex uno natus sit, alter ex duobus processit: et quomodo pater non precessit filium tempore sed origine, nec spiritum sanctum: et quomodo omnia dei unum sunt in deo, excepto quod ad relationem pertinet.⁶⁵

⁶¹ *The Writings*, ed. Gwynn, p. 28; Teresa Webber, *Scribes and Scholars at Salisbury Cathedral c. 1075–c. 1125* (Oxford, 1992).

⁶² For an inventory of surviving manuscripts associated with Worcester dating from ca. 1040–ca. 1130, see Richard Gameson, “St Wulfstan, the Library at Worcester, and the Spirituality of the Medieval Book,” in *St Wulfstan and his World*, ed. Julia S. Barrow and N. P. Brooks (Aldershot, 2005), pp. 59–104 at 92–104.

⁶³ Louis Gougaud accepted the idea that *De tribus habitaculis* was Irish, but noted that dating it on the grounds of either content or style would be extremely difficult: *Christianity in Celtic Lands* (London, 1932), pp. 291–92.

⁶⁴ See A. Edward Sicienski, *The Filioque: History of a Doctrinal Controversy* (Oxford, 2010).

⁶⁵ “Then it will be manifest to the just how God is invisible and unchangeable, without beginning and without end, before everything and after everything, and whatever difference there is between being born, which pertains to the Son, and proceeding, which pertains to the Holy Spirit, except that the one is born of one, and the other proceeds from two: and how the Father preceded neither the Son nor the Holy Spirit in time, but in origin: and how all things of God are together in God, except that which pertains to their relationship” (lines 230–36).

One might initially be tempted to see this as evidence of the text having been composed in the eleventh century, since it clearly states that while the Son was born of one, i.e. the Father, the Holy Spirit proceeds from two, i.e. both the Father and the Son. The papal sanction of the incorporation of the *filioque* into the Creed under Benedict VIII (1012–1024), and its subsequent use in the Roman liturgy, provides one historical moment during which the *filioque* issue was at the forefront of doctrinal debate. Another such moment is the exchange of anathemas between Cardinal Humbert of Silva Candida and Patriarch Michael Cerularius in 1054, which formed part of the build-up to the “Great Schism” between the Eastern and Western Churches. Despite its relatively recent incorporation into the Roman liturgy, Cardinal Humbert claimed that the Patriarch and his followers had removed from the Creed the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Son.⁶⁶ However, we should note that the *filioque* had long been incorporated in the Creed elsewhere in western Europe, following the Councils of Toledo (589) and Aachen (809).⁶⁷ Consequently, we cannot take the statement that the Holy Spirit proceeds from both the Father and the Son as evidence of the text post-dating the incorporation of the *filioque* into the Roman liturgy.

At two points in the text we can observe a particular concern with legitimate marriage practices and adultery. In the first example, the author begins with a consideration of the convertibility of transcendentals, in this case “truth” and “being,” in which he argues (echoing Augustine) that evil is good insofar as it is true, because “omne enim uerum a ueritate est, et omne uerum quantum uerum bonum est.”⁶⁸ He then observes that good things can emerge from evil, as, for example, God “fashions and makes good men” from adultery.⁶⁹ It is perhaps significant that this is the only example our author provides of good coming from evil, particularly given that, at an earlier point in the text, the author has stated of heaven that it is a place

[u]bi quicquid nunc nos latet manifestius erit: ubi ratio manifesta erit cur hic electus est et ille reprobatus, cur hic in regnum assumptus est et ille in seruitutem redactus, cur alius in utero moritur alius in infantia alius in iuuentute alius in senectute, cur alius pauper est alius diues, cur filius adultere baptizatur et aliquando filius legitime coniugis ante baptismum moritur, cur qui bene incipit uiuere aliquando male finitur et qui male

⁶⁶ Siecienski, *The Filioque*, pp. 112–15.

⁶⁷ See, for example, *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, ed. F.L. Cross, (3rd revised edn., ed. E. A. Livingstone, [Oxford, 2005]), s.v. “filioque.”

⁶⁸ “For all that is true comes from truth, and all that is true, insofar as it is true, is good” (lines 194–95). It is in this context that the author cites Augustine, *Soliloquies*, I.15.29 (see above n. 28).

⁶⁹ “Multa quippe bona de malis omnipotens facit, ut de adulterio hominum bonos format et facit homines” (lines 200–1).

incipit sepe bene finitur. Hec omnia et huiusmodi multa in libro uite plana et aperta erunt.⁷⁰

The question of why the son of the “legitimate wife” might die before baptism, whereas the son of an “adulterous woman” might be baptized, must be read in the light of the author’s statement that the son born of adultery, thus baptized, can go on to become a good man. Again, we might be tempted to look to an eleventh-century context, and this time a specifically Irish context, for such a statement. In his letters to Gofraid mac Amlaíb, king of Dublin, and Toirdelbach Ua Briain, king of Munster (and Gofraid’s over-king), Lanfranc, archbishop of Canterbury, chides the kings for permitting lax marriage practices in Ireland.⁷¹ The alleged ease with which divorce could be obtained, the practice of concubinage, and the permitting of marriage within an unacceptable degree of consanguinity were among the criticisms levelled at Irish society in the eleventh century. Thus, the moral fate of a man born of an adulterous union would have had great resonance in eleventh-century Ireland. Nonetheless, the references in *De tribus habitaculis* are too broad and non-specific to point definitively to any particular time or context, and certainly should not stand as evidence of Irish authorship. Within the scope of Christian theological writing, the themes and concerns of *De tribus habitaculis animae* recur at many historical moments, and in many geographical areas. The text’s universality helps in part to explain its enduring appeal, but simultaneously makes it very difficult to anchor the text in time and place. That is why medieval scribes could equally ascribe it to Augustine as to Patrick, to Eusebius as to Caesarius.

A more promising piece of evidence for Irish familiarity with *De tribus habitaculis*, predating the earliest extant English manuscript, is to be found in the vernacular Irish apocryphal text *In Tenga Bithnua* (“The Evernew Tongue”).⁷² Charles Wright has observed that the two texts share an unusual formulation of the motif of the sight of

⁷⁰ “Where whatever is now hidden from us will be clearer: where the reason will be clear why this one was chosen and that one rejected; why this one was received into kingship and that one driven into servitude; why one dies in the womb, another in childhood, another in youth, another in old age; why one is poor and another wealthy; why the son of an adulterous woman is baptised, and sometimes the son of a legitimate wife dies before baptism; why one who starts life well sometimes ends up being wicked, and one who starts out wicked often ends up being good. All these, and many other such things, will be plain and unlocked in the book of life” (lines 109–16).

⁷¹ *The Letters*, ed. and transl. Clover and Gibson, pp. 66–73 (letters 9 and 10). Both letters mention Patrick of Dublin and Lanfranc’s consecration of him as bishop.

⁷² *In Tenga Bithnua: The Ever-new Tongue*, ed. and trans. John Carey, Corpus Christianorum Series Apocryphorum. Apocrypha Hiberniae II. Apocalyptica 1 (Turnhout, 2009). Carey, pp. 72 and 92 suggests a date of ca. 1000 for the First Recension of the text in its present form, but argues that this is a reworking of a ninth-century original.

God offering respite to the damned.⁷³ However, because Wright accepted the attribution of *De tribus habitaculis* to Patrick of Dublin, he argued that the Latin text was drawing on the Irish, when in fact the borrowing could be in either direction (or, indeed, they may simply be drawing on a common source). One would hesitate to draw any definitive conclusions about authorship from a single Irish parallel; indeed, Peter Kitson has noted that material deriving from *In Tenga Bithnua* was known in twelfth-century England.⁷⁴ However, further investigation may yield other examples to support the case for an Irish origin of *De tribus habitaculis*.

In order to study *De tribus habitaculis* in its historical context, it needs first to have an historical context. Its composition needs to be fixed in time and place. Gwynn thought he had done that by attributing its authorship to an eleventh-century bishop of the Hiberno-Scandinavian kingdom of Dublin. This attribution is, however, not as secure as scholars have thought it to be. In fact, it is not very secure at all. Esposito argued that “there is nothing in the work that suggests an Irish origin,”⁷⁵ but equally there is nothing which disproves an Irish origin. Gwynn’s attribution of the corpus of Latin poetry to Patrick, bishop of Dublin, is not conclusive, and rests, as Brett has noted, on “extremely fragile” foundations.⁷⁶ The attribution of *De tribus habitaculis*, as I hope to have shown, is even less secure. One would hope that further close analysis of the sources and theology of the text may point us towards a particular milieu in which the text might have been composed. At present, in the absence of concrete evidence which can locate the composition of the text, we can instead seek to understand how it was read and understood by its many and varied audiences.

To that end, it is worth emphasizing that, according to the evidence of extant manuscripts and medieval library catalogues, no medieval reader thought that he (or she) was reading the work of Patrick, the eleventh-century bishop of Dublin, whether or not he is the author of the text. Being aware of the variety of authorial attributions is essential for understanding the reception and transmission of the text. In this regard, the cluster of manuscripts that ascribe the text to St. Patrick is of considerable interest: clearly some of the text’s readers in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries considered this to be a work with Irish connections. The scribe of the Troyes manuscript elaborated on this by recasting the poem “Perge carina,” perhaps written by Patrick, bishop of Dublin, as a verse prologue to *De tribus habitaculis* written in the voice of St. Patrick; but for most of its readers, for most of its history, it was the work

⁷³ *The Irish Tradition in Old English Literature* (Cambridge, 1993), p. 143, where Wright cites the relevant passages.

⁷⁴ Peter Kitson, “The Jewels and Bird *Hiruath* of the ‘Ever-new Tongue,’” *Ériu* 25 (1984), 113–36 at pp. 127–30.

⁷⁵ Esposito, “Notes,” p. 268.

⁷⁶ Brett, “Canterbury’s Perspective,” p. 34.

of Augustine. Therefore, if we return to Bloomfield *et al.*, and their *Incipits of Latin Works on the Virtues and Vices*, compiled without reference to Gwynn's scholarship, I would suggest that they were right, albeit for the wrong reasons, and that we should certainly not refer to this text as "Patrick of Dublin, *De tribus habitaculis animae*." Given the ubiquity of medieval misattributions to Augustine, Caesarius, and Eusebius, and the rarity of ascriptions – particularly for texts circulating in England – to St. Patrick, some weight should be given to those ascriptions, whether they reflect transmission of the text from Ireland, or simply a twelfth-century English belief that the text had Irish associations. I propose therefore, that, in the absence of further evidence to identify the author, or the place of composition, of the text, it be referred to as "ps. Patrick, *De tribus habitaculis*." The evidence of the text and its manuscript transmission affords us no more certainty than that.⁷⁷

⁷⁷ A version of this study was presented at the XIVth International Congress of Celtic Studies (Maynooth, August 2011) under the auspices of the "*De finibus*: Christian Representations of the Afterlife in Medieval Ireland" project, based in the Department of Early and Medieval Irish, University College Cork, and funded by the Irish Research Council for the Humanities and Social Sciences. I am grateful to the Leverhulme Trust and the Isaac Newton Trust for funding my own research and facilitating my collaboration with the "*De finibus*" project. I should like to thank Richard Sharpe for commenting on a draft of this paper, and the editor and the anonymous reviewer for helpful bibliographic and stylistic suggestions.

