Theological Works of the Venerable Bede and their Literary and Manuscript Presentation, with Special Reference to the Gospel Homilies

Submitted for the degree of Master of Letters by

Verity L. Allan

St Cross College, Oxford

Abstract I

This thesis examines the homilies of the Venerable Bede (*c*.673–735) and their theology, style, transmission and audience response. It extends upon work done by Hurst (who edited the homilies), van der Walt and Carroll. It investigates why people were reading Bede's homilies, how they read and understood them, and how they responded to them. There is a brief survey of important themes in the homilies: grace, heresy, the six ages of the world and ecclesiology, and how they combine in Bede's theology as expressed in the homilies and elsewhere. These themes are also examined in connection with Bede's sources. Particular attention is given here to Gregory the Great, who also wrote a collection of homilies which may have influenced Bede.

The style of the homilies is examined, with particular attention given to Bede's sentence structure, as that is the principal barrier to understanding them. Bede's style is complex, but it is clear that he used grammatical structures to facilitate reading. There is a study of Bede's use of cadence in the homilies, using statistical methods. Cadence is particularly useful for those listening to the homilies, as it indicates the end of a clause.

The analysis of sentence structure is accompanied by an analysis of punctuation in one of the few surviving manuscripts from the scriptorium of Wearmouth-Jarrow. The layout and punctuation of this manuscript demonstrate that the scribes there were working to a system which would enable the reader of the text to assemble the grammatical structures correctly.

Finally, the dissemination of manuscripts of the homilies across Carolingian Europe is analysed. The homilies spread widely and were popular. An analysis of the punctuation of these manuscripts shows that the punctuation style of Wearmouth-Jarrow had an influence on subsequent scribes, though the changing tastes in punctuation can also be witnessed in the changes made by subsequent scribes and readers.

Abstract II

This thesis examines the homilies of the Venerable Bede (*c*.673–735) and their theology, style, transmission and audience response. It extends the work done by Hurst (who edited the homilies), van der Walt and Carroll, among others.   It investigates why people were reading Bede's homilies, how they read and understood them and how they responded to them. The homilies were originally written for Anglo-Saxon monastics and clerics, though they achieved more widespread recognition and popularity through the Carolingian homiliary of Paul the Deacon. The homilies therefore found a place in the liturgy of the Carolingian night office, and their form also implies that they were intended to be part of the liturgy of the Mass. It is unclear whether they were originally preached, but they are able to be used both in public liturgy and in private meditation, or as a source of inspiration for a new sermon. Whatever Bede's original intent (and there is no clear evidence of this), he produced a flexible collection which was susceptible to being used in many different ways.

In the thesis there is a brief survey of important themes in the homilies: grace, heresy, the six ages of the world and ecclesiology, and how they combine in Bede's theology as expressed in the homilies and elsewhere. Ultimately, it was for the theology contained within them that people read the homilies.

Grace is one of the mainstays of Bede's theology. Worried about potentially Pelagian tendencies among the Anglo-Saxons, he was careful to give a portrayal of God's grace as the essential means for personal salvation. He discusses grace at length in the homilies and he gives there one of his most complete expositions on the subject.

Heresy was a *point d'appui* for Bede. He reacted violently against all forms of heresy, and though he eschewed detailed discussions of both the concept of heresy and of individual heresies in his homilies, he often mentioned heresies by name, and gave much attention to providing orthodox accounts of dogma, particularly that associated with grace. Here, Bede's aversion to heresy interacts with his knowledge of history. Bede was aware that Pelagius was British, and that the Pelagian interpretation of grace was heretical. In the homilies, Bede is concerned to give an accurate account of dogma in non-technical language, thus ensuring that he would not propagate error.

The six ages of the world provide an overarching framework for Bede's chronology and theology. In doing so, they allow Bede to explore theological parallels between the microcosm of the days of creation and Christ's death and resurrection, and the macrocosm of history. This has led scholars to accuse Bede of not being aware of the passage of time; however, his strong grasp of chronology as expressed in his scientific works mitigates against this.

Ecclesiology is another mainstay of Bede's theology. The building up of the Church on earth throughout time is almost the most important thing to be done; this also ties in with Bede's strong sense of pastoral responsibility, as the pastor is responsible for the cure of individual souls who make up the Church. The Church is built up with the help of God's grace, and should be kept free from internal strife; this is one of the reasons Bede reacted in such a violent fashion to heresy.

These themes are also examined in connection with some of Bede's sources. Particular attention is given here to Gregory the Great, who also wrote a collection of homilies, which may have influenced Bede. The arrangement of the two homiliaries is similar, though the themes explored by each man are different. Bede also read Augustine, and many verbal reminiscences from Augustine are found in the homilies. While Gregory was a profound influence on Bede's pastoral practice, Augustine was a strong influence on Bede's view of time and history. Bede tended not to express his indebtedness in the form of direct quotations in the homilies; instead, he used verbal allusions, only to be observed by the most learned, and he shows a close adherence to their ideas. While other works are in places intended to be florilegia of the Fathers (for example, Bede's commentary on Luke, where he marked the sources he used), the homilies are a more personal expression of Bede's orthodox theology.

Bede's theology is complex and closely interwoven; as we can observe, the different themes are interleaved within the homilies. Though Bede was profoundly influenced by Gregory, Augustine and the other Church Fathers, he combined their theologies in a new way that has had a lasting influence. For this reason, Bede's presentation of their theology became popular in Carolingian Europe, as is reflected in the number of manuscripts of his works from that time.

The style of the homilies is examined, with particular attention being given to Bede's sentence structure, as that is the principal barrier to understanding and reading them with ease. This may have been a problem as his Anglo-Saxon readers were not native speakers of Latin. Bede's homilies enjoyed a considerable vogue in the eastern Frankish Empire, where the native tongues were also Germanic rather than Romance. Bede's style is complex, but it is clear that he used grammatical structures to facilitate understanding, both for listeners and readers. He also used highly emotive language, using the words to produce a desired response in his listeners. These words tend to be arranged to stand out from their surroundings, so the less literate could gain an impression of the areas Bede wished to highlight.

Bede used many Classical rhetorical techniques in his homilies. In order to fully appreciate Bede's use of such techniques, there is a study of his use of cadence in the homilies, using statistical methods. Cadence is particularly useful for those listening to the homilies, as it indicates the end of a clause. It is probable that Bede used cadences to a certain extent, imitating the forms found in the liturgy and in Augustine and (to a lesser extent) in Ambrose, so the authors who influenced his theology also influenced his style. He was an able poet, and would have been able to observe these metrical and rhythmical patterns occurring in prose. Bede used a moderate number of *cursus mixtus* cadences, and a limited number of metrical cadences, enabling listeners to parse the complex structures more easily.

The analysis of sentence structure is followed by an analysis of punctuation in one of the few surviving manuscripts from the scriptorium of Wearmouth-Jarrow (Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Bodley 819). The layout and punctuation of this manuscript demonstrate that the scribes there were working to a system which would enable the reader of the text to assemble the grammatical structures correctly. The scribes have marked out the paratactic clauses in the text. This manuscript also uses the *diple* to mark out biblical quotations, a feature found in other earlier manuscripts, but here consistently applied. The manuscript shows a pattern of use that can also be observed in the continental manuscripts of the homilies; in this case, we have tenth-

century marginal annotations, indicating private reading, and twelfth-century repunctuation.

Finally, the dissemination of manuscripts of the homilies across Carolingian Europe is analysed. The homilies spread widely and were popular. An analysis of the punctuation of these manuscripts shows that the punctuation style of Wearmouth-Jarrow had an influence on subsequent scribes, though the changing tastes in punctuation can also be witnessed in the changes made by these later scribes and readers. In many manuscripts, the same tendency to punctuate the paratactic clauses can be observed and in the majority of manuscripts, the *diple* is still used to mark out biblical quotations. As in Bodley 819, manuscripts were often repunctuated in the twelfth century to provide a more up-to-date and familiar method of punctuation for readers. The manuscripts show signs of being used both in public (in the liturgy) and in private, with marginal numerals indicating sections to be read aloud, or with marginal comments indicating private reading. The surviving punctuation allows us to determine how people read Bede; the marginalia shows us how they interacted with Bede's text.

The manuscript transmission shows signs of disorder at a very early date, with a disrupted order of homilies. This enables us to trace the continental transmission, at least in part. It is clear that there were at least two eighth-century Anglo-Saxon exemplars circulating on the continent, one of which was copied by scribes in the Jura area of France. The earliest surviving manuscripts were probably copied at St Gall and St Omer, sites which had strong contacts with the Carolingian court and with Anglo-Saxon England. The manuscripts show a strong unity in layout, reflecting the level of control exerted over scribes throughout the Carolingian empire, and also, perhaps, reflecting the quality layout of manuscripts from Wearmouth-Jarrow.

It is shown that Bede's work was flexible, apt for use in different ways and in different time periods. He was strongly influenced by his predecessors, but produced a complex new synthesis of their work, which were popular with readers of successive generations.

Acknowledgements

Table of Contents

Abbreviations and Conventions

Abbreviations

ASE: *Anglo-Saxon England*

CCSL: Corpus Christianorum Series Latina. A searchable version of this corpus is available on CD-ROM as the CETEDOC library of Christian Latin Texts (Turnholt, 1996)

CSEL: Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum

CSS: Cistercian Studies Series

DTR: Bede, *De temporum ratione*, ed. C. W. Jones, CCSL 123B; *Bede: The Reckoning of Time*, trans. F. Wallis (Liverpool 1999)

EETS: Early English Text Society

HE: Bede, *Historia Ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum*; *Bede's Ecclesiastical History of the English Church and People*, ed. and trans. B. Colgrave and R. A. B. Mynors (Oxford, 1969)

JEH: *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*

ODCC: *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, ed. F. L. Cross and E. A. Livingstone, 3rd edn (Oxford, 1997)

OED: *The Oxford English Dictionary*, 2nd edn (Oxford, 1989)

PL: Patrologia Latina, ed. J.-P. Migne, (Paris, 1850-1900)

RB: *Revue Bénédictine*

Conventions

All references to Bede's homilies are given in the form I.25.53 (Book number, homily number, line number), with any page references referring to *Homiliae*, ed. D. Hurst, CCSL 122 (Turnholt, 1955), with a reference (where necessary) to the Cistercian Studies Series translation (*Bede the Venerable: Homilies on the Gospels*, trans. L. Martin, 2 vols., CSS 110 and 111 (Kalamazoo, 1991)), in the form CSS 110, p. 103. All references to Gregory's homilies are in the form homily 1; the references given are to the translation by D. Hurst, *Gregory the Great: Forty Gospel Homilies*, CSS 123 (Kalamazoo, 1990) unless otherwise specified. All biblical references are to the *Biblia Sacra: Iuxta Vulgatam versionem*, ed. R. Gryson *et al.*, 4th edn (Stuttgart, 1994). Translations are my own, unless otherwise stated.

Introduction

The Venerable Bede was born in 672 or 673, in the vicinity of what was to become the Jarrow monastery. At the age of seven,[1] he joined the monastery of Wearmouth founded in 673 by Benedict Biscop.[2] When Biscop founded the twin house at Jarrow, Bede and Ceolfrith (later to become abbot of the joint foundation) went to the new house.[3] During this time, a plague hit Northumbria and the inhabitants of the Jarrow monastery were severely affected, leaving only Ceolfrith and a small boy (usually identified as Bede) to sing the offices.[4] He studied under Ceolfrith for many years.

Most of our knowledge of Bede comes from his own writings. He tells us in the final chapter of the *Historia Ecclesiastica* that he was ordained deacon aged nineteen (in advance of the canonical age, a sign of his precocious talent). He was ordained priest later, presumably at the canonical age of thirty. We know of the monasteries in which Bede lived from his *HE* and *Historia abbatum* and from the Anonymous *Life of Ceolfrith*, written by a monk at the same foundation.[5] Bede is largely silent about his life, though he admits to being greatly upset when Ceolfrith, his life-long friend and mentor, left for a final journey to Rome which was cut short by his death.[6]

Bede states that 'it has always been my delight to learn, to teach or to write.'[7] His surviving works bear witness to this: chronologies, histories, biblical commentary and works for the schoolroom.[8] He started writing around the time of his ordination to the priesthood in 703.[9] He was presumably one of the monastery's main teachers, though there is little written evidence to support this, other than a few

---

[1] Bede, *Historia ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum (HE)*, ed. and trans. B. Colgrave and R. A. B. Mynors, *Bede's Ecclesiastical History of the English People* (Oxford, 1969), V.24, pp. 566-71.

[2] For a biography of Biscop see E. Fletcher, *Benedict Biscop*, Jarrow Lecture (Jarrow, 1981).

[3] For a biography of Ceolfrith see I. Wood, *The Most Holy Abbot Ceolfrid*, Jarrow Lecture (Jarrow, 1995).

[4] B. Ward, *The Venerable Bede* (London, 1998), p. 4.

[5] Bede, *Historia abbatum*, in *Venerabilis Baedae Opera Historica*, ed. C. Plummer, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1896), vol. I. Anon., 'Life of Ceolfrith', in *The Age of Bede*, trans. D. H. Farmer and J. F. Webb, rev. edn (Harmondsworth, 1998).

[6] Bede, *In Samuhelis*, ed. D. Hurst, Corpus Christianorum Series Latina (CCSL) 119 (Turnholt, 1962), IV, lines 4-22, p. 212.

[7] 'semper aut discere aut docere aut scribere dulce habui,' *HE* V.24, pp. 566-7.

[8] See Ward, *The Venerable Bede*, pp. 51-78, pp. 97-8 and pp. 114-32 for a discussion of the individual works.

[9] C. Plummer, ed., *Venerabilis Baedae Opera Historica*, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1896), p. xxi and p. cxlv.

remarks about those of meaner intellect,[10] and the plethora of school-texts he composed. He does not appear to have held any high office within the monastery and he never became abbot. This may be because of his humble origins; though Ceolfrith did not disdain manual work he was of noble birth, like Eosterwine and Benedict Biscop. The large number of the nobility found governing Anglo-Saxon monastic foundations has often been noted; it seems that while Bede's scholarship would commend him anywhere, he was effectively debarred from high office because of his birth.[11]

He was not a widely-travelled man; he visited York and Lindisfarne at least, and probably other places in Northumbria.[12] Unlike his abbots, Ceolfrith and Benedict Biscop, he never visited the continent. His was in many ways a world of books, and in his imagination he could visit the Holy Land through reading texts such as *De locis sanctis* by Adomnán of Iona, or he could listen to Benedict and Ceolfrith talking about their visits to Rome and Gaul. Thacker suggests that Bede was unusually remote from the practical world of royal and church government.[13] This is true in one sense; he was never responsible for the monastery's interaction with the outside world. However, Bede was in correspondence with bishops and abbots across England; Bishop Acca at Hexham and Abbot Albinus at Canterbury are two examples. While some of this correspondence was about matters historical and theological, there are examples of Bede's pastoral involvement. Bede may not have been a political figure; nevertheless, he was influencing the theologies of important churchmen across the country. This may well have led to a more subtle political influence. Ward even suggests that noblemen came to visit Bede.[14] The problem in ascertaining the extent of his influence is that relatively few letters by Bede survive. We may surmise a vigorous correspondence from the fleeting mentions in the *HE* and the prefatory letters which survive at the beginning of some of Bede's books.[15] But, unlike other authors, such as Aldhelm, Gregory the Great or

---

[10] C. Grocock, 'Bede and the Golden Age of Latin Prose in Northumbria', in *Northumbria's Golden Age*, ed. J. Hawkes and S. Mills (Stroud, 1999), pp. 371-82, p. 371; Bede, *Epistola ad Ecgberhtum*, in *Venerabilis Baedae Opera Historica*, ed. C. Plummer, vol. I, pp. 408-9.

[11] On the importance of noble birth in Anglo-Saxon England, see H. Mayr-Harting, *The Coming of Christianity to Anglo-Saxon England*, 3rd edn (Pennsylvania, 1991), pp. 253-4.

[12] Ward, *The Venerable Bede*, p. 12.

[13] A. Thacker, 'Bede's Ideal of Reform' in *Ideal and Reality Frankish and Anglo-Saxon Society: Studies Presented to J. M. Wallace-Hadrill*, ed. P. Wormald *et al*. (Oxford, 1983), pp. 130-53, p. 130.

[14] Ward, *The Venerable Bede*, p. 13.

[15] a) Biblical Commentaries:

 - *On Genesis*: Bishop Acca asked for a commentary, so Bede sent him a revised version of his commentary on Genesis, begun several years earlier.

Alcuin,[16] we do not have enough letters by Bede to uncover the influence of his correspondence, nor do any of the replies survive. For this, perhaps the Viking raids in England were largely responsible.

During his lifetime his fame increased. As noted above, he wrote to people all over the country, in Winchester, Hexham and Canterbury, and other monasteries not mentioned by Bede. Acca commissioned some of his works, convinced of their use in the semi-Christian society in which they still lived.[17]

'During his lifetime this Beda lay hidden within a remote corner of the world, but after his death his writings gave him a living reputation over every portion of the globe.'[18] Thus wrote a Durham historian in the twelfth century. One of our major

---

 - *On Samuel*: commissioned by Acca.
 - *Thirty Questions on Kings*: Nothelm sent Bede the questions.
 - *On the Tabernacle*: no prologue.
 - *On the Temple*: commissioned by Bishop Albinus.
 - *On Ezra and Nehemiah*: commissioned by Acca.
 - *On Tobit*: no prologue.
 - *On Proverbs*: no prologue.
 - *On the Song of Songs*: no prologue, though there is an introductory book refuting the theology of Julian of Eclanum.
 - *On Habakkuk*: an unidentified nun requested this commentary.
 - *On Luke*: commissioned by Acca.
 - *On Mark*: commissioned by Acca again.
 - *Exposition of Acts*: commissioned by Acca.
 - *Retraction on Acts*: no commissioner mentioned: Bede felt the need to set some things straight.
 - *On the Seven Catholic Epistles*: no commissioner mentioned in the prologue.
 - *On the Apocalypse*: dedicated to Eusebius.

b) Hagiographies, histories, hymns and homilies:
 - *Homilies*: no prologue.
 - *Hymns*: no prologue.
 - *Ecclesiastical History*: dedicated to King Ceolwulf (the only lay recipient of Bede's writings).
 - *The history of the Abbots*: for his own house of Wearmouth-Jarrow.
 - *Prose Life of St Cuthbert*: commissioned by the monks at Lindisfarne.
 - *Verse Life of St Cuthbert*: dedicated to priest John (as yet unidentified).

c) School texts:
 - *De orthographia*: no introduction.
 - *De arte metrica*: for a monk named Cuthbert.
 - *De schematibus et tropis*: no introduction.
 - *De natura rerum*: no introduction.
 - *De temporibus*: no introduction.
 - *De temporum ratione*: Hwætbert, abbot of Wearmouth-Jarrow, is mentioned in the prologue.

[16] Aldhelm, *Aldhelm: The Prose Works*, trans. M. Lapidge and M. Herren (Cambridge, 1979), pp. 152-70; Alcuin, *Alcuin of York: His Life and Letters*, trans. S. Allott (York, 1974).

[17] C. Leonardi, 'Il venerabile Beda e la cultura del secolo viii', *I Problemi dell'Occidente nel secolo VIII*, Settimane di Studio 20 (Spoleto, 1972), 603-58, p. 643.

[18] Anon., *Simeon's History of the Church in Durham*, trans. J. Stephenson (repr. Lampeter, 1993), ch. XIV, p. 644.

sources of information about Bede is Cuthbert's letter on the death of Bede, describing Bede's last days.[19] Bede died on 25 May 735, the Vigil of the Ascension, after a short illness during which he continued to teach and to pray. On his death-bed he distributed his few possessions, in an act recalling the deaths of St Anthony and St Cuthbert.[20] He was buried at the church in Jarrow, but Durham legend has it that his bones were removed and placed in Cuthbert's coffin in the eleventh century.[21] The remains were removed in the twelfth century from the coffin and interred in the memorial in the Galilee chapel of the cathedral in the fourteenth century until the Reformation, when the current memorial was built with the words 'haec sunt in fossa / venerabilis baedae ossa' upon it.[22]

As the Durham historian noted, it was Bede's writings which gave him his fame. Bede's work was focussed on turning out an educated Anglo-Saxon clergy.[23] It is tempting to split Bede's work into categories; it is probably more fruitful to regard them as a coherent whole, governed by that overarching aim. As noted above, Bede started writing after he reached the age of thirty, probably as a result of his ideas about the importance of listening to and learning from elders before starting to teach.[24]

Bede's theology is remarkably orthodox yet profound, both from a contemporary point of view and a modern one. His theology seems familiar to us, because it influenced so many subsequent theologians and his selections from writers such as Augustine proved formative to the theology of the Western Church.[25] As mentioned above, Bede was working in a semi-Christian society, with a mission to teach. This is exactly what he did. He did not speculate about the nature of God, or

[19] Cuthbert, 'Epistola de obitu Bedae', in *Ecclesiastical History of the English Church and People*, ed. and trans. B. Colgrave and R. A. B. Mynors (Oxford, 1969), pp. 580-7.

[20] A. Thacker, 'Lindisfarne and the Origins of the Cult of St Cuthbert', in *St Cuthbert, His Cult and His Community to AD 1200*, ed. G. Bonner *et al.* (Woodbridge, 1989), pp. 103-122, p. 109. He refers to Athanasius' Life of St Anthony, chs. 58-9, found in C. White, *Early Christian Lives* (Harmondsworth, 1998), pp. 7-70, p. 67. Here we have an example of the knowledge of what a saintly death looks like influencing the action of a person, thus providing a recurring motif in hagiographical literature.

[21] Ward, *The Venerable Bede*, pp. 140-143.

[22] Ch. XLII of *Simeon's History of the Church in Durham*, pp. 678-9 has the story of Bede's bones. An Icelandic manuscript has an account of the composition of the lines of verse, in a legend justifying Bede's title of 'venerabilis'. Anon., *The Saga of Hacon and a Fragment of the Saga of Magnus with Appendices*, trans. G. W. Dasent, 2 vols. (repr. Felich Fawr, 1997), vol. II, pp. 448-9.

[23] J. McClure, 'Bede's *Notes on Genesis* and the Training of the Anglo-Saxon Clergy', in *The Bible in the Medieval World: Essays in Memory of Beryl Smalley*, ed. K. Walsh and D. Wood (Oxford, 1985), pp. 17-30, pp. 18-19.

[24] M. T. A. Carroll, *The Venerable Bede: His Spiritual Teachings* (Washington, 1946), pp. 243-4.

[25] See particularly Bede's theology of the six ages, where he selected the non-millenarian opinions of Augustine, who at one point expressed a strongly millenarian attitude, which he later repudiated.

heaven, or grace; this was not appropriate for his society and it might have led people into error. We might therefore describe Bede as being 'goal-oriented', restricting his work to the instructional and leaving aside the speculative.

Bede's theology is complex, deep and coherent.[26] However, we do not always see the profundity of his thinking; for the most part it would not have been appropriate for his purpose. His theology is expounded not in thematic or systematic treatises, but through his biblical commentaries (and, more subtly, through his other works).[27] This means that there is no overarching discussion of elements in Christian theology; rather, the source material (the Bible) is picked over piece by piece, small components leading to the discussion of great principles. Line-by-line analysis and commentary is a practice still used in schools and universities today. No doubt, in the schoolroom, a larger discussion of the issues arising could have happened; Bede often chose to limit his discussion in favour of providing a thorough understanding of the text.[28]

Bede's practice when it comes to writing theology has been much examined in recent years. The basic lineaments have long been determined; Bede tends to make extensive use of earlier theologians.[29] This led earlier scholars to dismiss Bede's theology as wholly unoriginal and merely a piecemeal derivative of other authors,[30] but this is not entirely true. There is great value in careful synthesis, as many scholars have acknowledged. Providing extracts from Augustine is a valuable service; for, prolific though Bede was, Augustine's output is an order of magnitude bigger. Augustine also provides contradictory views in his writing, so Bede's selections have often proved influential in determining the most useful and orthodox sections of Augustine. Bede's synthesis of earlier authors thus proved influential to later Western theologians.

Bede did not slavishly copy either; he occasionally provides undigested extracts, but then, that may be all that was required or requested of him. He very often, particularly in the homilies, disguises his source, and blends it in seamlessly

---

[26] See chapter I, pp. 24-6.
[27] Carroll provides a study of themes in Bede, arranged as though it were a systematic theology of Bede. This is somewhat misleading. Carroll, *The Venerable Bede*.
[28] He allows himself more freedom in his commentary on the Temple, for example.
[29] C. Jenkins, 'Bede as Exegete and Theologian', in *Bede, His Life, Times, and Writings: Essays in Commemoration of the Twelfth Centenary of His Death*, ed. A. Hamilton Thompson (Oxford, 1935), pp. 152-200, p. 153.
[30] Carroll, *The Venerable Bede*, p. viii: 'In no respect do the monk's concepts represent an attempt to be original.'

with his own thought. Earlier theologians have had a profound influence on him, yet he has incorporated their words and used them in a new way. It is these aspects of Bede's theological writing that demand examination, particularly in his homilies.

Bede was always carefully analysing his sources. He was occasionally wary of Jerome; Bede's pupil Cuthbert tells us about the work he was doing during his last days to provide a list of 'sound' extracts from Jerome. Bede regarded Jerome as an interesting secondary source, but he did not have to be followed faithfully.[31] While Bede's thinking was dominated by the four authors still considered the Great Latin Fathers of the Church (Augustine, Ambrose, Gregory, Jerome), he also used works by Isidore, and by many other authors.[32] Bede mentions many theologians by name, but he often makes no acknowledgement of his source (particularly if he does not quote it directly), so we are reliant on the skill and effort of the modern editor to make these references apparent to us. Bede may well have left more guidance for us than now survives; he is known to have used source marks in some of his works, and may have done in others, but we have to rely on the diligence of long-ago scribes, who have not always been particularly careful.[33] The Corbie scriptorium seems to have been seized with the importance of these marks, and it is largely thanks to the Corbie copyists that the source marks Bede mentions can be seen today.[34]

His chronology was wholly original, so original that it led to his being accused of heresy. Yet he also provided a standard work on the subject for the next 800 years, until the change of calendar meant that his calculations of the Easter cycle became inaccurate. This accusation of heresy wounded Bede deeply.[35] He was vehemently opposed to heretics and took great care in his teachings to stick to the strictly orthodox. His accusers went to Bishop Wilfred shortly after the publication of *De temporibus* in 703, stating that Bede had placed the incarnation of Christ in the wrong age.[36] Bede was able to refute this with ease, pointing out that his accusers were following incorrect millenarian thinking and that they were using the wrong

---

[31] B. Ward, '"In medium duorum animalium": Bede and Jerome on the Canticle of Habakkuk', *Studia Patristica* 25 (1993), 189-93, p. 191.

[32] M. L. W. Laistner, 'The Library of the Venerable Bede', in *Bede: His Life, Times and Writings*, ed. A. Hamilton Thompson (Oxford, 1935), pp. 237-66, especially pp. 263-6.

[33] See Laistner, 'The Library', pp. 237-8, Bede, *In Lucam*, ed. D. Hurst, CCSL 120 (Turnholt, 1960) Prologus, p. 7 and appendix C below, p. 152.

[34] M. Stansbury, 'Source-marks in Bede's Biblical Commentaries', in *Northumbria's Golden Age*, ed. J. Hawkes and S. Mills (Stroud, 1999), pp. 383-89, especially pp. 384-5.

[35] *Bede: The Reckoning of Time*, trans. F. Wallis (Liverpool, 1999), pp. xxx-xxxi and pp. 405-415 for a translation of the Letter to Plegwine.

[36] See six ages of the world, below, chapter I, pp. 32-4.

text of the Bible and were therefore making mistakes. It is Bede's calculation which came to dominate, spread throughout Europe in *De temporum ratione* (*DTR*), the premier chronological and computistical handbook of the Middle Ages.

While Bede used the Fathers in his exegesis, like Augustine he uses scripture to interpret scripture.[37] This is probably because Bede likes the idea of *ruminatio* – it is a monk's duty to meditate on scripture.[38] This word is associated with Bede's story of Caedmon.[39] After the cowherd Caedmon heard the angelic message, he ruminated on the teachings and reproduced it in Old English verse. *Ruminatio* may also explain why Bede was content to leave opaque or difficult passages in his writings; one was allowed and expected to take time to meditate upon them. Bede is concerned with understanding scripture at all levels. 'Bede tends to avoid modifying, obscuring or negating the literal meaning … but he regularly adds a second meaning.'[40] Bede makes a connection between the world of the Gospel story and world of the audience.[41] The Gospels were, for Bede, an essential means of understanding contemporary life and human nature.

Carroll has already provided an analysis of Bede's themes. However, she was not concerned with any differences in presentation between various genres. Undertaking a new thematic survey is of limited value; nevertheless, a brief analysis of some themes can shed light on Bede's *Weltanschauung*. Bede's theology is closely interconnected; one theme leads seamlessly into another, with the words of his sources deeply assimilated into his own writing. I have chosen to examine the theological influences upon him and how he handled them. Bede's fondness for the six ages was noted by Levison, and his handling of this subject deserves closer attention.[42] Bede also responded strongly against heresy, despite his lack of contact with it.[43] This may be a result of Augustine influence on Bede's view on unity:

---

[37] J. F. Kelly, 'Bede's Exegesis of Luke's Infancy Narrative', *Medievalia* 15 (1993), 59-70, p. 61 and p. 68.

[38] A. Crépin, 'Bede and the Vernacular', in *Famulus Christi: Essays in Commemoration of the Thirteenth Centenary of the Birth of the Venerable Bede*, ed G. Bonner (London, 1976), pp. 170-92, p. 172.

[39] *HE* IV.24, pp. 414-21.

[40] C. W. Jones, 'Some Introductory Remarks on Bede's Commentary on Genesis', *Sacris Erudiri* 19 (1970), 119-198, p. 169.

[41] L. T. Martin, 'The Two Worlds in Bede's Homilies: The Biblical Event and the Listener's Experience', in *De Ore Domini: Preacher and Word in the Middle Ages*, ed. T. L. Amos *et al.*, Studies in Medieval Culture 27 (Kalamazoo, 1989), pp. 27-40, pp. 28-9.

[42] W. Levison, 'Bede as Historian' in *Bede, His Life, Times and Writings*, ed. A. Hamilton Thomspon (Oxford, 1935), pp. 111-151, p. 116.

[43] See G. Hardin Brown, *Bede the Educator*, Jarrow Lecture (Jarrow, 1996), pp. 9-10.

Augustine uses John 10:16 as authority for the unity of the apostolic church, one flock in Christ, a verse which inspired Bede also.[44] Ecclesiology is especially relevant when considering the homilies: 'Of great importance in Bede's ecclesiology is the growth of the Church through preaching.'[45] Together, these themes make a substantial contribution to Bede's understanding of the world in which he lived.

While the theology is clearly inspired by and derived from that of Gregory and Augustine, many of these concerns are of particular relevance to the Anglo-Saxon Church. Although heresy was not necessarily an active concern, unity certainly was, as even in Bede's time a few communities held onto an incorrect date for celebrating Easter. More abstract ideas like the six ages of the world and ecclesiology were firmly rooted in the importance of pastoral practice and personal attempts to do good. Bede is like John Scottus Eriugena; scholars have primarily looked to the past for the source of his thinking. Though the influence of the past is strong, their use of the past is entirely conditioned by the present, and awareness of what is important in the present.[46]

The homilies are an interesting medium through which to examine the content and method of Bede's theology, as they belong to a somewhat different genre from the majority of his theological work, which was presented in his biblical commentaries. Martin suggests that 'Probably fairly late in his writing career, perhaps around the year 725, Bede decided to try his hand at a new genre, the literary homily … Bede's homilies are carefully-wrought pieces of literary art, designed to explain the reading of the day, but also to move the reader or listener spiritually.'[47] Bede's pastoral mission is viewed as essentially literary.[48]

The homilies are also somewhat problematic. Sharpe has expressed doubt about their authenticity.[49] It was Morin who first identified the collection now

---

[44] M.-F. Berrouard, 'Deux peuples, un seul tropeau, un unique Pasteur: Ecclésiologie de Saint Augustin et citations de Jean 10:16', in *Collectanea Augustiniana: Augustine: 'Second Founder of the Faith'*, ed. J. C. Schnaubelt and F. Van Fleteren (New York, 1990), pp. 275-301, p. 291.

[45] T. Echlin, 'Bede and the Church', *Irish Theological Quarterly* 40 (1973), 351-62, p. 358.

[46] J. Marenbon, *From the Circle of Alcuin to the School of Auxerre: Logic, Theology and Philosophy in the Early Middle Ages* (Cambridge, 1981), p. 10.

[47] L. T. Martin, 'Augustine's Influence on Bede's *Homiliae Evangelii*', in *Collectanea Augustiniana: Augustine: 'Second Founder of the Faith'*, ed. J. C. Schnaubelt and F. Van Fleteren (New York, 1990), pp. 357-69, p. 357.

[48] G. Bonner, 'Bede: Scholar and Spiritual Teacher', in *Northumbria's Golden Age*, ed. J. Hawkes and S. Mills (Stroud, 1999), pp. 365-70, p. 367.

[49] R. Sharpe, 'The Varieties of Bede's Prose', in *Aspects of the Language of Latin Prose*, forthcoming, p. 5.

published as the fifty homilies in the CCSL edition.[50] My research has confirmed Morin's conclusions. Bede himself mentions two books of homilies in *HE* V.24; Paul the Deacon mentions fifty homilies in two books by Bede, many of which he included in his own composite homiliary. Morin discovered that Boulogne, Bibliothèque municipale, MS 75, said to be by Bede, contained fifty homilies in two books, many of which are indeed in Paul the Deacon's collection. However, homilies are easily assigned to a new author, so some care is needed. However, the same collection consistently travels under Bede's name, and it has homily I.13, which is an account of Benedict Biscop. As Hurst has noted, many manuscripts mistake this homily as being about a different Benedict; we should therefore consider this homily a strong indicator of authenticity. The other homilies in Boulogne 75 consistently travel together; many of these manuscripts contain insular features. I therefore suggest that we regard the fifty homilies as genuine. This in no way addresses the question of whether some more of the hundreds of homilies contained in early editions of Bede are also authentic; this may be the case, though it is fairly unlikely. On the manuscript evidence alone, it seems likely that the fifty homilies are genuine. Stylistically and theologically, the homilies also seem to fit comfortably into the Bedan *oeuvre*. There is a danger that this argument may become circular; nevertheless, the theological concerns and their method of presentation are very similar to those found in Bede's biblical commentaries.[51]

The second area of difficulty is the question of whether or not the homilies were preached. As noted above, Martin regards them as literary products only. West notes that liturgical features are at the basis of the homilies and he assumes a monastic audience, very familiar with the scriptures.[52] This may suggest a certain contact with the context of a delivered sermon. It seems at first sight that we are looking at a set of homilies for a monastic community, like Gregory's homilies on Ezekiel. But this merely redirects the question of whether or not the homilies were delivered. They may of course have been delivered in a different form; Bonner suggests that perhaps the homilies were based on talks given in English to the brethren.[53]

---

[50] G. Morin, 'Le recueil primitif des homélies de Bede sur l'Evangile', *Revue Bénédictine* (*RB*) 9 (1892), 316-26.
[51] See chapters I-III below.
[52] P. J. West, 'Liturgical Style and Structure in Bede's Homily for the Easter Vigil', *American Benedictine Review* 23 (1972), 1-8.
[53] Bonner, 'Bede: Scholar and Spiritual Teacher', p. 369.

I suggest that Bede deliberately wrote homilies which can be used in many different ways by people with differing degrees of Latinity. As discussed in chapter III below, the Latin of the homilies is complex. We know little for certain about Bede's preaching. Echlin asserts that 'Bede himself preached at St Paul's, Jarrow.'[54] However, other than the existence of the homilies, we have nothing to confirm this. While preaching was for a long time strongly directed by bishops,[55] and later in fifth- and sixth-century Gaul there was a question about whether monks should serve as priests within their monastery (some thought an outside priest desirable),[56] it is clear that this had changed. The Irish had monk-priests and monk-bishops.[57] The Benedictine rule encouraged monk-priests.[58] Both these cultures had profound influences on Christianity in Northumbria, so preaching was not solely the province of bishops and monk-priests were not uncommon in Anglo-Saxon England. The evidence for the preaching ability of Bede's theological predecessors is not always clear-cut. Around half of Gregory's Gospel homilies were not delivered by Gregory in person. Gregory was not concerned with his audience, unlike Caesarius and Augustine.[59] Evidence for Gregory as an exceptional preacher comes from John the Deacon, based on the account of Gregory of Tours.[60] Bede may well have been inspired by the accounts of Gregory the Great's preaching, even though Gregory did not necessarily preach that frequently. There are also legends of Bede as a preacher, suggesting that he did in fact preach.[61]

Bede writes inspiringly about preaching.[62] Eckenrode notes: 'When Bede espoused his notions on the art of preaching, how much was he inspired by the

---

[54] Echlin, 'Bede and the Church', p. 362.

[55] A. Olivar, *La Predicacíon Cristiana Antigua* (Barcelona, 1991), pp. 142-5.

[56] T. L. Amos, 'Monks and Pastoral Care in the Early Middle Ages', in *Religion, Culture and Society in the Early Middle Ages: Studies in Honor of Richard E. Sullivan*, ed. T. F. X. Noble and J. J. Contreni (Kalamazoo, 1987), pp. 165-80; p. 167.

[57] Amos, 'Monks and Pastoral Care', p. 167.

[58] Amos, 'Monks and Pastoral Care', p. 169.

[59] J. McClure, *Gregory the Great: Exegesis and Audience* (unpublished D.Phil. thesis, Oxford, 1978) pp. 163-4.

[60] McClure, *Gregory the Great*, p. 267.

[61] See R. Pfaff, 'Bede among the Fathers? The Evidence from Liturgical Commemoration', *Studia Patristica* 28 (1993), 225-9, p. 229. The story appears in Oxford, University College MS 9 (a late fourteenth-century manuscript from the East of England); the story also appears in the section on Pope Pelagius towards the end of the thirteenth-century *Legenda Aurea* of Jacobo da Voragine. Jacobo da Voragine, *Iacopo da Vorazze: Legenda Aurea*, ed. G. P. Maggioni, 2nd edn, 2 vols. (Florence, 1998), vol. II, pp. 1267-8.

[62] See van der Walt, *The Homiliary of the Venerable Bede and Early Medieval Preaching* (unpublished Ph.D. thesis, London, 1980), p. 11, p. 26.

monastic dynamic of the Irish missionaries?'[63] It seems inconceivable that he would not have exercised this part of his priestly ministry at all. It is likely that monks, including Bede, were involved in missionary work and pastoral care.[64] In Carolingian times, a lack of trained priests caused monks to undertake pastoral work;[65] perhaps it was the same in Anglo-Saxon England. Preaching is not necessarily associated with the pulpit;[66] stone crosses in Northumbria may have provided a focus for missionary efforts.[67] It is likely that preaching to the laity took place primarily in Old English, for two reasons. Firstly, the laity were almost certainly not sufficiently schooled in Latin to be able to understand a Latin homily. Secondly, many priests may not have had sufficient Latin to be able to deliver a sermon in that language, as Bede indicates in his *Epistola ad Ecgbertum*.[68] In the Carolingian era, this was taken into account, and some church councils recommended that sermons be in the vernacular. This was even more important to the Carolingians as they regarded the sermon as the best way to instruct people in the Christian way of life.[69] The homilies seem unlikely to have been preached outside the monastery; the monastic arena seems to have forged them completely,[70] though 'vernacular sermons would perhaps have generally been transcribed into the literary language, Latin.'[71] But laypeople may have attended services at the monastery and given that the monastery was probably responsible for a fair amount of pastoral care, it seems likely that Bede would have had at least some responsibility for preaching.[72] Though Bede was a man of his books, it would seem unlikely that Bede derived this ethic of preaching from them without putting them into practice. The liturgical echoes detected by West suggest a strong awareness of the context of a sermon, which may reflect actual delivery, or at least a strong intent for the sermons to be used in the context of the Mass.[73] Also, a sermon was not only

---

[63] T. R. Eckenrode, 'The Venerable Bede and the Pastoral Affirmation of the Christian Message in Anglo-Saxon England', *The Downside Review* 99 (1981), 258-78; p. 267.

[64] Amos, 'Monks and Pastoral Care', p. 165.

[65] Amos, 'Monks and Pastoral Care', p. 166.

[66] McClure, *Gregory the Great*, p. 131.

[67] R. Hill, 'Christianity and Geography in Early Northumbria', in *Studies in Church History*, ed. G. J. Cuming, 3rd edn (Leiden 1966), pp. 126-39, pp. 131-9.

[68] Epistola ad Ecgberhtum, *Venerabilis Baedae Opera Historica*, ed. C. Plummer, pp. 408-9.

[69] R. McKitterick, *The Frankish Church and the Carolingian Reforms 789-895* (London, 1977), p. 14.

[70] Van der Walt, *The Homiliary of the Venerable Bede*, p. 52. He refers particularly to homilies I.5 and I.13.

[71] McKitterick, *The Frankish Church*, p. 97.

[72] See II.17.193-99, p. 366 (trans. L. Martin, Cistercian Studies Series (CSS) p. 170-1) for suggestions that laypeople may have been in the audience, and, for the suggestion that monks went out to preach, 'Bede: Life of Cuthbert', in *The Age of Bede*, ed. D. H. Farmer and J. F. Webb, rev. edn (Harmondsworth, 1998), ch. 9, pp. 56-7.

[73] West, 'Liturgical Style and Structure in Bede's Homily for the Easter Vigil', pp. 1-8.

a way to instruct in the faith, 'but was also a direct appeal to the imagination, aesthetic sensibilities and social consciousness of the people.'[74]

If we accept that Bede did preach, whether to laity or to monastics (more likely), in Latin or English, the next question is to what extent did Bede's preaching affect the Gospel homilies. Did he, as Martin suggests, regard them as a purely literary endeavour? It would seem an unnatural separation; his school texts mostly sprang out of a need in the schoolroom, so we may presume that the homilies had some basis in his preaching. Bede used complex rhetoric: 'Since it was useful alike to those within and without the faithful community, rhetoric was to be used by the good to combat the evil. It was to be feared and embraced. In Bede's writing this basically Ciceronian attitude survives.'[75] The use of this rhetoric had several effects; firstly, it highlighted important words for the less able listener; secondly, it produced an emotional effect; thirdly, it provided depth for the most able listeners. This is an appropriate layering for a monastic audience, all of whom would have been exposed to some Latin, but who would not all have reached the same standard. We should also remember that Bede frequently uses rhetorical figures described in *De schematibus et tropis* (which presumably formed staple school material at Wearmouth-Jarrow). Moreover, *De schematibus et tropis* is much concerned with figures which use hyperbaton, providing monks with a tool for understanding Bede's more complex Latin. However, Bede was quite prepared to stretch his audience and in the homilies he uses rhetorical figures not found in *De schematibus et tropis*.[76] It may be that in a culture where oral tradition still played a strong part Bede was content to let people memorise phrases they did not quite understand, for future contemplation.

Van der Walt argues that the homilies were actually preached; Martin regards them as literary constructions. This represents the polarity on the issue. As I discuss in chapter III, there are stylistic features which point in both directions. The direct address to the audience and the emotional writing suggest that the homilies were delivered; the complex constructions used, which were frequently eschewed even by native speakers when speaking *ex tempore*, suggests that at the very least Bede was revising his own notes. It is highly unlikely that the homilies could have been taken

---

[74] McKitterick, *The Frankish Church,* p. 81.
[75] R. Ray, 'Bede and Cicero', *Anglo-Saxon England* (*ASE*) 16 (1987), 1-16, p. 8.
[76] Van der Walt., *The Homiliary of the Venerable Bede*, p. 175.

down while Bede was speaking them, as Tironian notes were unknown to the early Anglo-Saxons.[77] I suggest that, while firmly rooted in his preaching in terms of theme and pericope,[78] the homilies as we have them are carefully-wrought literary artefacts. They were probably still intended, at least in part, for reading aloud. However, it seems likely that Bede was also aware that they would be useful meditative or inspirational reading, especially since it seems likely that his monastery, like others in Northumbria, followed the Benedictine practice of private reading. They could be read by monks, bishops and priests. They were used for many of these purposes in the Carolingian age, and they continued to be read into the twelfth century, during which the style of preaching changed substantially.[79]

We are to a certain extent able to see how those who read Bede understood him. While there are no contemporary accounts of his preaching, we do have manuscripts containing his homilies. As Tunbridge notes, 'The innovative activities of Insular scribes, however, constitute a silent language or commentary upon the relationship of readers to books in this period.'[80] This is just as true of Carolingian Europe, whence come a number of surviving manuscripts.[81] But we also have a window into scribal practice at Bede's own monastery, suggesting that Bede was well aware of the weakness of his readers and accommodated this.[82] Examining manuscripts from Wearmouth-Jarrow and manuscripts containing the homilies gives insight into what accommodations were made for readers, and which of them might have come from Bede's own hand, and also we can observe how readers and scribes responded to the homilies. As is discussed in chapter IV, we have a valuable resource in Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Bodley 819, the only surviving manuscript of one of Bede's biblical commentaries from the Wearmouth-Jarrow scriptorium. This manuscript shows many interesting features of layout and punctuation which may have influenced later scribes. It is such features that allow us to determine how later audiences responded to Bede's writing.

---

[77] See M. B. Parkes, 'Tachygraphy in the Middle Ages: Writing Techniques Employed for the Reportationes of Lectures and Sermons', in his *Scribes, Scripts and Readers: Studies in the Communication, Presentation and Dissemination of Medieval Texts* (London 1991), pp. 19-34, esp. pp. 19-20. (This was first published in *Medioevo e rinascimento*, Annuario del Dipartimento di Studio sul Medioevo e il Rinascimento dell'Università di Firenze 3 (Florence,1989), 159-69.)

[78] The pericope was the (Gospel) reading for the day.

[79] See chapter V below, and D. L. d'Avray, *The Preaching of the Friars: Sermons Diffused from Paris before 1300* (Oxford, 1985), pp. 20-1.

[80] G. Tunbridge, *A Study of Scribal Practices in Early Irish and Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts* (unpublished D.Phil. thesis, Oxford, 1992), p. 41.

[81] See appendix C.

[82] See chapter IV.

The transmission of the homilies is complex and cannot be fully addressed in this thesis. Homilies are usually transmitted in groups in homiliaries; but what exactly are homilies and homiliaries? Gregoire, when discussing homiliaries of the Middle Ages, states that 'les lectionnaires liturgiques sont des recueils de textes … *lectio*, destinés à un usage spirituel, soit personnel, soit communautaire.'[83] He goes on to state that there are two kinds of these lectionaries: patristic and biblical. The patristic types were called homiliaries, because the texts often filled the function of a sermon or homily. However, these lectionaries may also contain excerpts from biblical commentaries, rewritten to a greater or lesser extent to fit the form of a homily, and rewriting was common in later Carolingian times.[84] Homilies, if the term is strictly applied, are works of biblical exegesis, in the form of a verse-by-verse commentary. Sermons tend to discuss a given theme, perhaps inspired by a biblical verse, or the day's liturgy. The term 'sermon' can be used to embrace homilies as well. So while a homily may be called a sermon, the reverse is not always true; in effect, homilies are a subset of sermons. In origin, both terms imply some kind of verbal delivery, whether by the author or by an appointed deputy; Gregory and Augustine used both methods. But a homiliary may contain works of both kinds: there is no English equivalent of the French term *sermonnaire*. If an extract from a commentary is turned into a homily, then the intention for delivery can be attributed to the compiler, not the author. However, one must consider the possibility that the sermon was regarded as a purely literary form – a work which might not have been read aloud. This was probably not the case until the Carolingian age, when the notion of the homiliary seems to have started to merge with the florilegium, in which excerpts from Patristic texts (which may or may not be sermons) are combined in books for private reading.[85] However, as McKitterick has shown, these collections had a significant part in inspiring preachers, even if they were not originally designed for reading aloud.[86] In the context of the discussion about constructing homiliaries, it seems preferable to refer to the 'authors' of homilies and homiliaries which they

---

[83] R. Gregoire, *Homéliaires liturgiques médiévaux: Analyse des manuscrits* (Spoleto, 1980), p. 5. 'Liturgical lectionaries are collections of texts, of lections, intended for a spiritual use, whether personal or communal.'

[84] H. Barré, *Les homéliaires carolingiens de l'École d'Auxerre: Authenticité – Inventaire – Tableaux comparatifs – Initia*, Studi e Testi 225 (Vatican, 1962), p. 29. We see this with Bede's own works. See Leclercq, 'Le iiie livre des homélies de Bède le Vénérable', *Recherches de Théologie ancienne et médiévale* 14 (1947), 211-8, and appendix C, pp. 162-3.

[85] Barré, *Les homéliaires carolingiens*, pp. 4-5.

[86] McKitterick, *The Frankish Church*, p. 102.

wrote and compiled themselves, and 'compilers' of homiliaries, who took the sermons of others or texts from commentaries, and may or may not have reworked them to a greater or lesser extent.

A further division may be applied to both authorial and compilers' homiliaries; between those intended to be read aloud to a group, and those intended for private reading. The former would most likely have had a liturgical function, whether at the Mass or the divine office. The latter would have been used outside the liturgy itself, but were very probably used in *lectio divina* – the reading prescribed by St Benedict in his rule. The homiliaries for public reading could probably have reached a wider audience, including laypeople, whereas collections for private devotion are more immediately associated with a monastic environment, at least in the early middle ages. Homiliaries for the liturgy tend to be biased towards the hermeneutic and homiletic, in connection with readings or Gospels just heard, though not exclusively so. Homiliaries for private devotion tend to include more sermons and more thematic works, though this is an over-simplification of a more complex combination of materials. As will be shown in chapter V, Bede's homilies could be used for either purpose.

It may be more constructive to examine the purpose of the compiler, as this is a sounder guide to the content of the homiliary. Olivar has pointed out that preachers were formed by their personal predilections and the circumstances in which they found themselves.[87] It would seem probable that the same is also true of the compilers of homiliaries. Compilers seem to have intended their homiliaries for one of three purposes: for personal devotion (late Antique and later Carolingian compilers) or for the night office (early Carolingian compilers, such as Paul the Deacon and in the sixth century, the compiler of the Roman homiliary) or for the Mass (the homilist of Toledo).[88] These homiliaries may or may not have been intended as exemplars or stimuli for preachers, but we know that some were used in this manner.[89] Authors may have collected their compositions for future use by themselves or by other preachers, or in order to refute a particular position (for example, sermons preached against Arianism), or for private meditation. They may have used a group of sermons as a means of controlling their biblical commentary

---

[87] Olivar, *La Predicación Cristiana*, p. 319 and p. 334 for example.

[88] D. J. F. Rivera Recio, 'El "Homiliarum Gothicum" de la Biblioteca Capitular de Toledo', *Hispania Sacra* 4 (1951), 147-68, p. 149.

[89] G. Morin, ed., *Sancti Caesarii Arlatensis: Sermones*, CCSL 103 (Turnholt, 1953).

(for example, Gregory's *Moralia in Iob*), for biblical commentary was not a purely academic exercise, but a means of revealing spiritual truth, providing nourishment and encouraging spiritual growth. The form of a sermon with its direct address may have seemed ideal to the teachers of the Church – a means of dealing with difficult texts to unlock their meaning in a way which encouraged Christian faith and life. They may also have collected their sermons for private reading, either for moral development or for the further comprehension of Scripture. There is a tendency to think of the learned men of the Early Middle Ages as the academics of their day, an image perhaps lent strength by the schools and universities of the later Middle Ages. However, this can also leave us with the impression that these men were removed from external life, an impression exacerbated if they were monastics. These men were often passionately and actively involved with society, as priests and bishops, in constant contact with ordinary people. In fact, one who was a cloistered academic for his whole life was something of a rarity. Unfortunately, we have no clues as to why Bede wrote his Gospel homilies; in none of the surviving manuscripts is there an introductory letter to shed light on his motivation.

The homiliary for private reading originated in the late patristic period, as witnessed by Gennadius.[90] This form was dominated by the homiliaries intended for use at public worship, whether the office or the mass. In the later Carolingian period, these homiliaries were revived, especially at the school of Auxerre, as Henri Barré has demonstrated.[91] In these later collections, the compiler begins to take a more active role (as did Smaragdus): the compiler would rewrite sections of biblical commentary to make the structure conform to that of a homily, or fillet sermons to produce a more useable whole. These compilations still used the Church year for their structure – they were a set of private readings in the form of a homily or sermon. Bede does not seem to feature prominently in such collections, at least from the Carolingian period. The first homiliaries specifically connected to the liturgy arose in the early medieval period. A liturgical homiliary in use at St Peter's basilica in Rome in the sixth century can be reconstructed; it formed the basis of Agimond's homiliary and for that of Alan of Farfa. These homiliaries are notable for the extensive use of St Augustine's homilies. It was at the Carolingian court, with the homiliary of Paul the Deacon, that the homiliary for public worship came into its

---

[90] Barré, *Les homéliaires carolingiens*, p. 7.
[91] Barré, *Les homéliaires carolingiens*, p. 30.

own. Gregoire notes that Alcuin is also alleged to have made a homiliary, indicating the influence of the Carolingian court in this area.[92]

The homiliary of Paul the Deacon was compiled at the court of Charlemagne, as part of the program of religious reform overseen by Alcuin. This homiliary, unlike that of Alan of Farfa, was based on the Roman breviary, and gave 244 readings for the divine office throughout the year.[93] It took sermons of the Church Fathers, and occasionally extracts from their other works, and assigned them to various dates through the year. Fifty-four of the readings are taken from Bede's homilies or his Gospel commentaries, on Mark and Luke.[94] This need not surprise us overmuch in this context; Alcuin is known to have been very fond of Bede's work and presumably brought a number of manuscripts with him from York. Both Paul's homiliary and Alan's were arranged to suit the liturgical year, which then fell into two parts: Advent to Holy Saturday and Easter Day to Advent.[95] Paul states in his introduction that his readings were designed for the night office,[96] when Old Testament, New Testament and Patristic readings were heard, especially during the winter months.[97]

The use of homiliaries at the night office is closely connected to their use in private study, since these were the two main opportunities for reading Patristic texts. However, homiliaries connected to the Gospel pericopes also arose at a similar period (the fifth century – a time closely connected to the formulation of the Sacramentary). The homiliary of Toledo was intended for use at the celebration of the Eucharist.[98] Homiliaries were not only compiled for personal spiritual edification, but also in order to help preachers. Caesarius of Arles compiled his homilies and also those of others (mainly Augustine) in order to help out the preacher – his parish priests and deacons who had to give a sermon each week. This was not the case before the fifth century, when only bishops had an obligation to preach, and priests preached only with the bishop's approval.[99]

---

[92] Gregoire, *Homéliaires liturgiques médiévaux*, p. 66.

[93] R. Gregoire, *Les homéliaires du moyen âge: Inventaire et analyse des manuscrits*, Rerum Ecclesiasticarum documenta series maior: Fontes VI (Rome, 1966), p. 71.

[94] Information derived from Gregoire, *Les homéliaires*, pp. 78-113.

[95] Gregoire *Les homéliaires*, p. 6.

[96] 'ad nocturnale officium', Patrologia Latina (PL) 95, ed. J.-P. Migne, (Paris, 1886), col. 1159.

[97] P. Salmon, *L'Office Divin: Histoire de la formation du Bréviaire*, Lex Orandi 27 (Paris, 1959), p. 141. For further discussion of Bede's homilies in the homiliary of Paul the Deacon, see below pp. 19-20.

[98] Gregoire, *Les Homéliaires*, p. 293.

[99] 'Homiletics', http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/07443a.htm

Where we have any clear idea of the form of homiliaries compiled by their own authors, as a general rule they seem to have grown out of the author's own preaching. This may mean that they used the liturgical year as the basis for their preaching, though this is not always the case. Reverentius, who wrote the *Vita S. Hilarii Arelatensis*, stated that St Hilary composed sermons for use on feasts throughout the year.[100] It is probable that the sermons of Caesarius of Arles could be assigned an order; one Germanic collection is called *De anni circulo*.[101] Within this preaching basis, different authors may use their sermons differently. Leo the Great's collection is liturgical: it is firmly centred on the major feasts of the Church year.[102] As indicated above, Caesarius' collection would seem to function as a preaching manual, guide or lectionary. Most probably Cassian's *Collationes* were intended for private reading. Augustine's *Tractatus in Iohannem* have a primarily exegetical function, and in fact became one of the most important works written about that Gospel. The different titles used for compilations of homilies should not confuse us: Augustine and Gregory the Great used a variety of titles such as *moralia*, *enarrationes*, *homilia*. However, they all describe collections of sermons, and were originally intended to be preached.

The context of this preaching may be debated. Homilists operating in a monastic environment could not only have preached at the Eucharist but at other points in the horarium, though it would seem unlikely that this would have replaced the reading of the orthodox Church Fathers. Their sermons need not have been short. Of the homilies in Augustine's Tractates on John, the longer ones are the ones he preached himself, which were taken down by secretaries, and the ones he dictated to be read out by someone else are shorter.[103] In Mayer's edition, the preached sermons cover, on average, ten pages, whilst those dictated average only two to three.

In this context, it is important to remember that relatively few authorial homiliaries survive in their original state. Collections which form a complete commentary upon a book of the Bible are likely to survive intact, but homiliaries connected to the Church year are apt to become at least slightly disrupted during the

---

[100] Gregoire, *Homéliaires liturgiques médiévaux*, p. 44.
[101] Barré, *Les homéliaires carolingiens*, p. 2
[102] Olivar, *La Predicación Cristiana*, pp. 313-4.
[103] Augustine, *Tractatus in Iohannem*, ed. A. Mayer, CCSL 36 (Turnholt, 1954), p. vii.

process of transmission. This is because the Church year and the cycle of readings were not stable, and a homiliary composed at one time for one place would need alterations in order to function elsewhere. Some authors, such as Caesarius of Arles, have been largely hidden beneath false attributions to another author: in the case of Caesarius, this was Augustine whose style Caesarius imitated, too successfully it seems. Works by authors such as Augustine, Jerome and Ambrose were swamped with pseudepigrapha. Authorial homiliaries are also often distributed piecemeal among compiler's homiliaries, adding to the difficulties of accurate attribution. Though authorial collections largely grew out of preaching, they were probably intended to be read in private when they were issued, not to be recycled at another church, if only because in the Patristic era, the number of preachers was limited.

Bede's homiliary contains only fifty homilies. If the monks at Wearmouth-Jarrow celebrated the Eucharist every day, then the homilies we have represent a very small percentage of the number of homilies Bede presumably delivered, even if a homily was not delivered at every Mass. There is also the question of how often Bede would have preached; surely the abbot would have preached on at least some occasions. This may suggest that Bede's homilies date from later on in his life, after his mentors were dead, when he was one of the most senior members of the monastery. It seems that the homiliary as we have it was a deliberate selection on the part of Bede (and that this selection was made by him is suggested by its inclusion in his short biography), and therefore its composition may indicate the direction of his interests.

Bede's homiliary travelled largely intact within a larger collection – that of Paul the Deacon.   Paul the Deacon's homiliary, as mentioned above, had, in its original recension, 244 homilies for use at the night office, assigned to various dates in the year. Some dates had more than one reading assigned to them. The homiliary is divided into summer and winter parts. There are fifty-four extracts of Bede, a fifth of the whole: a very respectable showing, when the other main contributors were Gregory, Caesarius and Leo (and pseudepigrapha, especially of Augustine, presumably under the misapprehension that these were genuine works). However, twenty of these extracts are not Bede's homilies, but extracts from his commentaries upon the Gospels of Mark and Luke. So not all of Bede's homiletic corpus travels in Paul the Deacon's collection. Missing are the two advent homilies (I.1 and I.2), both

on John the Baptist; the sermon on the Annunciation (I.3), and his Christmas homilies on the birth and the visitation of the shepherds (I.6 and I.7), though his tour-de-force on St John's Gospel is used (I.8). The homily on Benedict Biscop (I.13) is removed (for obvious reasons – no one in Carolingian France would have heard of him). His sermon on the calling of Nathaniel was excluded (I.17), as was his sermon on the purification of Mary (I.18). Four of his Lenten homilies were discarded: two healing miracles, one from John, one from Matthew (I.22 and I.23), the tale of the adulterous woman from John's Gospel (I.25), and the cleansing of the Temple (II.1). All of the ones for the Easter season itself are included. The post-Paschal homily on the betrayal of Judas (II.12), and Bede's Ascension homily (II.15) are removed. Three of his homilies on saints were also omitted: two on John the Baptist (II.20 and II.23) and the other for St James (II.21). It was mostly Bede's homilies on John's Gospel that were omitted, as well as healing miracles, where Bede's style was not appreciated, perhaps because of competition from Augustine. The other major omission is of his homilies on John the Baptist: Bede's great interest in him was evidently not appreciated by Paul.

'It is these homiliaries which were the distinctive contribution of the Carolingians to the didactic material of the church, for they were from the first designed to be of practical assistance in the Carolingian reforms.'[104] These homiliaries were similar in structure to lectionaries and eighth-century Gelasian-type sacramentaries.[105] They may have reached a wide audience; McKitterick suggests that 'Many compilations suggest that the homiliaries were intended for both a literate and an illiterate audience.'[106]

It is undoubtedly Paul the Deacon's homiliary which brought Bede's homilies to the largest number of readers. 'It seems clear that Ælfric knew Bede's homilies as whole items only through the homiliary of Paul the Deacon.'[107] Nevertheless, 'another important collection for the Carolingian Church appears to have been the collection of homilies by the Anglo-Saxon, Bede.'[108] The listing of manuscripts contained in CCSL 122 and in Laistner and King is conservative.[109] This

---

[104] McKitterick, *The Frankish Church*, p. 90.
[105] McKitterick, *The Frankish Church*, p. 91.
[106] McKitterick, *The Frankish Church*, p. 93.
[107] J. Hill, *Bede and the Benedictine Reform*, Jarrow Lecture (Jarrow, 1998), p. 13.
[108] McKitterick, *The Frankish Church*, p. 96.
[109] D. Hurst, ed., *Homiliae*, CCSL 122, pp. xvii-xxi, and M. L. W. Laistner and H. H. King, *A Handlist of Bede Manuscripts* (Ithaca, 1943), pp. 114-8.

conservatism is necessitated because of the accrual of inauthentic homilies under Bede's name in a quantity only paralleled in Bede's scientific corpus.[110] The number of homilies printed in earlier editions is clearly more than Bede produced.[111] Manuscript catalogues are not always helpful in their descriptions of contents; therefore to ascertain the true number of manuscripts containing homilies by Bede would be a massive undertaking. The difficulty is compounded by the fact that at an early date extracts were made from Bede's Gospel commentaries and circulated separately as sermons.[112] Thus we have only an imperfect understanding of the continental transmission, though it seems to have been primarily through the collection of Paul the Deacon, as there is little Bede included in other collections, and a small number of manuscripts of the homilies.

Many commentators have noted the explosion in the number of manuscripts of Bede's works in the Carolingian era.[113] This explosion happened with the homilies too, though the main contact would be through the homiliary of Paul the Deacon, as over one hundred copies survive. Why did the Carolingians read Bede so much? The following argument pertains principally to the homilies, though some points are applicable to his other works.

Firstly, the explosion of Bedan manuscripts is not an isolated phenomenon. The Carolingian era saw an unparalleled explosion of manuscript production of all types. This was because 'Carolingian rule meant a … positive attempt at the reshaping of a society within a Christian framework.'[114] As McKitterick notes, 'The development of the scriptoria and libraries is tightly bound up with the establishment and consolidation of Christianity.'[115] There was a requirement specified in the *Admonitio Generalis* of 789 to preach the faith and Christian virtues to the people.[116] As mentioned above, the preferred vehicle for this education was the sermon. The same proclamation notes that sermons should be free from heresy, and should, amongst other things, teach about the Triune God, God's son Jesus who was made man and came to judge, and the resurrection of the dead and eternal rewards.[117]

---

[110] C.W. Jones, ed., *Bedae Opera de Temporibus* (Cambridge, Mass., 1943).
[111] See above, pp. 8-9.
[112] See chapter V and J. Leclercq, 'Le iiie livre des homélies de Bède le Vénérable', *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médievale* 14 (1947), 211-18, p. 218.
[113] Laistner and King, *A Hand-list*, pp. 4-5.
[114] McKitterick, *The Frankish Church,* p. xx.
[115] McKitterick, *The Frankish Church*, p. 27.
[116] McKitterick, *The Frankish Church*, p. 5.
[117] McKitterick, *The Frankish Church*, p. 82.

These concerns coincide well with Bede's teaching, which is undoubtedly orthodox, free from heresy, and covers all those things. McKitterick also notes that 'Both the Virgin Mary and John the Baptist were prominent in Carolingian theology because they were mortals, chosen by God to perform a special function in their association with Christ.'[118] Bede pays close attention to both these figures in his homilies; we find here an excellent match between what we find in Bede's Gospel homilies and what the Carolingian reformists were seeking. Moreover, 'the council of Aachen in 836 explicitly accorded Bede the same authority as that of the Fathers.'[119]

Scholars have long been discussing the mechanisms whereby English texts reached the continent. Evidence of English influence (and therefore routes through which texts may have been transmitted) was discussed by Levison. He notes that English scripts were found at Echternach, Fulda, Mainz, Lorsch, Amorbach, Würzburg, Salzburg, Corbie and Tours in the eighth and ninth centuries.[120] There are many vectors for the transmission of Bede's work to the continent. All shed light on who his subsequent readers were. We know that Boniface read Bede; in fact he particularly asked for a copy of Bede's homilies to be sent to him. We find early manuscripts of Bede in centres associated with Boniface.[121] Alcuin went out to Charlemagne's court; he particularly revered Bede.[122] Both of these English scholars provided routes whereby Bede's work could be transmitted to the Carolingian world, where, as we have seen, he found a receptive audience.

The punctuation and manuscript presentation give us valuable clues about how these continental readers understood and used Bede's theology; his theology provides us with reasons for the popularity of his writing with subsequent generations. All these aspects demand our attention and form the bulk of this thesis: first, a discussion of Bede's theology and the influences upon it; second, an examination of Bede's style and the linguistic clues he left for listeners and readers; third, an examination of the scribal conventions and punctuation of minuscule manuscripts at Wearmouth-Jarrow, and finally an examination of the continental manuscripts of Bede. This approach will use the disparate approaches of Hurst,

---

[118] McKitterick, *The Frankish Church*, p. 105. Both are prominent in Paul the Deacon's collection and in Bede.
[119] J. Hill, *Bede and the Benedictine Reform*, p. 4.
[120] W. Levison, *England and the Continent in the Eighth Century: The Ford Lectures Delivered in the University of Oxford in the Hilary Term 1943* (Oxford, 1946), p. 136.
[121] Levison , *England and the Continent*, p. 140, p. 143. Laistner and King, *A Hand-list*, p. 5.
[122] See chapter V.

Carroll and van der Walt, giving an insight into the reasons for Bede's popularity in the early middle ages.

Chapter I: An Analysis of Selected Themes in Bede's Works

In this chapter three themes are discussed which recur in Bede's homilies and elsewhere in his *oeuvre*. These themes were selected in order to provide a cross-section of Bede's interests, while limiting the size of the study to something appropriate for the thesis as a whole. These particular themes have been chosen because of their especial importance in Bede's theology. Caputa has noted of Bede that he was particularly concerned with 'il mistero antico e nuovo della Pasqua, dell'Ascensione e della Pentecoste, i sacramenti dell'iniziazione cristiana, la Chiesa come tempio in costruzione, la vita di Cristo e dei cristiani come sacrificio sacerdotale.'[1] Jones has stated that: 'Nearly all of the identifiable interests of Bede as teacher attach themselves somehow to the doctrine of the Six, Seven and Eight Days of Creation, the Hexaëmeron, as model or prefiguration of the Six, Seven and Eight historical and chronological Ages of the World.'[2] I have chosen to include Bede's views on grace and heresy, as Bede seems to react very strongly against heretics in his writings, and this reaction is of interest; also, this theme connects well to the others aforementioned.[3] As noted above, Bede has a complex and coherent theology, but one which is not expressed in any systematic fashion.[4] Therefore Bede's teachings on grace and heresy within the homilies shall be examined, as well as his discussion of the doctrine of the six ages of the world and his ecclesiology.

I. Grace and Heresy

Grace has an important place in Bede's theology, which is strongly influenced by Augustine.[5] It is rare for him to devote an entire homily to the subject (though he does in homily I.2), but paragraphs or phrases about grace occur frequently. These often reveal the associations Bede made. For example, Bede uses the words *humilitatis gratiam* (the grace of humility),[6] and *gratiae medentis* (healing grace). The first suggests the special place humility held among the virtues for Bede,

---

[1] G. Caputa, 'Lineamenti di teologica liturgica nelle omelie di San Beda il Venerabile', *Ephemerides Liturgicae* 111 (1997), 116-131, p. 120: 'the ancient and modern mystery of Easter, of Ascension and of Pentecost, the sacraments of Christian initiation, the Church as a temple under construction, the life of Christ and Christians as a priestly sacrifice.'
[2] C. W. Jones, 'Introductory Remarks', p. 192.
[3] See below, pp. 28-30.
[4] See Introduction, p. 5 above.
[5] See chapter II, pp. 52-4.
[6] I.4.256, p. 28; I.21.6-7, p. 148.

because of its Benedictine associations.[7] The second suggests that grace has a healing action upon the individual. These short phrases tend to indicate aspects of the gift given by God, rather than providing a complete explanation of a global concept. These aspects could be meditated upon for further understanding and appreciation of grace.

Etymology provides Bede with ideas about the action of grace upon an individual.[8] The first relevant occurrence of this is in homily I.16, on the calling of the first disciples. Bede takes the biblical verse 'Tu es Simon filius Iohanna', and glosses this as 'tu es oboediens filius gratiae Dei'.[9] In the preceding lines Bede notes that this name is fitting for the head of the whole Church. This etymology is again used to explain the importance of Peter. In his homily on Saints Peter and Paul, Bede refers again to the meaning of the name John, this time in his commentary upon John 21:15.[10] The example thus provided for the Church is 'ut liquido cunctis ostendatur hoc quod maiore prae ceteris oboedientia domini iussis obsequitur quod ardentiore illum caritate amplectitur non humani meriti sed muneris esse diuini.'[11] Bede uses the interpretation of the name (taken from Jerome's *Interpretation of Hebrew Names*)[12] to indicate that grace is very much a privilege granted by God – it is not something that humans deserve. Bede also uses this interpretation when writing about John the Baptist. Bede wrote:

> ipse specialem prae ceteris sanctis eiusdem praecursionis gratiam accepit et inauditam eatenus mundo caelestis ingressus gratiam praedicare aduenit. Qui ergo et gratia plenus exstitit et ceteris Dei gratiam euangelizauit recte praeconium gratiae ipse etiam suo nomine signauit.[13]

---

[7] See H. Mayr-Harting, *The Venerable Bede, the Rule of St Benedict, and Social Class*, Jarrow Lecture (Jarrow, 1976), especially pp. 6-9, and A. G. P. van der Walt, 'Reflections of the Benedictine Rule in Bede's Homiliary', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* (*JEH*) 37 (1986), 367-76.

[8] Bede was particularly fond of this form of exegesis; see below, chapter II, p. 56.

[9] I.16.151-2, p. 115. The verse in question is John 1:42. CSS 110, p. 161: '"*You are Simon, son of John*" – "You are the obedient son of God's grace."'

[10] II.22.25-6, p. 343.

[11] II.22.27-31, p. 343. CSS 110, p. 221: 'To make clear to everyone that when one obeys the injunctions of the Lord more eagerly than others, and embraces him in charity more ardently, it is the result not of human merit, but of divine favour.'

[12] Jerome, *Liber interpretationis Hebraicorum nominum*, ed. P. Antin, CCSL 72 (Turnholt, 1959), 148.4.16-7, p. 146.

[13] II.19.246-50, p. 324. CSS 111, p. 197: 'He received a special grace beyond other saints, that of being [Christ's] precursor, and he came to proclaim a heretofore unheard of grace to the world, that of entry into heaven. Therefore, he who was full of grace himself, and who brought the good news of God's grace to the rest [of humankind], expressed even by his name a proclamation of grace.'

In the subsequent homily, Bede repeats this interpretation – John has special grace because he is the forerunner of Christ, who, as we will see, gave grace to the world.[14]

In Bede's mind, Mary is also full of grace. Her grace also derives from her connection to Jesus – she gave him birth, and as a result of this, grace entered the world.[15] Her dedication of her virginity to God also gave her special status.[16] Bede here echoes the words from the verse upon which he is commenting, which are familiar to us from the Hail Mary: she is indeed 'blessed among women', and 'full of grace'.[17] Her grace derives from her willingness to bear her son, who would give grace to the world. Despite these examples of grace and the individual, Bede's view of grace is very Christocentric. While the Holy Spirit is the immediate agent, without Christ, grace could not be given.

Bede makes it clear that it is through Christ that this grace is available; as mentioned above, John the Baptist is proclaiming the coming of grace into the world, through Christ. It is specifically through Christ's humanity that this grace is available: 'per humiliationem susceptae humanitatis spiritum gratiae fructiferis fidelium cordibus infudit qui excelsus in angelo apparens duris dura quondam dedit mandata populis.'[18] Grace is connected to the new covenant of Christ, and is given during baptism, after the forgiveness of sins: 'Baptizat quippe spiritu sancto qui munere spiritus sancti peccata dimittit et accepta remissione peccatorum etiam spiritus eiusdem gratiam tribuit.'[19]

The Spirit is usually the immediate source of the grace given, indeed, the grace of the spirit *is* the grace which is given. However, Bede has made it clear that this gift is a consequence of Christ's life. In this sense, Bede calls 'the grace of the Spirit the "mother and progenitrix of the Church."'[20] This interconnection of ideas is typical of Bede; he makes many connections between ecclesiology and other

---

[14] II.20.109-112, p. 331. CSS 111, p. 206.

[15] I.3.64-66, CSS 110, pp. 20-1.

[16] I.3.60-62. CSS 110, pp. 20-1.

[17] I.3.64-70, CSS 110, pp. 20-1.

[18] I.25.124-27; p. 181. CSS 110, p. 249: 'Through the humiliation of the humanity which he had adopted, he poured out the spirit of grace upon the fruitful hearts of the faithful, though once he appeared exalted in [the form of] an angel and gave hard mandates to a hard-hearted people.'

[19] I.1.157-160, p. 6. CSS 110, p. 7: 'He indeed baptised with the Holy Spirit who pardoned sins by the favour of the Holy Spirit; and when they had received forgiveness of sins he also bestowed the grace of the same Spirit.'

[20] I.15.99-100, p. 108, CSS 110, p. 151.

subjects. This is indicative of the importance ecclesiology holds for him. Bede notes the multiplicity of gifts which the Spirit can give:

> constat innumeros fidelium per donum spiritus sancti praenosse ac praedixisse uentura. Sed quia sunt non nulli qui spiritus gratia pleni infirmos curant mortuos suscitant daemonibus imperant multis uirtutibus coruscant ipsi angelicam in terris uitam gerunt nec tamen quae ibi sint uentura spiritus eiusdem reuelatione agnoscunt.[21]

Bede is essentially paraphrasing the words of Paul: 'Now there are varieties of gifts, but the same Spirit;'[22] uncharacteristically, Bede does not quote Paul here, but merely summarises: grace does not produce the same results in all who receive it.

As mentioned previously, the grace of the spirit is bestowed at baptism, which is the entry into the community of Christ.[23] Grace is also bestowed as a consequence of prayer, as Bede notes by his exegesis on this verse:

> *Hi omnes erant perseuerantes unanimiter in oratione*. Quod nobis est testimonium operis apostolici solerter imitandum uidelicet ut qui caelestia promissa habemus qui pro his accipiendis sedulo supplicari praecipimur et omnes ad orandum conueniamus et in oratione persistamus et unanima nobis orantibus pius conditor auditum accommodare et spiritus sui gratiam nostris quoque cordibus infundere dignabitur.[24]

In effect, homily I.2 is a treatise on grace; as grace is so intimately associated with Christ, it is rarely discussed in most of his other commentaries. The Gospel commentaries are more immediately reliant on Patristic sources, and they are commentaries on two of the synoptic Gospels; most of Bede's discussion of grace is focussed on John's Gospel. This is one of the longest continuous pieces of writing on grace that Bede produced. The homily comments upon John 1:15-18, which says:

> John bore witness to him, and cried, "This was he of whom I said, 'He who comes after me ranks before me, for he was before me.'" And from

---

[21] II.11.152-159, p. 257. CSS 111, p. 103: 'It is true that a countless number of the faithful have foreknown and proclaimed things which are to come as a result of the gift of the Spirit. There are some who, filled with the grace of the spirit, cure the sick, raise the dead, command demons, and shine forth with many virtues; they lead an angelic life on earth; nevertheless they do not know by a revelation of the Spirit the things that are to come about there.'

[22] I Cor. 12:4.

[23] See also I.16.118-120, p. 114; CSS 110, p. 160 and Bede, *De templo*, ed. D. Hurst, CCSL 119A (Turnholt, 1969), I.1613-1621, p.187, I.1721-1730, p. 190 (*Bede: On the Temple*, trans. S. Connolly (Liverpool, 1995), I.16.2, p. 58; I.16.6, p. 61).

[24] II.15.179-186, p. 285 (The biblical quotation is from Acts 1:14.) CSS 111, pp. 141-2: '*They were all persevering with one accord in prayer*. This testimony to the apostolic work must be meticulously imitated by us: we who have the heavenly promises, [and] are commanded to painstakingly offer supplication to receive them should all come together to pray, and should persist in prayer, and should entreat the Lord with single-minded devotion. And we must not doubt our benevolent Maker will deign to lend us a hearing if we pray in this way, and to pour forth the grace of his spirit into our hearts.' The modern theologian Karl Rahner also notes the importance of the 'community of prayer.' K. Rahner, *Meditations on the Sacraments*, trans. J. M. Quigley *et al.* (London, 1977), p. 61.

his fullness have we all received grace for grace. For the law was given
through Moses; grace and truth came through Jesus Christ. No one has
ever seen God; the only Son, who is in the bosom of the Father, he has
made him known.

The treatise on grace begins with the exegesis for verse sixteen: 'And from
his fullness we have all received grace for grace.' Bede notes that Jesus contained
the Holy Spirit, contained grace and truth because of his divinity: 'Plenus quippe erat
dominus spiritu sancto plenus gratia et ueritate quia sicut apostolus ait: *In ipso
habitat omnis plenitudo diuinitatis corporaliter.*'[25] It is from this fullness that people
receive grace, according to their capacity, which thesis Bede supports with
Ephesians 4:7.[26] Though grace is granted from fullness, not everyone receives
fullness. Bede here cites 1 Cor. 12:8-11 about the diversity of gifts within the Spirit.[27]
He then points out that, having been granted this grace, the recipient should keep in
mind that this is a gift, and that the good actions performed by the recipient are a
consequence of the grace given. To this end he quotes Paul, 1 Cor. 15:10: 'And His
grace has not been fruitless in me, but I have laboured more than any of them, not I,
however, but the grace of God in me.'[28] This he essentially paraphrases in homily
II.11.

The grace is twofold – 'Geminam ergo nos gratiam accepisse testatur unam
uidelicet in praesenti alteram in futuro; in praesenti quidem *fidem quae per
dilectionem operatur* in futuro autem uitam aeternam.'[29] The gift of grace is
connected to the gift of future salvation. Bede expands upon this, by noting that
good deeds done on earth, on account of which future life may be attained, are graces
of God.[30] In short, the homily covers the important theological role of grace, giving
the Augustinian interpretation to the British, as opposed to that of the British heretic
Pelagius, whose followers held that 'man can take the initial and fundamental steps
towards salvation by his own efforts, apart from Divine grace.'[31]

---

[25] I.2.36-38, p. 8. CSS 110, p. 10: 'The Lord was indeed full of the Holy Spirit, full of grace and truth,
because as the Apostle says, *In him dwells all the fullness of divinity bodily*.' The Pauline quotation is
Col. 2:9.
[26] I.2.38-40, p. 8; CSS 110, p. 10. 'De cuius plenitudine nos omnes iuxta modum nostrae capacitatis
accepimus quia *unicuique nostrum data est gratia secundum mensuram donationis Christi.*'
[27] I.2.45-52, p. 8; CSS 110, pp. 10-11.
[28] I.2.52-65, pp. 8-9; CSS 110, p. 11.
[29] I.2.71-73, p. 9; CSS 110, p. 11: 'He is testifying that we have received a twofold grace – namely one
grace in the present and another for the future – in the present, *faith which works through love*, (Gal.
5:6) and for the future, life eternal.'
[30] I.2.78-82, p. 9; CSS 110, p. 12.
[31] 'Pelagianism' in *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church* (*ODCC*), 3rd edn, ed. F. L. Cross
and E. A. Livingstone (Oxford, 1997), pp. 1248-9.

Bede 'sottolinea con forza il primato assoluto della grazia.'[32] He does not mention the Pelagian heresy by name in the homilies – he simply gives the orthodox theology. In the homilies, he refers to it once, when he says:

> quia quod omnibus patet nemo est qui sine corruptione ac dolore uiuere possit super terram, quod omnibus sapientibus patet licet heretici contradicant nemo est qui sine adtactus alicuius peccati uiuere super terram.[33]

He mentions Pelagianism twenty-two times by name outside the *HE*, particularly in *De tabernaculo*, when he accuses the Pelagians of hardening their hearts against God's grace, and twelve times in the commentary on the seven Catholic Epistles.[34] The form of this reference in the commentary on the Catholic Epistles is similar to that which is used for most of the heresies mentioned in the homilies; Bede states the orthodox position, then contrasts the errors of the heretics.[35] Pelagianism appears to have been of particular concern to Bede, as Pelagianism had originated in the British Isles, and had caused much difficulty.[36] He details this origin in book I of the *HE*, describing Germanus' two visits to Britain for the express purpose of combating this heresy.[37] The whole of the *HE* could be regarded as an expression of God's grace, manifested in the conversion of the British Isles to a unified Christianity. Bede's account is based on Constantius' *Life of St Germanus*, which Bede sometimes quoted verbatim.[38] In neither the source nor the adaptation is there any detail about the nature of Pelagianism and its doctrinal background. Constantius has Germanus demonstrate the superiority of orthodoxy by the saint's power to perform miracles, not by an analysis of biblical texts. However, Bede would have been and was able to obtain his doctrinal information elsewhere. Both Augustine and Jerome wrote arguments to refute Pelagianism, which Bede read, and

---

[32] Caputa, 'Lineamenti', p. 125: 'strongly underlines the absolute primacy of grace.'

[33] I.24.131-4, p. 173, CSS 110, p. 239: 'It is evident to everyone that there is no one who can live on earth without corruption and sorrow; and it is evident to all who are wise, although heretics deny it, that there is no one who can live on earth without being touched by some sin.'

[34] Bede, *De tabernaculo*, ed. D. Hurst, CCSL 119A (Turnholt, 1969), II.1591-1603, p. 82. See fn. 42 below.

[35] Bede, *In epistolas septem catholicas*, ed. D. Hurst, CCSL 121 (Turnholt, 1983), *Iacobus I*, lines 60-65, p. 184; 'Commentary on James', *Bede the Venerable: Commentary on the Seven Catholic Epistles*, trans. D. Hurst, CSS 82 (Kalamazoo, 1985), James 1.5, p. 9.

[36] V. Lozito has written an article about Bede's anti-Pelagianism. The argument is somewhat confused, but it seems to indicate that Bede thought the Irish had some Pelagian ideas or practices, particularly that their Easter cycle showed traces of Pelagian influence. 'Le tradizioni celtiche nella polemica antipelagiana di Beda', *Romanobarbarica* 3 (1978), 71-88.

[37] *HE* I.17-24.

[38] Constantius of Lyon, *Constance de Lyon: Vie de Saint Germain d'Auxerre*, ed. and trans. R. Borius, Sources Chrétiennes 112 (Paris, 1965), chapter III, pp. 144-59.

used when constructing his homilies, which in effect refute Pelagianism, though not referring to the heresy by name. Of these works, Bede knew perhaps of Jerome's *Dialogus adversus Pelagianos*, and some of his letters on the subject, along with Augustine's sermons, and the relevant books of *De civitate Dei* (books fifteen, sixteen and twenty).[39]

This approach of refuting a heresy without mentioning it by name may be contrasted with Bede's general attitude to heresy as expressed in the homilies, or indeed, his attitude to Pelagianism elsewhere, where it is mentioned by name. He is strongly averse to heresy of any kind – the account in the *HE* makes this clear, as do his general remarks on heresy.[40] In the homilies he refutes a fine array of heresies, most of them Christological (he refutes Mani, Photinus, Arius, Sabellius, and mentions Christological heresies in general), but also he upholds the virgin birth, the validity of baptism and the importance of marriage, and he refutes an obscure heresy on Christ's requirement of food after death.[41] Plummer provides an extensive list of the heresies mentioned by Bede. Twenty-nine different heresies are mentioned by name.[42] The vast majority of these heresies were of academic interest to Bede: even the Moslems in Spain, adherents to another religion, were hundreds of miles from Northumbria. Bede had strong views about the unity of the Church, which perhaps

---

[39] M. L. W. Laistner, 'The Library', Jerome, pp. 248-9; Augustine, pp. 249-51.

[40] Bede, *In Samuhelis*, CCSL 119, II.2000-2100, pp. 116-118.

[41] Christological heresies: general: I.8.34-71, pp. 53-4, CSS 110, pp. 74-5; I.9.236-40, p. 95, CSS 110, p. 94; Mani and Photinus: I.15.195-99, p. 110, CSS 110, p. 155; Arius: I.25.274-83, p. 169, CSS 110, pp. 232-3; Photinus, Arius, Sabellius: II.24.148-173, p. 362, CSS 111, pp. 246-7. Virgin birth: I.5.106-111, 119-121, p. 35, CSS 110, p. 48; II.1.4-8, p. 184, CSS 111, p. 1; Tatian and Marcion on marriage: I.14.5-6, p. 95, CSS 110, p. 134; Cerinthus: II.9.159-166, p. 243, CSS 111, p. 84; validity of baptism: II.18.42-6, p. 312, CSS 111, p. 179. See chapter II, pp. 53-4 for a consideration of Bede's sources here. There follows a summary of these heresies. Mani: Mani mixed Judaeo-Christian tradition with Gnostic teachings (*ODCC*, pp. 1027-8), Photinus: he denied the pre-existence of Christ, clearly a kind of Sabellianism (see below) (*ODCC*, p. 1283) Arius: Arius and his followers were the authors of the 'principal heresy which denied the full Divinity of Jesus Christ,' holding that Christ was not eternal nor coequal with God (*ODCC*, pp. 99-100). Sabellius: failed to properly acknowledge the independent existence of the Son. (*ODCC*, p. 1102, *s.v.* 'Monarchianism'). Marcion: Rejected the Old Testament completely, especially the Law. (*ODCC*, pp. 1033-4) Hence, presumably, his rejection of Old Testament marriage laws. Cerinthus: 'He taught that Jesus began His earthly life as a mere man, though at His baptism "the Christ", a higher Divine power, descended upon Him, only to depart from Him again before the crucifixion.' (*ODCC*, pp. 313-4). Presumably, this left him, as a man, requiring food for nourishment after the resurrection, hence Bede's words: 'In this matter, dearly beloved brothers, we must beware of the stupid heresy of the followers of Cerinthus, lest anyone should judge in a childish and absurd way either that the body of God's Mediator and our Lord stood in need of the support of food after it was raised from the dead, or that our own bodies will have to be restored with fleshly food in their life and spiritual mode of existence after their resurrection.' Translation: CSS 111, p. 8; II.9.159-66.

[42] Plummer, *Venerabilis Baedae Opera Historica*, vol. I, pp. lxii-lxiii. Unfortunately the references given are to Giles' edition of Bede; J. A. Giles, *Opera Omnia*, (London, 1843-4).

accounts for his need to combat potentially heretical thoughts in his teaching.[43] I say 'potentially heretical' advisedly – it is quite possible to lose sight of, say, an aspect of the person of Christ, in teaching, thus implying things about Christ's nature which are not in accord with orthodox doctrine. This is one of the reasons Bede and Gregory so frequently play with the dichotomies of Christ's nature – it is a convenient and thought-provoking way to keep both his humanity and divinity in mind.[44] Caputa says something of interest:

> Le spiegazioni dei dogmi riguardanti le verità rivelate e l'agire cristiano colpiscono per la chiarezza e precisione dei termini, espressione fedele degli enunciati dei grandi concili ecumenici, ai quali esorta ad attenersi con "simplicitas catholica" per non cadere negli errori degli eretici.[45]

Bede is trying to prevent heresy arising. Caputa also notes that the English were only recently converted, thus putting a premium on their doctrinal education.[46] Bede himself states: 'The gates of hell are depraved teachings, which by seducing the imprudent draw them down to hell.'[47] He would not have wanted to be found lacking here. Bede's seeming obsession with heresy is a result of his desire to point out pitfalls to the unwary, and the mirror-image of his desire for unity.[48] It is also a result of his passionate engagement with his books; his work thus reflects dangers which were important to Augustine, but which were not so immediately relevant to Anglo-Saxon England.

II. The Six Ages of the World

---

[43] II.16.170-84, p. 295, CSS 111, p. 155.

[44] See chapter II, p. 53.

[45] Caputa, 'Lineamenti', p. 123. This raises the question of how exactly Bede knew the outcomes of these councils, and how these were transmitted to Anglo-Saxon England. 'The explanation of the dogma concerning the revealed truths and Christian behaviour are striking for their clarity and the precision of their terminology, faithful expression of the pronouncements of the great ecumenical councils, [is] an exhortation to act with "catholic simplicity", so as not to fall into the errors of the heretics.'

[46] Caputa, 'Lineamenti', p. 129. See also Leonardi, 'Il venerabile Beda', pp. 640-42.

[47] I.20.135-7, p. 145: 'Portae inferi doctrinae sunt nequam quae seducendo inprudentes ad infero trahunt.' CSS 110, p. 201.

[48] One can also relate it to his desire for uniform practice in the Church, to eliminate schism (as over the Easter controversy), and to the responsibility of a preacher (see van der Walt's thesis, *The Homiliary of the Venerable Bede*, pp. 20-8).

The six ages of the world are a chronological arrangement of history into theologically significant time periods.[49] The first age runs from creation to the flood; the second from Noah to the Tower of Babel; the third from Babel to Saul; the fourth from David (Saul's successor) to the captivity in Babylon; the fifth from Babylon to Roman rule; the sixth from the birth of Christ under Roman rule to the second coming. The greater part of the theological importance of these ages arises when they are compared to shorter significant time units in Christian theology, namely the creation, Christ's passion, and the life-span of man. These smaller units are a microcosm of the sweep of sacred history.[50] As Wallis notes, Bede turns 'the reckoning of time into a figure of eternity.'[51]

Table 1:

Ages	Days of Creation	Days of Passion	Ages of Man
1 creation to flood	light	Jesus arrives in Bethany	infancy
2 Noah to Babel	firmament	Entry into Jerusalem	childhood
3 Babel to Saul	dry land	questioned by Jews	adolescence
4 David to captivity in Babylon	sun and moon	questioned by Jews	youth
5 Babylon to Roman rule	birds and fish	questioned by Jews	maturity
6 birth of Christ to Second Coming	mammals and reptiles	Jesus is crucified	ends in senility
7 Age of the Saints	rest	He is laid in the tomb	
8 Eternity		He is Resurrected	

As can be seen in table 1 above, these time periods contain different numbers of ages. The basic idea originated from the verse 'with the Lord one day is as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day',[52] and previous chronologists had calculated the time up to the birth of Christ from creation as approximately 5000

---

[49] For one example of the theological significance, see Bede, *In Genesim*, ed. C. W. Jones, CCSL 118A (Turnholt, 1967), I.1093-1224, pp. 35-39. Among Bede's major sources for this are Augustine, *De Genesi contra Manichaeos*, PL 34, cols. 190-193, I.xxiii-xxv, and Isidore, *Quaestiones in Vetus Testamentum*, PL 83, cols. 213-4.

[50] P. Siniscalco has already studied this area of Bede's theology, but reaches a somewhat different conclusion: 'In a time in which the "barbarian" culture and no longer the pagan culture of the Romans represents the alternative to the Christian faith, the valorization of the theory of the cosmic ages helps to tone down the pre-eminence that the *ethnos* holds among the Germanic peoples, and to give birth to a different world from that expressed by the ancient pagan civilization and also from that moulded by the Romano-Christian civilization.' P. Siniscalco, 'Le età del mondo in Beda', *Romanobarbarica* 3 (1978), 297-332, summary, p. 332.

[51] Wallis, trans., *Bede: The Reckoning of Time*, p. lxxi.

[52] II Peter 3:8, also Ps. 89:4.

years.[53] From a very early date this was extended to seven, or even eight, ages, where after the end of time, there was the age of eternity, after all souls have been resurrected.[54] The seventh age was usually considered to run parallel to the sixth (or even some of the earlier ages) and was the age of the saints in heaven. The eighth age occurs after the Second Coming. Table 1 also shows some of the most common comparisons made between the ages of the world and shorter chronological periods.

Bede took full advantage of the flexibility inherent in these varied chronological interpretations, as can be seen in the homilies. We find short, coherent, expressions of these comparisons, as well as more fleeting references, usually triggered by mention of the number six, seven or eight, designed to bring out a moral.[55] Homily I.14 is an exception to this; in it, the ages are used to reveal a way of understanding the history of the Church. This homily comments on the wedding at Cana (John 2:1-11), where Jesus turned water into wine. John noted that the water was contained in six stone *hydria* (jars), which led Bede to link the six jars to the six ages of the world.[56] Bede states that the reason Jesus changed water into wine, rather than creating wine *ex nihilo*, was to show the fulfilment of the Old Testament in Christ's life.[57] Thus, for key episodes in each age, Bede notes a moral lesson, the equivalent to drinking the water in his eyes, and a prefiguration of Christ and salvation, which, if recognised, is the equivalent of drinking wine. For the third age, Bede uses the example of God testing Abraham's obedience by asking him to sacrifice his son. The immediate moral of the episode is that one should strive to be obedient. But the sacrifice of the son, which should recall the passion of Christ, and the blessing promised to Abraham as a gift fulfilled in the reader, is wine.[58]

In homily II.7, a homily on the resurrection of Christ,[59] Bede expresses the relationship between the ages and the days of the passion:

> Sed alius nobis memorabile mysterium tempore suae passionis sepulturae
> et resurrectionis intimare curauit. Sexta quippe feria crucifixus est
> sabbato quieuit in sepulchro dominica surrexit a mortuis significans

---

[53] Wallis, *Bede: The Reckoning of Time*, p. lxxi. See also D. Ó Cróinín, ed., *The Irish* Sex Aetates Mundi (Dublin, 1983), pp. 1-12.

[54] 'The Epistle of Barnabas', in *The Apostolic Fathers*, ed. and trans. K. Lake, 2 vols. (1912-13, London), I, pp. 392-7, ch. 15.

[55] The only time Bede compares the ages of the world to the life of man is in *De temporum ratione*, ed. C. W. Jones, CCSL 123B (Turnholt 1977), ch. 66, l.1-47, pp. 463-4; *Bede: The Reckoning of Time*, tr. Faith Wallis, pp. 157-9.

[56] John 2:5; I.14.134-245, pp. 99-102, CSS 110, pp. 139-143.

[57] I.14.124-134, pp. 98-99, CSS 110, p. 139.

[58] I.14.167-182, p. 100, CSS 110, pp. 140-141.

[59] For the Easter Vigil, Matt. 28:1-10.

electis suis per sex huius saeculi aetates inter persecutionum bonis operibus insudandum in alia autem uita quasi in sabbato perpetuo requiem animarum sperandum porro in die iudicii quasi in die dominica corporum quoque inmortalium receptionem esse celebrandam in quibus deinceps animae superno gaudio sine fine fruantur.[60]

Bede notes the transition from worldly to eternal history through the progress of Christ's life. Worldly history also provides examples of good works (as seen above in I.14) and an opportunity for them, as seen below. Homily I.23 provides an example of the days of creation compared to the ages of the world, along with the eighth age compared to the day of Christ's resurrection.[61] Bede usually takes the opportunity to mention this age of eternity – the age of reward following the ages of the world in which one must strive to do good. Though the context from which this arises varies, one or both of good works or eternity are stressed when Bede mentions the six, seven or eight ages.[62] Bede weaves the moral aspect into these chronological comparisons, creating a link between sacred history and current action.

Other passages also do this, though to a lesser extent, owing to the difference in genre. The moral message is largely left implicit, especially in longer discussions. However, the link between these great acts of God (the creation, the passion) and human history still remains. The other major discussions of the six ages occur in Bede's commentary on Genesis, and in *De temporum ratione*. One passage in the Genesis commentary is the great exposition of the relation between creation and the ages. Each age waxes and wanes like a day – there is a zenith, and then a decline towards evening, indicating the fickleness of mankind.[63] The *DTR* passage likewise expressed the relation between the passion and the ages.[64] This covers the same ground as homily II.7. The comparison with creation indicates God's action upon

---

[60] II.7.17-26, pp. 225-6, CCS 111, p. 59: 'But he took care to suggest to us another remarkable mystery by the times of his passion, burial and resurrection. He was crucified on Friday, rested in the sepulchre on Saturday, and rose from the dead on Sunday, indicating to his elect that they must toil by good works throughout the six ages of this world amid the dangers of persecutions, and that they should hope for a [period of] rest for their souls in the next life, [enjoying] a kind of perpetual sabbath. Besides this, on judgment day, the Lord's day as it were, they are to celebrate the recovery of their immortal bodies, in which their souls may thenceforth enjoy heavenly happiness without end.'

[61] I.23.209-227, p. 167; CSS 110, p. 230.

[62] Perfection of works: I.24.85-97, p. 172, CSS 110, p. 237; II.17.299-306 p. 309, CSS 111, pp. 174-5; Resurrection: I.11.147-160 p. 77, CSS 110, pp. 108-9; II.1.266-74 p. 191, CSS 111, p. 11; II.20.152-7 p. 332, CSS 111, p. 208 ; II.25.248-62, pp. 374-5, CSS 111, pp. 263-4.

[63] See V. L. Allan, *Bede's Commentary on the Six Days of Creation and the Six Ages of the World in* In Genesim *I. 1093-1224: Sources and Analogues* (unpublished B.A. thesis, Cambridge, 2000), pp. 12-14. http://tartarus.org/verity/Bede_ug.html

[64] *De temporum ratione*, CCSL 123B, ch. 71, lines 33-86, pp. 543-4, trans. *Bede: The Reckoning of Time*, ch. 71, p. 247.

the world; the comparison with the passion indicates the hope for the individual manifested through the grace of Christ.

McCready has noted that Bede's account of the ages does not suggest that the end of the world is imminent. He notes that Bede clearly distinguished between his own time, when the Jews were still unconverted, and the end of time, when the Jews would have entered the Christian fold.[65] This leads Bede to place considerable emphasis on personal reform and salvation, as his fellows would die long before the end of the world.

Shorter references to the ages of the world are scattered throughout Bede's work: there are references in his Gospel commentaries,[66] his commentary on Samuel,[67] other of his Old Testament commentaries,[68] in *De temporibus*,[69] in his commentary on the Seven Catholic Epistles,[70] *De tabernaculo,*[71] *De templo*[72] and *De schematibus et tropis*.[73] He also wrote a luminous hymn of praise on the subject.[74] We can even find a reflection of it in his *Prose Life of Cuthbert*: Boisil spent seven days reading the Gospel and died on the eighth day.[75] The fashion in which the six ages insinuate their way into Bede's writing indicates how important this way of looking at history was to Bede. The ages were a way of linking the Biblical past to the present, in which Bede had a duty as a preacher. These comparisons are there to reveal Christ's saving work in history – both at the level of a day, and at that of an age of the world. It is an example of God's grace in microcosm and macrocosm. The six ages of the world are connected with fundamental theological questions about creation and salvation, both supreme examples of God's grace. Jones states: 'Plummer and Levison emphasise Bede's concern with the Six Ages of the World, though a close reading of Bede's works shows that it was fundamentally a teaching

---

[65] W. McCready, *Miracles and the Venerable Bede*, Studies and Texts 118 (Toronto, 1994), p. 95.

[66] *In Lucam*, CCSL 120, III.ix.1491-1507, p. 204.

[67] *In Samuhelis*, CCSL 119, IV.xxxi.2563, p. 272.

[68] *In Ezram et Neemiam*, ed. D. Hurst, CCSL 118A (Turnholt, 1969), III.951, p. 363.

[69] *De temporibus*, ed. C. W. Jones, CCSL 123C (Turnholt, 1980) ch. 16, pp. 600-1.

[70] CCSL 121, II. Petri. II.92, p. 271, *Bede the Venerable: Commentary on the Seven Catholic Epistles,* trans. D. Hurst, CSS 82, p. 138.

[71] CCSL 119A, II.967, p. 66.

[72] CCSL 119A, I.760, p. 166.

[73] Bede, *De schematibus et tropis*, ed. C. W. Jones, CCSL 123A (Turnholt, 1975), II.ii.239-257, pp. 166-7.

[74] 'Hymnus Bedae presbyteri de opere sex dierum primordialium et de sex aetatibus mundi', ed. J. Fraipont, CCSL 122, (Turnholt, 1955) pp. 407-11.

[75] 'Bede: Life of Cuthbert', *The Age of Bede*, ch. 8, pp. 55-6, B. Ward, 'The Spirituality of St Cuthbert', in *St Cuthbert, His Cult and His Community*, ed. G. Bonner *et al.*, (Woodbridge, 1989), pp. 65-76, p. 70.

device with him, as it was with St Augustine.'[76] However, I would contend that these are not merely a mnemonic or teaching device; the ages were a nexus of complex theological and temporal issues which Bede delighted in exploring.

The nature of this comparison has led scholars to speculate about how Bede viewed time and history. The parallel nature of the seventh age has confused commentators. Jones suggests a purely linear view of time:

> Christian historians therefore assumed all temporalities to be linear, with movement from beginning through middle to end. On that historical line rested topics. Hence Christian historiography was basically chronological, and the chronicle was an essential form. The most popular topics of Western writers were Genesis, Advent, and Second Advent including Last Judgment.[77]

This goes a certain way to explaining Bede's preoccupations in the homilies and elsewhere.[78] It also places certain limits on the conception of time. On the other hand, Davidse stresses Bede's *Zeitlosigkeit* (timelessness), and wonders whether he has a fundamental awareness of time as succession.[79] Davidse mentions a 'noncontemporaneous contemporaneity' as being characteristic of Christian writing – the knowledge of the Church Fathers (from the past), form part of Bede's present, as does the Bible.[80] He speaks of these things, and the past of the English Church, equally vividly. McCready states: 'Like Gregory the Great, Bede saw no fundamental cleavage separating biblical times from his own.'[81] This is certainly true; the Bible contained an account of redemptive history that was still continuing in Bede's own day. To exclude either concept seems unwise. Bede clearly had a grasp of time and history as a succession of events – this can be seen in his chronologies at the end of *De temporibus* and *DTR* and in the *HE*. However, he was also well aware of the patterns of history – the microcosm of the week, and the macrocosm of an age of the world, and that the one could inform the other, despite the difference in time and scale. The same is true with regard to the Fathers – their distance in time did not make them distant theologically and morally, in the which sense a

---

[76] C. W. Jones, 'Bede as Early Medieval Historian', *Medievalia et Humanistica 4* (1946), 26-36, p. 36.
[77] Jones, 'Introductory Remarks', p. 192.
[78] The homilies are clustered around Advent, Lent and the Easter season (see chapter II, p. 48 for details). Bede's other works show an interest in chronology and eschatology, especially *De temporum ratione* and *In Apocalypsin*, ed. R. Gryson, CCSL 121A (Turnholt, 2001).
[79] J. Davidse, 'The Sense of History in the Works of the Venerable Bede', *Studi Medievali* 23.2, series 3A (1982), 647-95; p. 654.
[80] Davidse, 'The Sense of History', p. 657.
[81] McCready, *Miracles*, p. 78.

'noncontemporaneous contemporaneity' is operating in Bede's writing. Bede had the gift of explaining a distant moment in a vivid fashion, making it real and current and relevant.

III. Ecclesiology

In the homilies, Bede explores the composition of the Church in three senses: the Church in the present world, with its hierarchy, and its responsibility for teaching; the composition of the Church in the next world, the Church of the Resurrection, and finally the metaphors which transcend both – the Church as the Temple, the Church as the body of Christ. His presentation of all three areas shall be examined, along with their presentation in *De templo*. The latter is a unified expression of the ideas which are found scattered throughout the homilies. O'Reilly, in her introduction to Connolly's translation of *De templo,* also connects the ecclesiology therein to the *HE*.[82]

When considering the action of the faithful in the present world, Bede places special emphasis on the role of preachers.[83] This is confirmed in *De templo*. In homily I.6, Bede wrote:

> Nam et futurum iam tunc erat ut per orbem uniuersum electi pastores, id est praedicatores sancti mitterentur qui ad ouile dominicum uidelicet sanctam ecclesiam.[84]

This is expanded in I.19, where the additional responsibility of the preacher is noted:

> Per auditum quippe disciplinae paternae ac per obseruantiam maternae legis gratia capiti nostro et collo torques additur quia quanto quis diuinis intentus fuerit auscultare praeceptis quanto ea quae didicerit in unitate matris ecclesiae diligentius obseruare studuerit tanto et nunc dignius ad honorem praedicandi et in futuro sublimius ascendet ad beatitudinem cum Christo sine fine regnandi.[85]

---

[82] S. Connolly, *Bede: On the Temple* (Liverpool, 1995), pp. xxxiii-xlxv.

[83] Echlin, 'Bede and the Church', p. 358. Van der Walt, in his thesis, studies the references to preaching found in the homilies. *The Homiliary of the Venerable Bede*, pp. 16-40.

[84] I.6.210-213, p. 42, CSS 110, p. 59: 'Now there was already then [an indication] that there would be a time when chosen shepherds, that is, holy preachers, would be sent through the whole world, and they would gather believing people into the Lord's sheepfold, namely, Holy Church.'

[85] I.19.70-76, p. 136; CSS 110, pp. 189-90: 'Indeed, through listening to paternal instruction and through the observance of maternal law, grace is put on our head and a neck-ring on our neck, for the more one gives heed to divine commands [and] strives to observe with greater diligence what one has learned in the unity of mother Church, the more one may now ascend with greater worthiness to the honour of preaching, and may in the future ascend with greater exaltation to the blessedness of reigning with Christ forever.'

Bede stresses the fact that this grace is acquired through unity with the rest of the Church. In the Temple commentary, Bede notes the personal role Christ takes in the formation of preachers: an indication of the hours preachers are meant to spend in prayer.[86] In the same commentary, he mentions the place preachers have in the metaphorical building of the Church – something he is not so concerned with in the homilies, but which forms the essential matter of the Temple commentary.[87]

The homilies are there in part to provide a template for living. Bede mentions the merits of active and contemplative lives, as a guide.[88] The Church has a responsibility to pray for those in spiritual difficulty: not just the Church on earth, but the support of the Church in heaven must be sought. Bede makes this clear in his homily upon the Canaanite woman:[89] the Church has the role of the mother here, and has responsibility for the soul in difficulty. But Bede extends this – the Church has the same duty of persistence as the mother had, and has the additional resource of the saints upon which to call.[90] Bede uses another woman as an example of the behaviour the Church should adopt – in homily II.4 he uses the example of Mary Magdalene. She anointed the feet of the Lord, as an example of her devotion, which devotion the Church, and every perfect soul, should imitate.[91]

As well as indicating the desired spiritual behaviour of the Church on earth, Bede also notes the importance of the hierarchical structure of the Church, mostly to indicate the importance of unity and obedience. He is quite definite that Peter was given authority as head of the Church.[92] Similar authority is given to the apostles.[93] Here the key word is 'similar'; Peter is given additional responsibility by Christ in the *tu es Petrus* speech.[94] This allows Bede to reconcile apparently disparate positions: the one supporting the collegiality and autonomy of bishops (still an important point of debate in the Roman Church), the other supporting the primacy and authority of Rome. This squares exactly with Bede's attitude as manifested in the *HE*: he is quite clear that the English Church is directed from Rome.[95] Bede also

---

[86] *De templo*, ed. D. Hurst, CCSL 119A (Turnholt, 1969), I.198-208, p. 152; *Bede: On the Temple*, p. 11.
[87] CCSL 119A, II.595-603, pp. 206-7; *Bede: On the Temple*, p. 84.
[88] I.9.195-209, pp. 64-5; CSS 110, pp. 90-91.
[89] Matt. 15:21-28. The Canaanite woman asks for her daughter to be delivered from a demon.
[90] I.22.90-103, pp. 158-9; CSS 10, p. 218.
[91] John 12:3. II.4.130-132, pp. 210-11, CSS 111, p. 38.
[92] I.16.193-7, p. 116; CSS 110, p. 163.
[93] I.20.165-72, pp. 145-6, CSS 110, p. 202.
[94] Matt. 16:18.
[95] *HE* III.4.

indicates that bishops are the successors to the apostles; however, Echlin suggests Bede was 'unaware of the complex development of the episcopate.'[96] In my opinion Bede may have been glossing over this complexity in order to present a simple chain of descent, encouraging unity and respect for the office of bishop. As Bede was aware of recent Church councils (such as Whitby), he must also have been aware of how the results of such councils were spread, and the authority of the bishop to enforce them. Despite this hierarchical view, Bede does not always give bishops and priests special status over the rest of the faithful – they are all present in one Church.[97] As Mayr-Harting has pointed out, Bede notes that bishops, and to a lesser extent priests and even deacons, have a special ministry which sets them apart from the rest of the faithful.[98] Though Bede resolves in favour of the authority of Rome, there is a tension in his writing between these apparently contradictory positions; the one expressed in *De templo*, where all Christians are part of a community in Christ, equally able to be saved, and the hierarchical Church, which Bede was part of in this present world.

Bede devotes some time to explaining the composition of the Church in heaven. He notes how the elect are different from others:

> quia nimirum electi quo sollicitius suam conscientiam discutiendo examinant eo latiores ex intimo cordis fonte lacrimarum fluuios fundunt et quia minus perfectos se esse deprehendunt sordes suae fragilitatis undis paenitentiae diluunt.[99]

The elect are often also virgins – Bede stresses this aspect in his homily on Benedict Biscop.[100] The elect provide an example for the Church on earth, but they also gain special privilege after death. Their death should not be mourned, as they gain eternal life.[101] However, not all the elect attain their reward instantly.[102] In homily I.2 Bede discusses how some will have to go through purgatory before attaining their reward, of seeing God:

[96] Echlin, 'Bede and the Church', p. 359.

[97] *De templo*, II.82-91, p. 194; *Bede: On the Temple*, p. 68. See also G. Caputa, *Il sacerdozio dei fedeli secondo San Beda: Un itinerario di maturità cristiana*, Monumenta Studi Instrumenta Liturgica 16 (Vatican, 2002), p. 2.

[98] H. Mayr-Harting, *The Venerable Bede*, p. 15 and *The Coming of Christianity to Anglo-Saxon England*, p. 219.

[99] I.1.75-78, p. 3; CSS 110, p. 4: 'To the extent that the elect more solicitously examine their consciences by scrutinising them, to that extent they pour forth broader streams of tears from the inmost font of their hearts, and because they apprehend themselves to be less perfect, they wash away the stains of their weakness with the waves of repentance.'

[100] I.13.141-6, p. 92, CSS 110, p. 130.

[101] I.10.226, pp. 68-9, CSS 110, p. 97.

[102] J. Le Goff, *The Birth of Purgatory*, trans. A. Goldhammer (London, 1984), pp. 102-3.

> Me ipsum, inquit, manifestabo dilectoribus meis ut quem in sua cognouere mortalem in mea iam natura patri et spiritui sancto uidere possint aequalem. Verum hoc de apostolis martyribus confessoribus ceterisque artioris ac perfectoris uitae uiris fieri credendum est quorum unus certaminum suorum conscius non dubitauit de se ipso testari: *Cupio dissolui et cum Christo esse*. Ceterum sunt plures in ecclesia iusti qui post carnis solutionem continuo beata paradisi requie suscipiuntur expectantes in magno gaudio in magnis congaudentium choris quando recepto corpore ueniant et appareant ante faciem Dei. At uero non nulli propter bona quidem opera ad electorum sortem praeordinati sed propter mala aliqua quibus polluti de corpore exierunt post mortem severe castigandi excipiuntur flammis ignis purgatorii et uel usque ad diem iudicii longa huius examinatione a uitiorum sorde mundantur uel certe prius amicorum fidelium precibus elemosinis ieiuniis fletibus et hostiae salutaris oblationibus absoluti a poenis et ipsi ad beatorum perueniunt requiem.[103]

Again, the image of the elect is used to encourage similar behaviour by the congregation.

'Bede transmitted the concept of the universal Church which had been taught by Gregory the Great. The universal Church included angels and the just before Christ as well as the visible, hierarchical, sacramental Church which issued from the redemption.'[104] The humans took the place of the fallen angels.[105] The Church at that time existed both on earth and in heaven.[106] The Church after Christ would principally be drawn from nations other than the Jewish nation:

> Vbi manifeste praefiguratur quod post passionem resurrectionemque suam dominus in praedicatoribus suis Iudaeorum perfida corda relicturus et in partes gentium exterarum esset secessurus.[107]

This was particularly important to Bede, who needed to justify the place of the English in the church, despite their position at the edge of the world. This did not

---

[103] I.2.202-220, CSS 110, pp. 16-17: '"I will manifest myself to those who love me," he says, "so that the one whom they have recognised as mortal in his nature, they may now, in my nature, be able to see as equal to the Father and Holy Spirit." We must believe that this is occurring with respect to the apostles, martyrs, confessors and other men of a more rigorous and perfect life … Besides this, there are many just people in the Church, who, after being freed from the flesh immediately gain the blessed rest of Paradise, waiting in great joy among great choruses of fellow-rejoicers for the time when, having received their bodies, they may come and appear before the face of God. But in truth there are some who were preordained to the lot of the elect on account of their good works, but on account of some evils by which they were polluted, went out from the body after death to be severely chastised, and were seized by the flames of the fire of purgatory. They are either made clean from the stains of their vices in their long ordeal up until judgment day, or, on the other hand, if they are absolved from their penalties by the petitions, almsgiving, fasting, weeping and oblation of the saving sacrificial offering by their faithful friends, they may come earlier to the rest of the blessed.'

[104] Echlin, 'Bede and the Church', p. 357.

[105] II.3.169-171, p. 209, CSS 111, p. 29.

[106] II.16.138-141, p. 294, CSS 111, p. 154.

[107] I.22.79-82, p. 158, CSS 110, p. 218: 'Clearly it is prefigured here that after his passion and resurrection the Lord, in his preachers, was going to leave behind the faithless hearts of the Jews and move onto the regions of foreign nations.'

mean that the Jews were excluded from this, however, as Bede writes: 'utriusque testamenti populus adunandus in Christo ad aeternae uitae sit introducendus coronam.'[108] Bede thought serious sinners excluded themselves from the community of the Church:

> Vnde multum tremenda sunt haec, dilectissime, et digno expauescenda timore sedulaque praecauendum industria ne ueniens inprouisus peruersum quid in nobis unde merito flagellari ac de ecclesia eici debeamus inueniat.[109]

Heretics have excluded themselves from the Church by lacking unity:

> etsi heretici siue scismatici aliquam bonae actionis arcem conscendere uidentur, quia tamen compagem ecclesiae unitatis non habent quasi patentibus et non solidis laterum praesidiis semper ad uitiorum infima relabuntur dum diuino destituti auxilio suae pertinaciae fastu intereunt.[110]

Though Bede spends much time emphasising the need for good works, this is not sufficient. The unity of the Church is one of its most important characteristics.[111] However, not all breaches in unity are considered heretical; Bede never refers to those who kept the Irish date of Easter as heretical. Bede seems to class this as a minor difference in practice (such as Pope Gregory permitted St Augustine of Canterbury), as there was no doctrinal problem. Bede was probably also aware that their method of calculating the date of Easter had at one time been widespread, and that, for the most part, the Irish were not perverse in using the old method of calculation, but that they genuinely needed teaching about the superiority of the method Bede used, as happened at Whitby.[112]

The Church is unified across time − from both before and after the Incarnation:

> unde liquido patet quia una est ecclesia in omnibus sanctis eius eadem fides electorum omnium praecedentium uidelicet et subsequentium carnalem eius aduentum quia nimirum sicut nos per fidem transactae incarnationis passionis ac resurrectionis illius saluamur et illi futuram

---

[108] *De templo*, II.571-3, p. 206, *Bede: On the Temple*, p. 83: 'the people of both testaments who were to be unified in Christ were to be brought in to receive the crown of eternal life.'

[109] II.1.61-4, p. 186, CSS 111, p. 3: 'We should dread them [the wrongdoings] exceedingly with well-deserved fear, and carefully avoid them with painstaking diligence, lest he come unexpectedly and find something evil in us, as a result of which we should rightly be scourged and cast out of the Church.' See Echlin, 'Bede and the Church', p. 358, for details of this in other of Bede's works.

[110] *De templo*, I.677-681, p. 164; *Bede: On the Temple*, p. 27: 'although heretics and schismatics seem to scale some peak of good work, nevertheless, because they lack the structure of the Church's unity, the protecting side-walls are, as it were, gaping wide open and weak, and consequently, they are continually falling back into the depths of their vices until, deprived of God's help, they perish through their arrogance and obstinacy.'

[111] See *De templo*, I.456-8, p. 158; *Bede: On the Temple*, p. 19.

[112] *HE* III.25, pp. 294-309.

ipsam incarnationem passionem ac resurrectionem certissime credentes
per eundem uitae auctorem se saluari sperabant.[113]

In his next homily, Bede speaks most movingly of the unity that is to come,
where there will be no discord of minds nor disharmony of speech, everything in
common in God.[114] The fact that Bede writes so movingly of this indicates its great
importance to him, a fact reflected in his insistence upon unity of the celebration of
Easter in the *HE*.

Christ and the Church are intimately entwined; Bede implies the espousal of
Christ and Church,[115] and Christ was not only present in the Church in the distant
past, but also in the present.[116] Christ takes on many roles in the Church; he is also
there a ruler of the elect.[117] These views reinforce the ideal of unity within the
Church – the Church is unified within Christ.

The general tenor of Bede's theology is remarkably optimistic. He tends to
concentrate on the spiritual benefits of good behaviour, and rarely gives examples of
the disadvantages of bad behaviour. When he does give examples of the latter, they
tend to be outweighed by examples of the joy to be experienced by the faithful. This
general impression is swiftly obtained when reading the homilies; a specific example
may be found in the overflowing of joy found in homily I.7 on Christmas. But a
counterexample may be found in Bede's poem *De die iudicii*, in which he treats on
both the pains of hell and the joys of heaven, and the former outnumber the latter.[118]
However, the joys of heaven wrap up the whole poem, leaving the reader in a
positive and uplifted frame of mind.[119]

A surprising absence in Bede's picture of the Church in the homilies is the
interpretation of Mary as a type of the Church. The interpretation was already

---

[113] II.15.12-17, p. 280, CSS 111, pp. 135-6: 'Hence it is perfectly evident that the Church is one in all
its saints, that the faith of the elect is the same, namely, who preceded and who followed his coming
in the flesh. Just as we are saved through faith in his incarnation, passion and resurrection which have
been accomplished, so they, by believing most certainly in his incarnation, passion and resurrection to
come, hoped that they would be saved through the same author of life.'
[114] I.16.170-84, p. 295; CSS 111, p. 155.
[115] I.6.51-6, p. 38; CSS 110, p. 54.
[116] II.8.184-8, pp. 269-70; CSS 111, p. 76.
[117] I.3.114-125, p. 17; CSS 110, p. 23.
[118] Not all authorities agree that this poem is by Bede; however, M. Lapidge considers that this poem
is by Bede, and discusses it in his Jarrow Lecture, *Bede the Poet* (Jarrow, 1993). He provides a full
listing of previous discussion in footnote 31.
[119] Bede, 'De die iudicii', in *Liber hymnorum*, ed. J. Fraipont, CCSL 122, pp. 442-4, lines 72-123
about Hell; lines 124-151 about heaven.

prevalent in patristic theology, which Bede then developed further.[120] He created a new formula found in his Lucan commentary, *dei genitrix ecclesia*.[121] He showed that the mysteries of Mary prefigured those of the Church.[122] This aspect is explored more fully in Bede's commentary on the Song of Songs. Other aspects of the Church as nurturer are found in the homilies;[123] these aspects are of less concern to Bede in this context than the moral qualities needed in the Church on earth, or than the construction of the Church in heaven. Bede does liken the Church to women, or at least to female types; as noted above, he uses Mary Magdalene as an example which the Church should follow.[124] The two major interpretations are the Church as bride, and the Church as mother. The Church is also the daughter of the Spirit; Bede mentions this once.[125] The Church is a mother in the sense that she is fruitful in good works, and begets spiritual children, at whose death she is both sorrowful and rejoices, like a woman giving birth.[126] Christ as the spouse of the Church is mentioned in Bede's sermon on the wedding at Cana.[127] Bede does not use this metaphor much in the homilies – he seems to regard the Church in a primarily architectural light, perhaps influenced by his own commentaries on the tabernacle and the temple.

Bede mentions that the Church is Christ's body,[128] that the Temple is like the Church,[129] and that the people of the Church are likewise a temple of God.[130] This is partly because Bede can then describe the Church being built up through the ages of the world.[131]

As has been shown above, themes in Bede's writing often interconnect. Part of Bede's writing on grace is conditioned by his strong belief that the Church should be unified; heretics have no place in the Church in Bede's view. And grace is what

---

[120] A. Muller, 'L'unité de l'Église et de la Sainte Vierge chez les Pères des IVe et Ve siècles', *Études Mariales* 9 (1951), 27-38, especially p. 27, p. 34.

[121] *In Lucam*, I.1165, p. 48.

[122] H. Barré, 'Marie et l'Église du Vénerable Bède à Saint Albert le Grand', *Études Mariales* 9 (1951), 59-143, p. 59.

[123] See above, p. 38 for some discussion of this.

[124] See above, p. 38.

[125] I.1.5.102-7, p. 108, CSS 110, pp. 151-2.

[126] II.13.78-115, pp. 269-70; CSS 111, pp. 120-1. See also, more fleetingly, I.19.70-76, p. 138, CSS 110, pp. 189-90 and II.17.191-3, p. 306, CSS 111, p. 170.

[127] I.14.50-55, p. 96, CSS 110, pp. 135-6. See also I.12.224-6, p. 86, CSS 110, p. 121.

[128] I.1.108-117, p. 4, CSS 110, p. 5.

[129] II.1.34-130, pp. 185-7, CSS 111, pp. 8-11.

[130] II.1.70-4, p. 186, CSS 111, p. 4.

[131] II.24.229-275, pp. 364-5, CSS 111, pp. 249-50.

allows the Church to exist; the grace of the Spirit is given to each member of the Church. Grace is given to allow good deeds; good deeds allow a place in the heavenly kingdom, as Bede illustrates using the six ages of the world, which are there as a time in which those works should be performed and the Church built up. Bede's homiliary naturally provides a scattered excerpt of most themes – more coherent accounts can often be found in his other works. The exception to this is Bede's writing on grace – the bulk of it is found in the homiliary. These themes have demonstrated the orthodoxy of Bede's theology, secured by the Benedictine virtue of humility and the divine gift of grace. The themes have a generally optimistic feel when we encounter them in Bede's homilies; he is more interested in providing incentives than in scaring his audience. When separated out into its component themes, Bede's theology looks rather systematic. We find few contradictions, which is rare; in contrast, St Augustine tended to change his mind during his life-time.[132] Carroll has created a systematic view of Bede's theology in her book.[133] This creates a misleading impression; Bede did not impart his information in a systematic fashion, as if he were a twelfth-century scholastic. Rather, he preferred to present glimpses of this coherent theology through a rather more stream-of-consciousness approach, where he took his immediate inspiration from the biblical verse before him.

---

[132] As can be seen in his attitude to millenarianism. In his youth, Augustine was strongly millenarianist, but he reconsidered his position as he got older. See G. Folliet, 'La typologie du *sabbat* chez saint Augustin: son interprétation millénariste entre 388 et 400', *Revue des études augustiniennes* 2 (1956), 371-90 for details.
[133] Carroll, *The Venerable Bede*, *passim*.

Chapter II: Bede and Gregory the Great: An Analysis
of Bede's Use of his Sources

Gregory the Great (*c*.540–604) also composed a series of Gospel homilies. It has long been known that Bede knew and was particularly indebted to Gregory's work. Laistner states that the Wearmouth-Jarrow library encompassed 'all Gregory's genuine works except the *Letters*.'[1] However, it has been noted that Bede seemed to be more creative in his use of authority when writing his Gospel homilies.[2] Gregory's influence upon this work deserves special attention, as he too compiled a Gospel homiliary, drawn from across the four Gospels; this form of collection appears to be a model for Bede.[3]   In contrast, Augustine's sermons were not structured as an exegetical collection covering the Church year, but are a more eclectic collection of his recorded preaching.[4] An approach in which we seek Bede's sources involves treating the homilies primarily as a literary genre, and also seeking the influence of Gregory and Augustine in the form of quotations, recollections and borrowed ideas.

In his 1964 Jarrow lecture, Meyvaert summarised the then-current state of research on Bede's theological sources and influences.[5]   Despite the emergence of new editions in the CCSL, our understanding has not significantly advanced. It is true, as Meyvaert noted that Capelle predicted, that we have a greater understanding of Bede's originality. However, such research has been carried out piecemeal, and most editors and translators of Bede have been content to identify sources in their notes, and perhaps devote a page or two of introduction to the question.[6] The last general survey was that of Carroll in 1946.[7] So while Bede's debt to the Church Fathers is well known (in the forms of direct quotation, verbal reminiscence and

---

[1] Laistner, 'The Library', p. 248.

[2] L. T. Martin, *Bede the Venerable: Homilies on the Gospels: Book One Advent to Lent*, CSS 110 (Kalamazoo, 1991), p. xvii.

[3] Indeed, Bede's homiliary has been thought of as a complement to Gregory's. J. Hill, *Bede and the Benedictine Reform*, p. 3.

[4] His Tractates on John's Gospel are rather different, as they effectively provide a commentary on the Gospel.

[5] P. Meyvaert, *Bede and Gregory the Great*, Jarrow Lecture (Jarrow, 1964), p. 16.

[6] So, for example, the edition of the homilies, *Homiliae*, ed. D. Hurst, CCSL 122, contains no discussion of sources, and Martin's introduction includes a small section (see note 2 above).

[7] Carroll, *The Venerable Bede*. See also J. N. Hart-Hasler's thesis, *Vestigia patrum sequens: The Venerable Bede's Use of Patristic Sources in his Commentary on the Gospel of Luke* (unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Cambridge, 1999), and her article 'Bede's Use of Patristic Sources', *Studia Patristica* 28 (1993), 197-204. The Fontes Anglo-Saxonici project is working to catalogue (amongst other things) all the citations of other authors in Bede's work. Fontes Anglo-Saxonici Project, ed., *Fontes Anglo-Saxonici: World Wide Web Register*, http://fontes.english.ox.ac.uk/, last accessed August 2005.

concepts), the precise extent and nature of that debt requires further examination. My approach here will be similarly specific, focussing as it does on the homilies of Bede and Gregory, with some reference to Augustine for further comparison, though Bede used a much wider range of sources, as recourse to the *apparatus fontium* of any CCSL edition of his works will show. Augustine is of particular interest in this context, as J. Hill characterises the homilies as 'more Augustinian in style and less Gregorian, unlike the commentaries, where the affinity is more obviously to Gregory.'[8]

At this point it is worth considering for a moment why Gregory and Augustine exercised such influence over the Venerable Bede. It seems self-evident that Bede would have been influenced by these people who had such great influence on the thought and practice of the Church in the Middle Ages and beyond. Was this eminence nearly so evident in the early eighth century? Is it possible that it was mostly the books available which determined the influence upon Bede? At one level, this might look plausible – Bede's library can be reconstructed to a certain degree, and it is apparent that the library is dominated by the works of Gregory and Augustine.[9] This still leaves us to determine why these writers so influenced him. It is known that the agreement between patristic texts is important – the *consensus patrum* – and Gregory and Augustine help define and hold the common ground.[10] Even before Bede, other authors were referring to them, giving these Fathers extra authority. Where authors did not refer to Augustine or Gregory, but gave substantially the same opinion, they reinforced their authority as authors who held the orthodox opinions. Moreover, the four great Western Fathers – Ambrose, Augustine, Gregory and Jerome – between them wrote commentaries on specific books of the Bible and provided guidance on doctrine, on education and on pastoral practice.[11]

First, let us examine the construction of the homiliaries themselves. Tables of the pericopes, stories and the time of the church year for which the homilies were

---

[8] J. Hill, *Bede and the Benedictine Reform*, p. 3.

[9] Laistner discussed this in his above-mentioned article 'The Library of the Venerable Bede', pp. 237-66; in 2001, Michael Lapidge delivered the Lowe lectures, which included an updated discussion of the contents of Bede's library. The frequency of use can be examined in the list of Patristic citations on pp. 401-3, CCSL 122.

[10] For a brief indication of this, see 'Fathers of the Church' in the *ODCC*, p. 600.

[11] For example, Ambrose's commentary on Luke (CCSL 14, ed. M. Adriaen (Turnholt, 1957)), Augustine's *De doctrina christiana* (CCSL 32, ed. J. Martin (Turnholt, 1967)) and Gregory's *Regula Pastoralis* (*Règle pastorale: Grégoire le Grand*, ed. and trans. F. Rommel and C. Morel, Sources Chrétiennes 381-2 (Paris, 1992)).

intended have been constructed. The data for the latter are somewhat problematic. The current arrangement of the homilies may reflect neither the precise order nor the date in the Church's calendar on which they were originally given. Neither collection survives in a manuscript with close connections to the author; in the manuscripts in which the collections survive the homilies come in varying order. Some can be fixed easily, because they were for a specific feast, such as Pentecost, but for Lent, the homilies could be assigned to almost any date in the Lenten season.[12] Liturgical changes and local practice give a considerable amount of variation for the readings used;[13] but with all the manuscripts originating at a geographical and temporal point considerably removed from the original, there has been plenty of opportunity for the order and date of the homilies to become disrupted. For some homilies, there is internal evidence to show the date for which they were intended, with words such as 'on this Christmas day' providing the necessary information in homily I.7. For other homilies, we are forced to rely on the information from the manuscripts, or from manuscripts containing biblical texts marked up with the Gospel readings for the day, whether missals, bibles or lectionaries. Morin, in a series of articles in *Revue Bénédictine*, found a series of manuscripts that preserved readings which, in his opinion, reflected the liturgical usage of Wearmouth-Jarrow.[14] A comparison of these manuscripts provides a reasonable approximation of the order of homilies.[15] Whilst the date on which most homilies were given remains difficult to determine, the seasonal distribution of the homilies is sufficiently accurate for this analysis to be fruitful.

Using appendix A,[16] it at first appears that Bede's homiliary is structurally different from Gregory's, if we use the dates to which the homilies are assigned in the CCSL edition. However, my manuscript research suggests that the two homiliaries are more similar in structure than they might at first appear. Both are

---

[12] For further details, see appendix F, where I propose an ordering of the homilies.

[13] As is shown by the tables at the front of Hurst's edition, showing various early lection lists (such as those in the Lindisfarne Gospels) with Anglo-Saxon links, pp. ix-xvi.

[14] The articles are 'Le liturgie de Naples au temps de saint Grégoire', *RB* 8 (1891), 481-93 and 529-37; 'Le recueil primitif des homélies de Bede sur l'Evangile', *RB* 9 (1892), 316-26; 'Les notes liturgique de l'Évangelaire de Burchard', *RB* 10 (1893), 113-26; 'Liturgie et basilique de Rome au milieu du VIIᵉ siecle', *RB* 28 (1911), 296-330.

[15] I have used the information given in Hurst's edition of Bede, CCSL 122, pp. vii-xvi (which is modified from the original ordering proposed by Morin) and in Dom Hurst's translation of Gregory's homilies, in which he uses a similar procedure for assigning them a date: *Gregory the Great: Forty Gospel Homilies*, CSS 123 (Kalamazoo, 1990). The probable date for each homily is provided in the notes at the end of that homily, as on p. 61, n. 1.

[16] See pp. 128-31, especially table 2, p. 128.

structured around the Church year. Naturally, because of this structure, both have Christmas, Easter and Ascension homilies. The two homiliaries show a similar balance: Gregory wrote 30% of his homilies for Saints' days (as both manuscript evidence and internal evidence shows), whereas Bede wrote 22%. Bede devoted most of his homilies to the two great seasons of the Church year – Advent and the Christmas season, and Lent and the Easter season, with 26% on the former and 34% on the latter. Gregory shares this interest in the Easter season, with 30% of his homilies for that time, but a mere 15% for the Christmas season. Other important feasts (Pentecost, Ascension), naturally make a more slender contribution to the total: 7.5% of Gregory's and 14% of Bede's. There remain the homilies which cannot be fixed to a date, or which were for weekdays, or for other occasions (Gregory wrote two homilies for various gatherings of bishops; Bede wrote two for the dedication of the churches at Wearmouth and Jarrow). This alone shows the differing interests of the men: Gregory is there concerned with the pastoral role of the bishop, and Bede with the construction of the physical and spiritual Church.[17] Superficially, the homiliaries share a common structure, but the individual choice of readings shows the differences between the two authors.

Of their Gospel homilies, only one shares a pericope – Gregory's seventh homily and Bede's sixth share the pericope Luke 2:1-14. This is the only narrative of the birth of Christ in any of the Gospels, so this coincidence of pericope is of no significance. Martin considers that this overlap may be because Gregory only wrote a short Christmas homily, and that Bede therefore felt he could expand on the start made by Gregory.[18]

It is not possible to state conclusively that this lack of overlap is a result of design – some of it may be the result of the differing lections in use in fifth- to sixth-century Rome and in seventh- to eighth-century Wearmouth-Jarrow. That some of it at least is due to the lections is suggested by the evidence of the early manuscripts, where different places have the homilies attached to different dates, presumably because of those local variations in the lections.[19] For example, John 11:55-12:11,[20] which is the text for Bede's homily II.4 and which Hurst assigns to *Maioris*

---

[17] If we accept that Bede's homiliary was intended for his monastery, then surely Bede was also concerned with the spiritual welfare and development of his community.
[18] Martin, *Homilies on the Gospels*, CSS 110, p. xvi.

[19] Hurst, CCSL 122, p. xvi, homily II.22.
[20] Not all the verses in a given pericope need be commented upon.

Hebdomadae, is in Würzburg, Universitätsbibliothek, MS Mp.Th.F.62 assigned to 'feria ii post dominicam sextam in Quadragesima', in London, British Library, MS Cotton Nero D.IV (better known as the Lindisfarne Gospels) to *Dominica vi de indulgentia*, and in Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, MS lat. 9472 to *in symboli traditione*.[21]

On occasions Bede wrote a homily based on the same Gospel story as Gregory, only using a different Gospel. This is particularly noticeable when we examine the pericopes for the Christmas and Easter seasons. The stories are those which can be heard today in churches: before Christmas, there are Gospel readings centred on John the Baptist; at Christmas there are the Christmas narratives; after Easter, there are the tales of Christ's appearances, and the Ascension narrative. Interestingly, they have two different stories for Epiphany – Gregory the conventional visit of the Magi, but Bede the baptism of Christ in the Jordan. It would have been difficult for Bede to construct a Gospel homiliary which did not contain similar pericope narratives for the major feasts.[22] This still leaves the question of whether the different pericopes are a result of Bede's choice, or a result of the different lectionaries.

Could Bede possibly have composed a homiliary avoiding all the major feasts which had already been covered by Gregory? No matter what function the homiliary served (for private devotion, public reading, a source-book for preachers), omitting those feasts would have produced an inadequate homiliary, which did not encourage reflection on those key festal days.

Each homiliary has an internal consistency – each works as a separate entity, reflecting the subtly different concerns of the two men. The pericopes provide evidence for their differing interests. While the pericope for any given day would be determined by the lectionary, the selection of days for which to write homilies is more personal: Bede and Gregory had considerable room for choice. There were many pericopes from which to choose and each wrote homilies on only a small fraction. Only two of Bede's homilies are on Mark's Gospel, and one of those pericopes is similar to that found in another Gospel.[23] Matthew and Luke have a roughly equal number of pericopes, thirteen and fourteen respectively, making up a

---

[21] Hurst, CCSL 122, p. xi, with the sigla listed on p. ix.

[22] Indeed, since preaching did not necessarily occur outside Sundays and feast days, it would be exceptionally difficult to write an entirely non-overlapping homiliary. See Introduction, p. 19.

[23] I.1 and II.6, which latter appears also in Matt. 15:29-31.

little over half of the homiliary. But the majority of the homilies are on pericopes from John's Gospel.[24] The majority of these focus on the first two chapters of John; then most of the rest are from the chapters associated with the Last Supper and the resurrection.

Gregory similarly has only two pericopes from Mark, the contents of one of which is also found in another Gospel.[25] The distribution of Gregory's homilies is otherwise quite different: the majority of the pericopes come from Luke's Gospel. It is notable that neither writer comments upon the Beatitudes. A certain bias can also be detected in their selection of pericopes. Bede seems concerned with quite different things from Gregory.

Bede has four main themes which seem to govern his choice of pericope. He is particularly interested in the birth of Christ, John the Baptist, the resurrection and the promise of the heavenly kingdom, whether after death or at the second coming.[26] This latter ties in with his interest in ecclesiology, which is occasionally revealed in the homilies, especially in the final two, for the dedication of the church.[27] He comments upon *no* parables, and only five miracles: three healing miracles, and two 'Eucharistic' miracles.[28] Perhaps he considered that the parables, with their explanations already provided, required no further commentary. His relative lack of comment upon miracles is more surprising, for he is fond of using the metaphor of Christ's healing.[29] These miracles are not included as 'wonder-stories', but as metaphors for Christ's relationship with his Church and its people.[30] Perhaps Bede found the miracles largely self-explanatory, and therefore did not comment on them.

There is also an interest in visions and prophecy in the Gospels: Bede includes six homilies which comment upon foretelling events to come.[31] Gregory, by contrast, has only two.[32] Gregory is also largely silent about the mission of the

---

[24] See tables 3, 4 and 5, appendix A, pp. 141-4.

[25] Gregory, homilies 21 and 29. The latter is told in John 21:1-23.

[26] See Introduction, p. 22.

[27] This interest is primarily expressed in his commentaries upon the Tabernacle and the Temple.

[28] The two relevant homilies are I.14 (the wedding at Cana) and II.2 (feeding the 5000); the healing homilies are I.22, I.23 and II.6. All but the wedding at Cana are for Lent.

[29] This lack of concern with miracles might reflect Bede's attitude in the *Historia abbatum*, in which, as Ward has pointed out, Bede deliberately does not include miracles. It might be that he did not include miracles in the homilies for the same reason he did not do so in the *Historia Abbatum*. Ward, *The Venerable Bede,* p. 88, p. 106. For example, we have *gratiae medentis*, at I.21.6-7, p. 148.

[30] For example, see I.23.1-30.

[31] Homily I.1, John's preaching; I.5, Joseph's dream; II.11, Jesus prophesies about the Spirit; II.13, Jesus foretells his return to the Father; II.16, Jesus tells of the coming of the Spirit; II.19, Zechariah's vision.

[32] Gregory, homily 6, John's preaching; homily 30, foretelling of Pentecost.

disciples and apostles. Some of these silences are interesting when Bede is compared to Gregory: Gregory talks about mission in general (and John the Baptist in connection with this).[33] Gregory is less interested in things before Christ's ministry began – in addition to mission, he emphasises the parables, Christ's interaction with the Jews, the good shepherd and the resurrection.[34] Like Bede, he comments on relatively few miracles, both of healing, though there are often miraculous events in the stories Gregory included in his homilies.[35] This is one of the most striking differences between Bede and Gregory; contemporary miracle stories are completely absent from Bede's homilies.[36] Both men show an interest in the calling of the disciples, perhaps because of their calling to monasticism and the priesthood.[37] Bede's interest in John the Baptist, John the Evangelist and Mary is something very personal to him, and cannot be explained with reference to Gregory's collection.[38]

Ten of the twenty-one pericopes from John's Gospel used by Bede are from the first six chapters of the Gospel. These chapters (especially the first, on which Bede wrote no less than five homilies), are concerned with Christ's divinity and the call of the Apostles.[39] This is something which Bede wished especially to communicate to the Anglo-Saxons; Cuthbert's letter on the death of Bede shows this, as Cuthbert tells us that on his deathbed, Bede was occupied in translating those first six chapters.[40] We can also see this love of the Gospel in the prose Life of Cuthbert, where Bede tells us that Boisil and St Cuthbert spent the week before Boisil's death reading a commentary upon John's Gospel.[41] It is also worth noting that Mynors, in his discussion of the Stonyhurst Gospel, hints strongly that Bede might have been the scribe, saying: 'Great men in those days did not disdain to write books with their own hands, and the text of this book gives one the impression that it might well be

---

[33] Gregory, homilies 2, 6, 17 and 19.
[34] Parables: homilies 9, 10, 11, 12, 18, 31, 34, 36, 38; Christ's interaction with the Jews: homilies 5, 16, and to a lesser extent 1, 4; good shepherd: homilies 15, 34; resurrection: homilies: 3, 9, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 29.
[35] Gregory, homilies 13 and 28.
[36] McCready, *Miracles*, p. 86.
[37] Bede: homilies I.17 and I.21; Gregory: homily 2.
[38] John the Baptist: homilies I.1, I.2, I.15, I.16, II.19, II.20, II.23; John the Evangelist: I.8, I.9, II.9, II.22; Mary: I.3, I.4, I.6, I.7, I.10, I.11, I.14, I.18, I.19, II.7, II.10.
[39] H. Mayr-Harting, *Two Conversions to Christianity: The Bulgarians and the Anglo-Saxons* (Reading, 1994), pp. 25-6.
[40] 'Cuthbert's Letter on the Death of Bede', in *Bede's Ecclesiastical History of the English People*, pp. 582-3.
[41] Bede, 'Life of Cuthbert', in *The Age of Bede*, pp. 55-6, ch. 8.

the work, not just of a monastic scribe however good at his craft, but of some highly qualified scholar.'[42] Such work may exemplify the virtue of humility. The selection of pericopes from John's Gospel demonstrates the same bias of distribution across all pericopes selected by Bede. The notable difference is that three of the five miracle stories discussed previously are taken from this Gospel. After the miracles early in Christ's ministry, we move on to Palm Sunday, the last days of Jesus and his resurrection.[43] These homilies demonstrate Bede's interest in the saving power of Christ as he entered into the world, called all people and revealed to them the way to eternal life. This call to eternal life is also seen in the content of his homilies, not just the subject of them. This preponderance of John was not simply to avoid overlap with Gregory (and indeed, would have caused him to be compared to Augustine, who wrote his *Tractates* on John's Gospel), but to reveal the divine and human aspects of Christ so favourably displayed in that Gospel. It should be noted that Bede used Augustine's tracts on that Gospel as the basis for much of his thinking. This is particularly evident in homily I.8, on the first fourteen verses of John's Gospel, where Bede uses Augustine as the foundation for his theological exposition.[44]

We can see this most clearly in this homily, where Bede recalls the *Tractates*: 'Homines namque qui ad imaginem Dei facti sunt percipere sapientiam possunt animalia non possunt.'[45] Christ has given mankind the ability to use divine wisdom.[46] Bede is comfortable using the terms used in Christological debate, as we see in a later homily: 'una nobis substantia, una est divinitas una aeternitas perfecta aequalitas dissimilitudo nulla.'[47] These terms would have been familiar to him from

---

[42] R. A. B. Mynors, 'Technical Description and History of the Manuscript' in *The Relics of St Cuthbert*, ed. C. F. Battiscombe (Oxford, 1956), pp. 356-61, on p. 357. T. J. Brown says nothing to contradict this in his discussion of the manuscript, and places the scribe in Northumbria (p. 36), with close connections to Wearmouth-Jarrow (p. 6), suggesting the man was active around 720 (p. 12); *The Stonyhurst Gospel of Saint John* (Oxford, 1969). M. P. Brown notes that this Gospel book is bound in twelve quires, and suggests that there may be a 'sacred codicology', in *The Lindisfarne Gospels: Society, Spirituality and the Scribe* (London, 2003), p. 71. This might increase the likelihood that Bede was involved with its production, for he was very conscious of numerology and its revelations of the sacred.

[43] Homilies I.25, II.1, II.2, II.4, II.5, II.11, II.12, II.13, II.16. See also table 3, p. 128-30.

[44] Homily I.8.8, pp. 52-3, CCS 110, p. 73; (Augustine, *Tractates in Iohannem*, CCSL 36, p. 323, 16/20).

[45] Bede, I.8.90, p. 54; Augustine, CCSL 36, 10.117. CSS 110, p. 76: 'Human beings, who are made in the image of God, can attain wisdom; beasts cannot.'

[46] Bede, I.8.80-100, p. 54; CSS 110 p. 76.

[47] Bede, II.24.148; CSS 111, p. 246: 'We have one substance, one divinity, one eternity, one perfect equality, no dissimilarity.'

Augustine's writings, though he does not discuss them in detail. However, there are two notable features in the presentation of his Christology: first, his use of paradox and second, his reaction to heresy.

Gregory the Great is notable for his use of paradox and oxymorons in his presentation of Christ.[48] Bede does something very similar in one of his Christmas homilies, where he states that Christ was *in* the world through his divinity, but he came *into* the world by his incarnation.[49] He opposes the static attribute of divinity with the mutability and motion of humanity. Bede also makes frequent mention of God as mediator – a quotation from I Timothy 2:5 of which Gregory is also very fond.[50]

Bede has very strong views about heresy; he mentions many heresies by name throughout his works.[51] An example of his strong reaction may be found in his account of Pelagianism in the *HE*.[52] Bede had little or no contact with actual heresy – his contact with and knowledge of it came almost exclusively from books, except when he was accused of heresy himself.[53] It is notable that his Christological discourses are often constructed, at least in part, as refutations of heresy.[54] He mentions the heretics by name (if infrequently), where he will not mention the orthodox fathers whose theology he uses.[55] Some of this visceral opposition to heresy may have come from Gregory, who hated heretics and extremists.[56] But it was Augustine who wrote against Manichees, was involved in active debates with heretics, and wrote tracts against Donatists, against Pelagianism.[57] I think here we may determine a strong Augustinian influence upon Bede, particularly in his theology on grace.

---

[48] C. Straw, *Gregory the Great: Perfection in Imperfection*, (Berkeley, 1988), p. 21.

[49] Homily I.8.164ff; CSS 110, p. 79.

[50] Bede cites this verse twelve times (information in CCSL 122, p. 398), for example at I.6.7, I.15.146, II.2.212. Gregory, *Homiliae in Evangelia*, ed. R. Étaix, CCSL 141 (Turnholt, 1999), p. 425, has nine references.

[51] See chapter I, p. 30, fn. 42.

[52] *HE* I.10.

[53] See Introduction, p. 6.

[54] I.8.35ff and II.24.148ff.

[55] Bede mentions Photinus at II.24.154, Arius at II.24.159, Sabellius at II.24.165.

[56] Mayr-Harting, *The Coming of Christianity*, p. 52.

[57] Some of Augustine's anti-Manichaean writings include his *Acta contra Fortunatum Manichaeum* and his *Contra Faustum Manichaeum* (both in Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiastiorum Latinorum (CSEL) 25, ed. J. Zycha (Vienna, 1891)) and his anti-Pelagian writings include: *Contra Julianum* (CSEL 85, ed. E. Kalinka and M. Zelzer (Vienna, 1978).

At first sight, the structure of the individual homilies is identical. Both Bede and Gregory adopt a verse-by-verse method of exegesis, whereas Augustine's sermons are very different. However, this is the very stuff of homilies, and as it is this technique that defines the genre, this is of little significance.[58] Any moral exegesis then imparted arises from the consideration of the literal meaning of the verse. Both end their homilies with doxologies in praise of the Trinity. Olivar notes that many ancient sermons end with a doxology;[59] this suggests that it is possible that Bede's doxologies were not necessarily written in imitation of Gregory's. If it is an important feast day, Bede and Gregory devote some time to discussing the feast, as well as the Gospel reading. (This is particularly relevant to their Pentecost homilies, where the Gospels do not provide an account of events.)[60] However, such conscientious men as Bede and Gregory could scarcely pass over such an important feast without some discussion.

Upon closer examination, differences may be observed. Gregory places much more weight on his moral exegesis, expanding his remarks.[61] He is more apt to include digressions, such as the extended discussion of angels in homily 34.[62] The most important difference is that Gregory frequently includes edifying narratives (some of which also appear in his *Dialogues*).[63] These stories can take up to a quarter of the homily, as in homily 12. Ten homilies contain some kind of contemporary moral story or example. Bede includes *no* such stories, though their influence may be seen in the edifying miracle narratives in the *Historia Ecclesiastica*.[64] This confirms the slightly differing aims of the two: Gregory tends to offer specific examples, in the lives of good people, bad people and saints, whereas Bede expounds the general precept. This may reflect an attempt at a more populist approach on Gregory's part – as d'Avray suggests, edifying stories of this kind were designed to capture popular attention, and in the later Middle Ages were

---

[58] In other words, Bede and Gregory are working within a slightly different genre from Augustine.

[59] Olivar, *La Predicación Cristiana*, p. 524.

[60] The events are detailed in Acts 2, which was probably read in place of the epistle.

[61] Though his Christmas homily (7) is notable for its brevity.

[62] Gregory is a peculiarly angel-conscious author, as H. Mayr-Harting has pointed out in *Perceptions of Angels in History: An Inaugural Lecture delivered in the University of Oxford on 14 November 1997* (Oxford, 1998), p. 16.

[63] Homilies 1, 10, 11, 12, 28 and 34-40 all contain an edifying story; the stories of 10-12, 35-8 and 40 are repeated in the *Dialogues*, though occasionally in a modified form. Gregory, *Dialogues*, ed. A. de Vogue (Paris, 1978).

[64] For examples, see *HE* I.18, II.7, III.9, IV.30, V.3 amongst others.

even collected as preaching aids.[65] This might point to a more exclusive audience for Bede's homilies.[66]

Bede uses his sources variably: sometimes he quotes verbatim, sometimes he has a subtle verbal reminiscence. Examples of the former technique can be found at the end of book I of Bede's commentary on Genesis, and in book VII of his commentary on the Song of Songs;[67] examples of the latter technique in his commentary on the Temple, and in the Gospel homilies.[68] I shall not distinguish between direct quotations and reminiscences in this analysis, though Martin notes only one instance of direct quotation from a non-scriptural source in all fifty homilies: it seems to have been a policy of Bede's to eschew direct quotation in this genre.[69]   In the Gospel homilies, Bede includes quotations or reminiscences of Gregory's writing relatively rarely: he uses Gregory's Gospel homilies twenty-four times, and quotes other Gregorian works a further twelve times. This does not begin to compare with his use of Augustine: there are forty-two reminiscences of his Sermons alone. Bede also uses commentaries on individual Gospels: Ambrose's commentary on Luke is used twenty-three times, Jerome's commentary on Mark thirty-three times, Augustine's *Tractates* eighty times.[70] Gregory, then, has little impact on the wording of the homilies.

Beyond frequency of reference, we can consider how the reminiscences are used: are they essential to the argument, are they additional authority for the argument, or are they decoration? In the homilies, it is rare for the argument to depend wholly upon the authority of another; Bede very rarely makes explicit reference to his sources, as Laistner has pointed out.[71]   Bede mentions neither Gregory nor Augustine by name in these homilies. Examining the totality of the

---

[65] d'Avray, *The Preaching of the Friars*, pp. 65-7.

[66] See Introduction, p. 12 for a discussion of the audience of Bede's homilies.

[67] 'The seventh book of Bede's commentary on the Song of Songs is nothing more than a *florilegium* of Gregory.' Laistner, 'The Library', p. 248. Jones' article, 'Introductory Remarks', pp. 166-7 contains some account of Bede's use of Augustine in his commentary on Genesis.

[68] The Gospel homilies contain only verbal reminiscences, and one can find considerable stretches written without recourse to Patristic authority, such as II.8.146-201, II.9.1-112, II.15.20-119. Similarly in *De templo*, CCSL 119A, I.1642-1715; II.80-550 amongst other locations.

[69] Either a quotation or reminiscence shows Bede's debt to a text. A reminiscence may suggest a deep knowledge of the text has permeated Bede's thinking, but this cannot be proven. It does not matter for this analysis whether or not the audience or reader was intended to spot the reference; its simple existence shows its importance to Bede.   Martin, ' Augustine's Influence', p. 357.

[70] The list of citations may be found at CCSL 122, pp. 401-3. The authors are listed alphabetically.

[71] Laistner, 'The Library', p. 240.

verbal reminiscences and quotations from Gregory, the broad outline is this: rarely does the argument depend entirely on the quotation from Gregory, as will be demonstrated.

Four of the total citations of Gregory may be discarded from our discussion, as there are two or more possible sources for the reference in question; any slight inclination of wording towards one source over the other could well be coincidental, and therefore unable to be used as evidence.[72] For the rest, on two occasions, Gregory is used as an etymological source; there is nothing particularly significant in Bede using Gregory's etymology, in view of Bede's interest in the subject. It is difficult (and possibly unwise) to suggest that Gregory inspired Bede's interest in etymology, as Isidore wrote a whole book on the subject.[73] Nevertheless, it is telling that this feature of Gregory's exegetical style also found its way into Bede's composition. On three occasions, they quote the same Biblical verse as evidence.[74] Both men knew the Bible thoroughly, and it is possible that they could independently use the same verse. These examples cannot show conclusively that Gregory influenced Bede's thinking; at best they demonstrate that Bede had read Gregory carefully. On one other occasion, Bede uses Gregory as a source of information for an historical fact.[75] This is of similar significance to the other points: it demonstrates Bede's knowledge of Gregory, but no deeper influence.

For the points which remain, the Gregorian reminiscences either summarise, expand, support, or form a small part of Bede's argument. With these reminiscences removed, Bede's argument would not collapse: it might look a little weaker. An example of this is Bede's use of the *Moralia* where a snippet of Gregory is used in Bede's interpretation of John the Baptist's clothing.[76] But in the absence of direct quotation from or reference to an author, we can assume that Bede was not calling upon their authority to reinforce his argument, though these references are a further indication of his comprehensive knowledge of Gregory.[77] They are not of key

---

[72] As at I.14.49, where both Augustine's *Sermo* 110, line 1 (PL 38, col. 638) and Gregory's homily 31; see also II.1.38, II.8.21, II.10.152.

[73] I.3.20, I.6.108. Isidore's *Etymologiae* and Jerome's *Nomina Hebraica* are also frequently cited: twenty-eight and nine times respectively (see pp. 402-3, CCSL 122).

[74] I.1.133, I.24.38, II.14.79.

[75] I.8.61-2.

[76] Bede: I.1.108, Gregory: CCSL 143B; p. 1582, lines 1-17.

[77] Not all verbal reminiscences would be picked up by an audience, and therefore they are unlikely to have been included by Bede as pointers for his readers to ascertain his (Bede's) authority.

importance to the concepts being discussed, though they may refine them, which cases indicate a profounder influence on his thought.

With this in mind, let us recall Martin's comment, mentioned earlier, that it seems to have been Bede's policy to use verbal reminiscence rather than direct quotation. This could reflect his method of composition, suggesting an *extempore* delivery, with consequential slight inaccuracies and misrecollections.[78] Or it could be deliberate: a concealing of authority from all but the most alert. There is a precedent for this in Bede's handling of his verse life of Cuthbert. Lapidge has shown that one of Bede's practices in his revision of this verse life is the alteration of lines to make a quotation or inspiration less visible.[79] The same mechanism may be at work in the homilies – Bede is concealing the tracks that he has followed, leaving us with his opinions, opinions which have clearly been influenced generally by his predecessors, but from which specifics are difficult to extract by design.

It is clear that Gregory's ideas have underpinned Bede's thinking, even if Bede does not directly acknowledge the influence. It appears that Gregory's writing was less influential on the words chosen (for those, we see that Bede tended to choose Augustine) but was used for the broader moral approach. Gregory was Bede's social and pastoral model – hence we see Gregorian influence, since Bede discusses themes such as baptism, discipleship, ecclesiology, forgiveness of sins and the role of the pastor. Yet for numerology and eschatology, a more Augustinian influence may be detected, as will be discussed below. Augustine is also noted for his attention to the literal meaning of the biblical text (he wrote, after all, *De Genesi ad litteram*); Bede begins by analysing the letter (with due attention to names, places and numbers therein). One might broadly characterise Gregory's influence as pastoral and Augustine's as scholarly,[80] though it would be misleading to suggest that Gregory had little scholarly influence on Bede, or that Augustine gave little pastoral help.[81]

A slightly more detailed analysis of the key reminiscences reveals the areas where Bede was significantly influenced by Gregory. Bede states that John the

---

[78] This is less likely; see Introduction, pp. 12-13.
[79] M. Lapidge, 'Bede's Metrical *Vita S. Cuthberti,*', in *St Cuthbert, His Cult and His Community*, ed. G. Bonner *et al.* (Woodbridge, 1989), pp. 74-94, p. 82.

[80] This is given more weight when one observes that at I.8.89, Bede follows the verse division proposed by Augustine in *Tractates in Iohannem* 1.16, CCSL 36, pp. 9.1-10.25.
[81] Martin notes that Augustine has a strong stylistic influence on Bede, discussed further in chapter III. Martin, 'Augustine's Influence', p. 360.

Baptist only preached a baptism of the forgiveness of sins; only Christ could actually impart this forgiveness, a point derived from Gregory.[82]   Many of these points concern Bede's Christology.   Some also connect to Bede's ecclesiology: Bede uses Gregory's homilies on Ezekiel to demonstrate that Christ led both Jews and Gentiles to the heavenly Jerusalem.[83]   This is of particular importance to Bede, whose *HE* demonstrates the salvation of the English people.   There is one interesting point where Bede followed Gregory: they both believed that there would be an immediate judgement, followed by a final one (this latter ties in with Bede's eschatological beliefs).   This is implied in: 'martyres … mox soluti carcere carnis debita suo certamini praemia sortiuntur'[84] and expanded later on, where Bede states that the elect get their *final* reward after the *final* judgement (my italics).[85]   Straw notes that Gregory believed the same.[86]

Augustine and Bede were greatly interested in numerology, as Jones points out.[87]   In the homilies we can see this in two ways: Bede has adopted Augustine's interpretation of the number forty-six, relating to Christ's formation in the womb.[88] The significance of this number has informed other works by Bede: both his Lives of Cuthbert have forty-six chapters.[89]   But more interestingly, there is a profound influence with regard to the handling of the numbers six, seven and eight, which Augustine uses in his descriptions of the ages of the world.[90]   This numerological interpretation is essential to Bede's view of the end of time, where we may detect an interesting synthesis of Gregorian and Augustinian thought.

This importance of numerology can be examined in his homily on the dedication of the Church.[91]   This is a reference to Bede's belief, expressed more clearly in his commentary on Genesis,[92] that the world progressed through six

---

[82] Bede I.1.10 (Gregory, Gospel homilies 20.25).
[83] II.3.38-9; Gregory, *Homiliae in Ezechielhis*, ed. M. Adriaen, CCSL 142 (Turnholt, 1977), pp. 275.33-276.37, II.v.2.   See also Bede's analysis of Apocalypse 7:4-5 in ch. 9.42-165 of his commentary, *In Apocalypsin*, ed. R. Gryson, CCSL 121A (Turnholt, 2001), pp. 311-23.
[84] II.24.111.
[85] II.24.317.
[86] Straw, *Gregory*, p. 59.
[87] Jones, 'Introductory Remarks', p. 192.
[88] II.24.264, p. 365 and II.1.193, p. 189, following Augustine, *De diversis quaestionibus 83*, ed. A. Mutzenbecher, CCSL 44A (Turnholt, 1975), p. 363.181-202.
[89] W. Berschin discusses this in his article 'Bede's *Opus deliberatum ac perfectum*' in *St Cuthbert, His Cult and His Community*, ed. G. Bonner *et al*. (Woodbridge, 1989), pp. 95-102, pp. 99-101, where he also includes an account of Augustine's treatment of the number.
[90] For a useful survey of Augustine's writings on the matter, see Folliet, 'La typologie du *sabbat*'. The position closest to Bede's is outlined on p. 384, from Augustine's *Confessions*, book XIII.
[91] II.24.240-50.
[92] *In Genesim*, CCSL 118A, I.1093-1224.

temporal ages, with a seventh, spiritual age in parallel to those six, and the sixth and seventh ages ended with the Final Judgement, beginning the eighth age of eternal life.[93] Bede's numerological interests lead him to refer to this idea when the number six, seven or eight appears in a biblical text. These six, seven or eight ages may be compared to shorter spans of time: the seven days of creation (as in the Genesis passage), or the eight days of the Lord's suffering and death (from Palm Sunday to Easter Sunday), as in the homily passage. These ages are vital for determining the limits of time; they show the beginning and end of the world. It is no coincidence that chapter sixty-six of Bede's *De temporum ratione* contains a discussion of these ages. As I have shown, Bede's conception of these ages is heavily influenced by Augustine.[94] This tight-knit interlacing of numerology and history is Augustinian, but Bede's interpretation of the sixth age is most Gregorian. Augustine believed that the sixth age (that following Christ) was not prophesied, and that it was false to assume that 'any slice of secular history, of any nation, institution or society, could have an indispensable place in the historical realisation of God's purpose.'[95] Bede quite clearly believed the opposite – the *HE* is in effect one long exposition of the historical workings of divine Providence. This is in line with Gregory's extremely interventionist beliefs: as Straw puts it so strongly, for Gregory 'natural causation is eclipsed by supernatural intervention.'[96] Gregory saw the revelation of God's plan everywhere.

It is not difficult to demonstrate that Bede was familiar with the writings of the Church Fathers, sufficiently familiar to include both direct quotations and verbal reminiscences from many of their works. It is much more difficult to demonstrate the precise influence a particular author had on his thinking: while Bede may recall Augustine's or Gregory's words when stating a common theological concept, Bede could have encountered this concept in many places. In the absence of finding a theological statement that is confined to one author (though there are a few such), one is left to try to uncover a general 'inclination' by Bede towards a particular author's ideas or ideals. While Gregory appears to provide a close match for the

---

[93] This is discussed more fully in chapter I, pp. 32-7.

[94] See my unpublished B.A. dissertation, *Bede's Commentary on the Six Days of Creation*, pp. 12-9.

[95] R. A. Markus, *Saeculum: History and Society in the Theology of St Augustine*, revised edn (Cambridge, 1988), p. 157.

[96] Straw, *Gregory*, p. 10.

ideas and ideals revealed in the *HE* and the Life of Cuthbert, finding these traces in the Gospel homilies is much more difficult: Bede is occupying some middle ground between Gregory and Augustine, different from both yet not completely so. The choice of a series of Gospel homilies is a homage to Gregory, but, as noted above, the style can be described as Augustinian. But the work has its own internal coherence, assimilating and augmenting the wisdom of both men, to make something appropriate for its Anglo-Saxon audience. Perhaps the best analogy we may find is that Bede is writing a student's commentary on the Gospels – he does not seek to challenge established ground – he synthesises and arranges the work of former scholars in a way that is all his own.

Chapter III: The Style of the Homilies

Style is a vital component of deciphering the meaning of the homilies, regardless of whether they were to be read in public or in private. It seems likely that Bede did not deliver these sermons *ex tempore,* to be recorded by stenographers as Augustine's were;[1] at the least, the sermons were carefully revised before they were copied and distributed.[2]   The style may provide clues about who the original audience was, as well as containing grammatical information readers used to comprehend the homilies. Although the homilies became popular in the Carolingian Empire, where for some readers the language was not totally dissimilar to the one they spoke every day, they were originally written in Northumbria, where Latin would always be a second language.

Early students of Bede's style have commented on its simplicity and its resemblance to Classical Latin. Plummer made this comment on Bede's Latin: 'Bede's command of Latin is excellent, and his style is clear and limpid, and it is very seldom that we have to pause to think of the meaning of a sentence.'[3] Wetherbee states that 'Bede's Latin … is pure, simple and efficient.'[4] De Bruyne characterises Bede's Latin as 'clear, even elegant', and as presenting a 'classical character.'[5]

We find ample evidence that Bede was familiar with the Classical forms of rhetoric, and was able to use them with flexibility and ease, as van der Walt has shown.[6] As we may assume that a Wearmouth-Jarrow audience would be taught such forms, probably using Bede's own textbook (*De schematibus et tropis*), Bede would have felt quite assured that most of his audience would be able to understand them. These forms also provide direction to the listener, bringing important words and phrases to the fore, linking ideas through wordplay or chiasmus, repeating important concepts.

---

[1] R. J. Deferrari, 'St Augustine's Method of Composing and Delivering Sermons', *American Journal of Philology* 43 (1922), 97-123 and 193-219, p. 104.
[2] See the Introduction, pp. 12-3 for a discussion of the read/spoken argument.
[3] Plummer, *Venerabilis Baedae Opera Historica*, vol. 1, pp. liii-liv.
[4] W. Wetherbee, 'Some Implications of Bede's Latin Style' in *Bede and Anglo-Saxon England: Papers in Honour of the 1300th anniversary of the Birth of Bede, Given at Cornell University in 1973 and 1974*, ed. R. T. Farrell, British Archaeological Reports 46 (Oxford, 1978), pp. 23-31, p. 23.
[5] A. de Bruyne, *Études d'esthétique médiéval* (Bruges, 1946), p. 149.
[6] Van der Walt, *The Homiliary of the Venerable Bede*, p. 92, p. 175.

But subsequent commentators, particularly those who have studied Bede's exegetical writings rather than the *HE*, have reached a somewhat different conclusion. Bede is not writing the simplest, most unadorned Latin; he is writing complex Latin that compares well to that of Augustine, who received a formal rhetorical training. At times, Bede may go beyond this and become convoluted. Connolly has noted this complexity, and, commenting on Plummer's statement that 'Bede's command of Latin is excellent … and it is very seldom that we have to pause to think of the meaning of a sentence,' states '[The words] simply do not reflect this translator's experience of reading and translating Bede's *exegetical* writings. The plain truth is quite often the reverse.'[7] Sharpe has analysed this phenomenon, showing how tricky Bede's Latin can be.[8] He notes that perhaps those works with a thematic (such as *De templo*), rather than a strictly verse-by-verse approach (such as Bede's commentary on Luke's Gospel) are more prone to contain difficulties; the homilies offer a halfway house here, being concerned with both theme and verse. The difficulty for the modern reader is compounded by the format of the CCSL editions, which do not include much punctuation. Sharpe hypothesises that this may be because the editor was 'insufficiently secure in his understanding of the syntax to feel able to punctuate without risk of misleading the reader. Not without reason, because sometimes the sentences require a real effort to understand them.'[9] It is apparent from an analysis of the homilies that sometimes the sentence can be construed in more than one way.[10] Bede is not easy on his readers, and expects them to have a comprehensive knowledge of rhetorical features of *De schematibus et tropis*; without this knowledge, one would be lost. Sharpe provides examples from Bede's commentary on Samuel, particularly the sections commenting on I Samuel 7:2 and I Samuel 10:17-9, demonstrating some of the more misleading sentences. He finds a parallel for this kind of expansive discourse in Jerome's commentary on Ezekiel. He suggests that some of this unclarity may stem from Bede not being a native speaker of Latin; however, one finds long and convoluted sentences in English, written by native speakers, whether in literature, by authors such as James Joyce, or in scholarship, by scholars such as Judith Butler (one of the

---

[7] S. Connolly, trans., *Bede: On Tobit and on the Canticle of Habakkuk*, (Dublin, 1997), p. 15.
[8] Sharpe, 'The Varieties of Bede's Prose', pp. 7-8.
[9] Sharpe, 'The Varieties of Bede's Prose', p. 8.
[10] See my analysis of I.10.1-3, pp. 69-70 below.

proponents of feminist literary criticism). Moreover, Bede is not unaware of the nuances of Latin style; he corrected the Life of St Anastasius to improve its Latin idiom,[11] and as Sharpe also points out, Bede rewrote *De locis sanctis* by Adomnán of Iona, finding the florid style unhelpful to students. He asserts that this is because of Bede's models; furthermore, he characterises Bede's style as 'showing a deliberate neutrality'.[12] It may well not be possible to define a personal style for Bede. He has no especially favoured vocabulary, unlike Aldhelm.[13] He uses a wide range of vocabulary, has mastered many complex Latin constructions, and has mastered many styles of discourse. This may make the attribution of Bedan *dubia* on stylistic grounds particularly difficult.

Bede's style has received a certain amount of attention in recent years, with some studies focussing specifically on the homilies.[14] Much of this analysis is devoted to examining Bede's use of rhetorical devices. As van der Walt has demonstrated, Bede follows his own pedagogical advice, contained in *De schematibus et tropis*, and even goes beyond it.[15] Bede was a careful reader of the grammarian Donatus, and was able to implement the stylistic teachings found in his models.[16] One point, which is little noted by those who examine Bede's style in the homilies, is that they are not all of a piece. The homilies contain considerable stylistic variation: in some, Bede uses many rhetorical devices; in others, he exhibits a plainer style. This may be a reflection of Bede's attitude to the subject matter, or may be symptomatic of the homilies being written over several years, then being collected at a later date.

Scholars have suggested several stylistic influences on Bede. As discussed above, Sharpe suggests that the later, bloated prose of Jerome may have influenced Bede's style in some of his obscurer passages.[17] Martin has demonstrated that Bede

---

[11] P. Meyvaert, 'Bede the Scholar', in *Famulus Christi*, pp. 40-69; p. 49.

[12] Sharpe, 'The Varieties of Bede's Prose', pp. 10-18.

[13] For a study of Aldhelm's prose style, see M. Lapidge and M. Herren, trans., *The Prose Works of Aldhelm*, (Cambridge, 1979), Introduction; A. de Bruyne characterises Aldhelm's style as 'Hisperic' in his *Études d'esthetique médiéval*, pp. 127-30, though this is a description not widely favoured now.

[14] Namely, van der Walt's thesis, *The Homiliary of the Venerable Bede* and Martin's article, 'Augustine's Influence'. West has provided a close analysis of some of the homilies, focussing on structural and liturgical features. P. J. West, 'Liturgical Style and Structure in Bede's Homily for the Easter Vigil', 1-8 and 'Liturgical Style and Structure in Bede's Christmas Homilies', *American Benedictine Review* 23 (1972), 424-38.

[15] Van der Walt, *The Homiliary of the Venerable Bede*, p. 175.

[16] M. Irvine, 'Bede the Grammarian and the Scope of Grammatical Studies in Eighth-Century Northumbria', *ASE* 15 (1985), 15-44, p. 17.

[17] See above, p. 62 and Sharpe, 'The Varieties of Bede's Prose', p. 17.

also pays homage to Augustine, though he keeps his rhetorical flights to a minimum, and tends to use stylistic features which also appear in Old English.[18] However, Crépin suggests that 'it would be risky to suppose Old English linguistic habits underlying Bede's Latin. His style is from Latin authors.'[19] Like Augustine, Bede uses antithesis, paradox and wordplay. Augustine also uses alliteration, which Bede uses relatively infrequently. Martin states that Augustine used the Bible as a stylistic model and that 'it is to a large extent these biblical features of Augustine's sermon style which influenced Bede when he set out to write his own eloquent series of *Homeliae Evangelii*.'[20] This notion of a biblical style, copied across Christian Latin authors from diverse cultures is discussed by Howlett.[21] He enumerates ten rules of Biblical style, which may be summarised as the use of parallelism, chiasmus and word-play in various combinations.[22]

Bede makes considerable use of parallelism and chiasmus. While Howlett makes a case for Bede following these principles in his Letter to Cuthbert, it is harder to make such a case for the homilies. More daringly, Howlett suggests that the arrangement of the number of words in each section of this letter follows the proportions of the Golden Section. Why would this proportion be significant to Bede? How would he observe the proportions of this decimal, given the restrictions of Roman numerals?[23] How would he construct the geometric figure and then convert it into a proportion to be used as a guide while writing?[24] As Riché has noted, Aldhelm, who had greater arithmetical training, had great difficulty with fractions.[25] While Bede does state and restate his ideas, the structure of the homilies is not dictated primarily by rhetorical rules, but by the Gospel story upon which the commentary is centred.[26] While he does use parallelism and chiasmus, it is harder to claim that he does so over long passages, as the structure is less open to that kind of manipulation than it is in a sermon.[27] It is also hard to claim that Bede used these

---

[18] Martin, 'Augustine's Influence', p. 364.

[19] Crépin, 'Bede and the Vernacular', p. 173.

[20] Martin, 'Augustine's Influence', p. 360.

[21] D. Howlett, *British Books in Biblical Style* (Dublin, 1997), especially pp. 1-31 and pp. 101-193.

[22] Howlett, *British Books*, pp. 6-7.

[23] Howlett, *British Books*, pp. 167-8.

[24] For a brief note on the knowledge of arithmetic and geometry in Bede's time, see M. Lapidge, 'Schools', in *The Blackwell Encyclopaedia of Anglo-Saxon England*, pp. 408-9, p. 409.

[25] P. Riché, *Education and Culture in the Barbarian West: Sixth Through Eighth Centuries*, trans. J. J. Contreni, (Columbia, 1976), p. 385.

[26] See detailed analyses below, pp. 69-76.

[27] However, an example of Bede's use of repetition can be found in his use of *transeamus* in homily I.7.

figures only because they appeared in the Bible: he read widely, including some Vergil and also Augustine and Jerome.[28]   The repetition of ideas may well arise independently in oral cultures – Bede need not have used these techniques solely because of their use in the Bible.

Ray has hinted that perhaps Bede may have been acquainted with Cicero.[29] In his article, Ray shows convincingly that Bede would not have avoided any of the pagan texts he chanced to encounter (for indeed, we know he read Vergil),[30] but his suggestion that Bede knew Cicero's *De Inventione* must wait for further analysis of possible Ciceronian traces in Bede.[31]   However, as Sharpe has noted, Pope Pius II, before he took that office, wrote in 1444: 'sed fuerunt et alii apud Anglos Tullianae cultores eloquentiae, inter quos Venerabilem Bedam nemo non posuit', a useful reference from an age when people were familiar with the works of Cicero.[32] But Bede may have had other stylistic models who also exhibit 'Tullian eloquence'.

However, Oberhelman has noted that in the homilies of Augustine and Ambrose, 'formal rules of rhetoric are avoided, and certain elements of an oral homiletic style present to the audience the essential truths under discussion.'[33]   He notes that Augustine's early homilies do not conform to this pattern of avoiding the rules of rhetoric, and tend to have long periodic prose, showing the influence of his Classical training.[34]   He goes on to note the following features of Augustine's later homilies: the stringing of paratactic cola, without conjunction or subordination; parenthetic phrases that shatter the syntactic unity of a sentence; frontal positioning of verbs for stress; the stress of the *élement nominal* by omission of verbs; placement of a relative pronoun clause or of a nominative phrase in anacoluthon at the

---

[28] As noted on p. 64 above, Martin considers Augustine to have a biblical style.

[29] R. Ray, 'Bede's Vera Lex Historiae', *Speculum* 55 (1980), pp. 1-21.   Stable URL: http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0038-7134%281980%2955%3A1%3C1%3ABVLH%3E2.0.CO%3B2-T Last accessed July 2005.

[30] N. Wright, 'Bede and Vergil', *Romanobarbarica* 6 (1982), 361-79. This refutes P. Hunter Blair's argument in 'From Bede to Alcuin', in *Famulus Christi*, ed. G. Bonner (London, 1976), pp. 239-260, p. 250.

[31] Ray, 'Bede and Cicero', pp. 14-5. However, it is still possible that Bede only knew Cicero through extracts contained in other works. See further, G. Knappe, *Traditionen der Klassischen Rhetorik* (Heidelberg, 1996).

[32] Sharpe, 'The Varieties of Bede's Prose', p. 4; Aeneas Silvius Piccolomini, *Epistulae*, ed. R. Wolkan, *Der Briefwechsel des Eneas Silvius Piccolomini*, Fontes rerum Austriacarum 61 (Vienna, 1909), Letter 143. 'But there were other cultivators of Tullian eloquence among the English, amongst whom no-one would fail to place the Venerable Bede.'

[33] S. M. Oberhelman, *Rhetoric and Homiletics in Fourth-Century Christian Literature: Prose Rhythm, Oratorical Style and Preaching in the Works of Ambrose, Jerome and Augustine*, American Classical Studies 26 (Atlanta, Georgia, 1991), p. 102.

[34] Oberhelman, *Rhetoric and Homiletics*, p. 109.

beginning of a sentence; the repeated use of short questions for didactic purpose; the very frequent use of *ergo* before and after a verb at the beginning of a sentence and preference for the popular *quia* over the more formal *quoniam* in causal clauses.[35]

Bede tends to eschew these aspects of oral delivery, instead using complex subordination, with the verbs sometimes well buried in the substance of the sentence.[36] Grocock notes that Bede was writing at a time when word order was moving away from Subject-Object-Verb towards Subject-Verb-Object, though he also notes that Bede seems unconcerned with this in his writing.[37] He does on occasions address questions to the audience, and frequently addresses them directly in the text. However, it would seem that Bede has avoided aspects of informal, oral style in favour of a more carefully constructed rhetoric, imitating the non-homiletic aspects of his predecessors' style. This may suggest a greater concern for readers than for listeners, and indeed Martin has suggested that Bede created a new genre, that of the literary homily.[38] Unlike most of his predecessors (and unlike his sources, for he was not aware of many Latin homilists), Bede does not note that he preached these in church, or that he used stenographers. Indeed, at the time Bede was working on the homilies, it is unclear whether Bede dictated his work or not, as in his commentary on Luke he famously notes that he acted as his own secretary,[39] but Cuthbert's letter on Bede's death notes that he dictated his translations.[40] However, this does not prove that anyone at Wearmouth-Jarrow would be able to cope with taking notes at normal speaking speed; we have no evidence that Tyronian notes were known there. Gregory the Great sometimes noted that he had dictated a homily, through being too unwell to preach personally, suggesting therefore that for the other homilies, he had a member of staff taking notes in the congregation.[41] Augustine did likewise.[42] Perhaps we are simply seeing that Bede is less confident at speaking *extempore* than a native speaker, such as Augustine, and that therefore he would at least wish to tidy up any stenographic or dictated notes.

---

[35] Oberhelman, *Rhetoric and Homiletics*, pp. 102-4.
[36] See my analysis of I.10, pp. 69-74 below, where Bede's complex subordination and signals can be seen.
[37] Grocock, 'Bede and the Golden Age of Latin Prose', p. 373.
[38] Martin, 'Augustine's Influence', p. 357.
[39] *In Lucam*, CCSL 120, Prologus, lines 94-6, p. 8.
[40] 'Cuthbert's Letter on the Death of Bede', pp. 582-3.
[41] D. Hurst, trans., *Gregory the Great: Forty Gospel Homilies*, CSS 123 (Kalamazoo, 1990), p. 4 (Introduction) and p. 157 (Homily 21).
[42] Deferrari, 'St Augustine's Method', pp. 102-4.

If this is the case, it could have interesting implications for preaching at Wearmouth-Jarrow. Were sermons carefully prepared beforehand, or were a few grammatical errors allowed in *extempore* preaching? Was there a limited elite permitted to preach, and was Bede's tidying up of his own homilies therefore simply a desire to ensure a high standard of Latinity for his work? Or did preaching occur in Old English within the monastery, as it presumably did outside?[43]

But it seems unwise to look for a single stylistic source, or a single reason for the complexities of Bede's style, just as it is unwise to seek a single source of his theology. Bede was a master chameleon. Especially in later life, Bede was fond of exceptionally long sentences, full of complex subordination, which can be difficult to disentangle without the benefit of some kind of punctuation.[44] Unlike in the *HE*, the subordination is not always clearly signalled by the choice of words and the surrounding agreements. A brief analysis of the *HE* IV.3 (which discusses Chad and the diocese of Lichfield) shows that Bede frequently begins his sentences with verbs. On the occasions he does not, he uses a relative pronoun (*qui*), to refer us back to the bishop under discussion, and a temporal clause, before beginning the main clause of the sentence with a verb. It is easy to separate off the subordinate clauses and return to the main thrust of the sentence; the beginning of each subclause is clearly signalled, as is the return to the main text, where Bede has usually used a verb. The passage then moves to a long section in which the sentences begin with *qui*, as Bede is reinforcing the fact that the subject of the sentence has not been mentioned by name for a while. There is a strong tendency to begin the sentence with either the subject, or a verb.[45] Closure of the previous sentence has usually been indicated by a verb.[46] Even without the benefit of punctuation (and the editors of the *HE* are exceptionally helpful here) the structure of the sentences is apparent:

> Habuit autem sedem episcopalem in loco qui vocatur Licidfelth in quo et defunctus et sepultus est ubi usque hodie sequentium quoque provinciae illius episcoporum sedes est. Fecerat vero sibi mansionem non longe ab ecclesia remotiorem in qua, secretius cum paucis id est septem sive octo fratribus quoties a labore et ministerio verbi vacabat orare ac legere solebat.[47]

---

[43] The local laity may have come to the monastery for services. See Introduction, p. 11.

[44] See chapter IV, p. 88, for a further discussion of the benefits of punctuation.

[45] See *HE* IV.3, p. 336, line 11 (*suspectum*) and line 18 (*habuit*).

[46] See *HE* IV.3, p. 336, line 11 (*conpulit*), line 17 (*permanent*), p.338, line 3 (*solebat*).

[47] *HE* IV.3, p. 336, p. 338; Translation: 'He had his episcopal seat at a place called Lichfield, where he also died and was buried, and where the succeeding bishops of the kingdom have their see to this day. He built himself a more retired dwelling place not far from the church, in which he could read and

Here we can quickly see that the subject contained in the verb *habuit* must come from the preceding sentence. The *in quo* indicates that the subordinate clause introduced by *qui* has ended, and *ubi* reintroduces us to the main thrust of the sentence, telling us that the see is still situated there. Likewise, in the following sentence, the postponement of the adjective *remotiorem* (agreeing with *mansionem*) allows us to determine more easily that *qua* refers to *mansionem*, not to *ecclesia*, which otherwise would be difficult to determine. A similar mechanism is used in the following clause, in which *fratribus* is postponed in order to indicate that the ablative clause and its subclause are finished. Though Bede uses extensive subordination, the word order allows us to understand where his clauses begin and end, and the sentences are not overlong.

A brief analysis of homily I.13 provides a rather different picture. Bede still does occasionally begin a sentence with a verb (e.g. *habebit*, line 15), or the subject (*nemo*, line 27). However, he is much more likely to begin the sentence with some form of conjunction, often a subordinative conjunction.[48] The clauses nest together in the sentences, and the sentences nest together in a long paragraph. The homilies and the *HE* share these long arcs of thought, but in the *HE* the subdivisions are more clearly signalled to the reader. Some of this clarity may be due to the *HE* being narrative, and thus easier to follow than the more discursive nature of biblical commentary, which makes the latter an inherently difficult genre to read. To make matters more difficult for the reader of I.13, Bede often ends his sentences with a biblical quotation, or with a noun, adjective or participle.[49] The sentences do not always end in a verb. One reason for this is analysed below; Bede may have been using clausulae, and final verbs do not always scan particularly easily. Bede was presumably aware of the difficulties his language might present; after all, he had

---

pray privately with a few of his brothers, that is to say seven or eight of them; this he did as often as he was free from his labours and from the ministration of the word.', pp. 337-9.

[48] This is partly dependent upon editorial punctuation; however, as I show in chapter V, pp. 131-2, editorial punctuation is much more minimalist than that found in most manuscripts. The manuscript punctuation does not tend to create more sentences; it merely subdivides those that already exist. For examples of subordinative conjunctions, see I.13.7, p. 88 (*ubi*), I.13.38, p. 89 (*quia*).

[49] For a biblical quotation, see I.10.6-7, I 10.35; adjective, I.10.79; noun, I.10.74; participle, I.10.38.

written other, quite clear, works. We therefore must seek a reason for his complexity.

A detailed analysis of the individual homilies reveals that they have a deceptively simple overall structure. They also exhibit some of the features of Bede's exegetical prose. In some ways they seem like exhibitions of 'good style'; many of the features found in Bede are those of the classroom over centuries.

I shall begin with a detailed analysis of homilies I.10 and II.25. Homily I.10 is one of the shortest in the corpus – if Bede were writing and then reading aloud his homilies, this may be because this homily is to be read on the feast of Holy Innocents (December 28th), after a number of Christmastide homilies. II.25 is for the celebration of the dedication of a church, and is considerably longer. While there are stylistic variations between the homilies, the basic structure remains the same; a function of the genre.

In homily I.10, the first half of the homily is formed of an explanation of the significance of the Gospel reading for the feast of the Holy Innocents.[50] The second half is a meditation upon martyrs, including a commentary on some verses from John's vision of the martyrs in the Apocalypse.[51] This structure is generally followed throughout Bede's homilies: the first half focusses on the Gospel meditation, the second half may then provide a freer meditation on the subject, occasionally commenting on other portions of the Bible, and sometimes providing Bede's own thoughts on the subject, as in homily II.15 for the Ascension.[52] As mentioned in chapter I, many themes may be entwined in one homily, depending on where the verse-by-verse exegesis goes. In the case of homily I.10, the general structure is as follows: there is a paraphrasing of the Gospel verse, usually introduced by *quod*, followed by an explanation of its significance. The significance may be further enlarged upon, or the next verse may be adduced.[53] This continues in the second part of the homily, where the verse from the Apocalypse is introduced and explained.

The homily contains some difficulties, as well as exhibitions of Bede's latinity. We can see this in the complex first sentence:

---

[50] I.10, CCSL 122, pp. 68-72. The Gospel reading for this homily is Matthew 2:13-23.
[51] Apocalypse 7:9-10, 14-5.
[52] The one can be seen in homilies I.2, I.12, II.1, II.17, II.24, II.25, the other in homilies I.4, I.6, I.11, I.13, I.21, II.7, II.16.
[53] I.10.31ff; or I.10.14ff.

> De morte pretiosa martyrum Christi innocentium sacra nobis est, fratres carissimi, euangelii lectio recitata in qua tamen omnium Christi martyrum pretiosa est mors designata.[54]

Bede postpones the introduction of the subject *lectio* until after we have heard what the celebration is for – the precious death of the innocent martyrs of Christ. There is ambiguity here about how *sacra* is to be construed: it can either be agreeing with *morte*, in parallel with *pretiosā*, encapsulating the nature of the feast; alternatively, it can agree with *lectio*, forming a frame with *recitata*, encapsulating the act of listening to the reading. The translator has opted for the latter interpretation, as it would be unusual to have two parallel adjectival forms separated by so great a distance, though only manuscript punctuation or the marking of quantities can show us how a medieval audience understood it.[55] A listener would of course have the benefit of being able to hear the difference in quantities for the final -a. The second word, *morte* is referred to by the *in qua* of the last clause, where Bede has used an unusual cadence – the penultimate word is a monosyllable.[56] Bede has also chosen to use an interlacing word order (chiasmus); the noun phrase *pretiosa mors* is intertwined with the verb form *est designata*, giving the arrangement *pretiosa est mors designata*, leaving *mors* as the penultimate word, paralleling *morte* at the beginning, with *pretiosa* echoed in the nominative and ablative forms.[57] This sentence is a classic example of periodic prose; the meaning of the sentence is not fully unlocked until the final word.

We then move into a series of sentences beginning with *quod*, in which the slaying of the innocents is given a significance related to martyrs and the Church which Christ was yet to found. In the third sentence we see Bede's fondness for the construction *non solum…sed et*, which he uses frequently, with minor alterations in wording.[58] This allows him to use grammatically parallel constructions to illustrate his point.[59] We see Bede's love of antithesis in the last phrase of this sentence,

---

[54] I.10.1-3, p. 68.
[55] CSS 10, pp. 96-102, p. 98. See chapters IV and V below for more details on punctuation.
[56] See further below, p. 77, about cadences.
[57] I.10.1-3.
[58] See for example, chapter V, p. 118, fn. 57.
[59] As mentioned above, parallelism is frequently used in both the Bible and the works of Augustine, on p. 64.

'persecutionem saevituram perfidorum et piorum patientiam.'[60] This sentence finishes with the classic Ciceronian cadence *esse coronandam*.[61]

On page 68, line 18 we find that Bede ends his sentence with a Biblical quotation: Sive enim uiuimus siue morimur domini sumus. It is necessary to know that this is a quotation in order to understand the grammar of the sentence. It is the nverb together with the next *quod* which indicates that a new sentence has begun. In a manuscript, only capitalisation or punctuation would indicate this transfer, as quotations are at best marked by marginal *diple*.[62]

The next sentence introduces one example of Bede's association; he introduces a verse from Jeremiah, in order to demonstrate that the Lord listens to his people.

> Quod iuxta uaticinium Hieremiae: *Vox in Rama*, id est *in excelso, audita est ploratus et ululatus multus*, manifeste denuntiat luctum sanctae ecclesiae quo de iniusta membrorum suorum nece gemit non ut hostes garriunt in uacuum cedere sed usque ad solium superni ascendere iudicis; et sicut protomartyris Abel ita etiam sanguinem ceterorum martyrum de terra clamare ad dominum iuxta illud uiri sapientis.

Bede's style and method are here closely connected; his allusions can make understanding sense and content difficult. He provides a gloss of *Rama*, suggesting that while Bede was familiar with Jerome's *Nomina Hebraica*, his audience might not have this knowledge at their fingertips. We see here his consideration for the less able; he is providing spiritual education for people at all levels of learning. Bede then adduces another Old Testament reference – Abel the 'protomartyr' (a favourite appellation of Bede's, which he also uses in his Commentary on Genesis, among other places).[63] Bede uses a biblical quotation to conclude this small section, forming a kind of punctuation. Biblical quotations may well have formed a kind of punctuation for monastic audiences, as they would be much more familiar with the Bible than many modern readers. This would be particularly if heard aloud, as the lector would be able to alter his tone of voice to indicate the use of quotation.

The next section is focussed on Rachel as a type of the Church, and we have a greater variety of words at the beginning of each sentence, though new verses are still introduced by *quod*. We find an example of Bede's tendency towards using

---

[60] I.10.10-11, CSS 110, p. 96.
[61] I.10.11, see Oberhelman, *Rhetoric and Homiletics*, pp. 5-7 for a brief discussion of Cicero's cadences.
[62] See chapter V, below.
[63] I.10.75, *In Genesim*, CCSL 118A, p. 39, I.1209.

many subordinate clauses.[64] This is not typical for an oral style, and is one of the factors which militates against a purely oral delivery.[65]

> Quod Rachel plorasse dicitur filios suos nec uoluisse consolari quia non sunt significat ecclesiam plorare quidem sanctorum de hoc saeculo ablationem sed non ita uelle consolari ut qui saeculum morte uicerunt rursus ad saeculi certamina secum [35] toleranda redeant quia nimirum non sunt ultra reuocandi in mundum de cuius aerumnis seme euaserunt coronandi ad Christum. Rachel namque quae ouis aut uidens Deum dicitur ecclesiam figurate demonstrat cuius tota intentio ut uidere eum mereatur inuigilat. Et **ipsa** est ovis centesima quam [40] pastor bonus relictis in caelo nonaginta nouem ouibus angelicarum urtutum abiit quaerere in terra inuentamque suis inposuit humeris et sic reportauit ad gregem. **Quaeritur** autem iuxta litteram quomodo Rachel plorasse dicatur filios suos cum tribus Iuda quae Bethleem tenebat non de Rachel sed de [45]sorore eius Lia fuerit orta. **Ubi tamen** facilis patet responsio **quia** non tantum in Bethleem uerum etiam in omnibus finibus eius pueri sunt omnes trucidati. Tribus autem Beniamin quae de Rachel orta est proxima fuit tribui Iudae. Unde merito credi debet quod plaga crudelissimae necis non paucos etiam [50] Beniamineae stirpis pueros inuoluerit quos progenies Rachel elata est in excelsum uoce plorauerit. **Potest et aliter intellegi quia** Rachel iuxta Bethleem sepulta est sicut titulus monumenti eius manens usque hodie testatur ad occidentem ciuitatis ultra uiam quae ducit Hebron.[66]

In the first sentence of this paragraph, Bede repeats *saeculum* in three different cases, and uses *revocandi* and *coronandi*, two different verbs of the same conjugation and in the same gerundive form, using the repeated sounds to draw the audience through the sentence. In line 39 we have *ipsa* referring back to Rachel in the previous sentence; in some cases the noun thus indicated is a long way away.[67] This series of sentences forms a tree: *ipsa* in line 39 refers back to Rachel. The *quaeritur* relates to the previous section *quod Rachel plorasse*. This question is answered in the next sentence (which incidentally contains another *non tantum ... verum etiam* construction). This is amplified in the next sentence, and concluded in the final one. Then we seek an alternative explanation of the question in line 41; this alternative

---

[64] I.10.31-37.
[65] See above, pp. 65-6.
[66] I.10.31-54 p. 69. Emphasis mine. Numbers in square brackets give the line numbers of the edition.

[67] See pp. 75-6, below, discussing homily II.25.

explanation is introduced by *quaeritur autem*. The structure of the previous answer is paralleled; there is a phrase indicating that an answer can be expected: *ubi tamen facilis responsio* and *potest et aliter intellegi*, both followed by *quia*. The second answer calls on Bede's knowledge of the Holy Land derived from Adomnan's *De locis sanctis*. As can be seen, Bede uses complex structures in his paragraphs. In this example, he gives four interpretations of the verse: two metaphorical (focusing on the etymology of *Rachel*) and two literal. The first metaphorical interpretation is given, then *ipsa* introduces the next. *Quaeritur* introduces the literal interpretations, which each have a construction introducing them. But each sentence is still referring to the biblical verse which began the paragraph. Given Bede's fondness for subclauses, it is not surprising that such texts soon become difficult to follow.

The next section is similarly constructed, with *quod* introducing the paraphrase of the biblical verses, with expansion over the next sentences. Line 92 has Bede using the opposition of light and dark to illustrate the difference between sinners and the faithful. Bede was fond of using such antithesis, as indeed was Gregory the Great.[68] Following this is a slightly more difficult sentence.

> Quod damnato licet Herode Ioseph timore Archelai filii eius in Iudaeam ubi metropolim habebat ire formidans monente angelo in Nazareth Galilaeae secedit ultima praesentis ecclesiae tempora designat quando pro ea quae nunc est uniuersali gentis illius caecitate qua christianos in quantum ualet persequi non desistit acrior in quibusdam antichristi persecutio consugret et quidem plurimis ad praedicationem Enoch et Heliae a perfidia conversis sed ceteris ad instinctum antichristi tota intentione contra fidem dimicantibus.

It begins with *quod* once again. Next, *filii eius* refers back to Herod, then we have another subclause *ubi metropolim habebat* before finding out that Joseph feared to go there (there is also the repetition of fear – Joseph feared (*formidans*) to go there for fear of (*timore*) Archelaus); then there is another ablative absolute before we find out where he went instead. After navigating this paraphrase of the Bible, we discover Bede's interpretation. He uses chiasmus at the beginning: *ultima praesentis ecclesiae tempora designat*. A listener here has the advantage – it is clear that *ultima* is an accusative plural agreeing with *tempora*. Now there is a temporal clause, in which we have one thing replaced by another, *ea caecitate* is to be replaced by an *acrior persecutio*. This is again difficult to construe, as Bede inserts a subclause between *ea* and *caecitate*, to describe the extent of the blindness, and a second

---

[68] See chapter I and chapter II.

between *caecitate* and *acrior*, describing the results of the current blindness, and *acrior* is separated from its noun by a prepositional phrase and the causer of the persecution, the antichrist. The sentence then concludes by saying that some will be converted by Enoch and Elijah, but the rest will not; Bede contrasts these two groups.

This passage is an example of the emotionalism of Bede's writing. We know that he was a man who could be profoundly moved, as he himself witnessed in his prefatory letter to his commentary on Samuel, writing of Ceolfrith's departure.[69] Bede brings out many things here; the fear of Joseph, the horror of blindness, the bitterness of persecution. This, then is the function of the parallelism, chiasmus and hyperbaton, to excite a reaction in the reader. He uses emotionally loaded words such as *damnato* to create the initial atmosphere in the sentence. The hyperbaton (disruption of natural word order) brings out the key words, such as *caecitate*. This emphasis on key words allows the least Latinate of the audience to gain a flavour of the whole. We are seeing Bede's eagerness as a preacher to communicate with his flock, and his total concern for them. As he himself permitted, he is using the techniques of rhetoric to good effect; to sway his audience as Cicero used his Verrine orations to sway the Senate.[70]

Homily II.25 is very similar in structure to homily I.10 – we have an explanation of the feast (that of the dedication of a church), followed by an explanation of the reading, followed by an explanation of the significance of the feast, in the form of a commentary on the Temple. Unlike in I.10, Bede returns frequently to his audience, drawing them away from the previous close analysis to initiate a new analysis.

> Quia propitia diuinitate, fratres carissimi, sollemnia dedicationis ecclesiae celebramus debemus congruere sollemnitati quam colimus ut sicut ornatis studiosius eiusdem ecclesiae parietibus pluribus accensis luminaribus amplificato numero lectionum addita psalmorum melodia laetis noctem uigiliis ex more transegimus ita etiam penetralia cordium nostrorum semper necessariis bonorum operum decoremus ornatibus semper in nobis flamma diuinae pariter et fraternae caritatis augescat semper in sanctuario pectoris nostri caelestium memoia praeceptorum et euangelicae laudationis dulcedo sancta resonet. Hi sunt enim fructus bonae arboris hi boni thesauri cordis haec

---

[69] See Introduction, p. 1.
[70] Cicero, *The Verrine Orations*, ed. and trans. L. H. G. Greenwood, 2 vols. (London, 1928-35).

> fundamenta sapientis architecti quae nobis hodierna sancti euangelii lectio commendat non nos formam solummodo sed uirtutem potius habere pietatis. Quod etiam mystica ueteris instrumenti nobis historis diligenter insinuat quando Moyses tabernaculum uel templum domino Salomon in sanctae ecclesiae typum condidit.[71]

Once again we see Bede using adjectives and their nouns to enclose his clauses, as in *ornatis ... parietibus*,[72] *necessariis ... ornatibus*,[73] and *mystica ... historia*.[74] In this first case this renders the parsing considerably more difficult, as *parietibus* wraps up an ablative absolute, but it comes immediately before an ablative prepositional phrase *pluribus accensibus luminaribus*. The last case has Bede using a form of hyperbaton again: '**mystica** *veteris instrumenti* nobis **historia**'. These uses of hyperbaton have three functions: one, they provide a structural bracketing of clauses; two, they are ornamental; three, they can help indicate important words: in the last example, the key word is *historia*, which is postponed, attracting extra stress as the last word of a clause.

We see again Bede's use of repeated words to indicate structure;[75] we see also repeated structures as a hint to the reader in the sentences in lines 21-31.

> Ligna quoque erant inputribilia e quibus et tabernaculum omne factum et templum intus ornatum ac desuper tectum fulgebat. Aurum etiam de thesauro bono optimum proferebatur de quo et tabernaculi parietes intus ac foris uestiti et templi non tantum parietes uerum etiam laquearia trabes ostia postes et pauimenta erant cooperta. Sed et uasa uel utensilia domus utriusque cuncta paene aurea neque haec nisi de auro purissimo fieri licebat. Fructus etiam arborum qui in domum domini offerebantur purissimi et exquisiti esse iubebantur, hoc est uitis oliuae turis mirrae uel stactis et ceterarum huiusmodi.

The subjects for interpretation (also the subjects of the sentences), *ligna*, *aurum*, *fructus*, are the first words. For the first two, there is then a subclause containing a parallel construction, 'ligna .. a quibus et tabernaculum ... et templum';[76] 'aurum ... de quo et tabernaculi ... et templi'.[77] These constructions emphasise that both the temple and the tabernacle may exemplify the Church. *Fructus*, while at first appearing part of the same sequence, has a different subclause, and contains interpretations which will be picked up later, in the analysis of the

---

[71] II.25.1-17, p. 368.
[72] II.25.3-4.
[73] II.25.7.
[74] II.25.15.
[75] *semper...semper* in II.25.7-8.
[76] II.25.21-2.
[77] II.25.23-5.

reading, particularly the list of offerings *vitis olivae turis* ....[78] The *quae* which begins the next sentence, on line 31, refers to the interpretations given in lines 15-30; this sentence too contains hyperbaton: *verbam ... sinceritatem*.[79]

Bede later asks the audience two rhetorical questions.[80] It is such features, along with the constant use of first person plural verbs,[81] and the direct addresses to the *fratres carissimi*, which suggest that the homilies may have been designed to be heard, written for delivery to a Wearmouth-Jarrow audience, or written as a direct model for delivery to an audience. The more complex features are there to provide food for thought and meditation for the most able; the structure of the sentences opening up into the fullness of the homily's meaning. The complexity is not impenetrable; the grammar is always correct, and Bede has built in many helpful structures. Some scribes went further, using punctuation to help orient the reader. Were it not for the long arcs of thought, the homilies would not be so difficult to understand. Moreover, the simpler are provided for too, with emotive words. A similar phenomenon can be observed in Bede's metrical *Life of Cuthbert*. As Lapidge notes,

> This poetry of Bede can never have been easy to understand. Even with the anonymous *Life* [of St Cuthbert] as a guide, each line of verse often requires several readings before its meaning becomes clear…it is often extremely difficult, and was clearly intended to be so … Bede's poem was intended as a meditation on the life and significance of Cuthbert.[82]

I suggest that the homilies were written as meditations on the Gospels (in contrast with Bede's commentaries on them), and that his later commentaries (such as that on Ezra and Nehemiah) were also intended as meditations upon the subject, rather than primarily as an introductory guide to the entire book. This meditation could either proceed with a copy of the text in front of one, or as a piece to be heard in church, with snatches to be remembered and mulled over in private. Bede's Anglo-Saxon audience was still in many ways an oral culture, and we should remember that they would be more attuned to learning by heart, and remembering the spoken word.

---

[78] II.25.30.
[79] II.25.32.
[80] II.25.59; II.25.64.
[81] II.25.52.
[82] Lapidge, 'Bede's Metrical *Vita S. Cuthberti*', p. 93.

In order to help an audience understand that a sentence had ended, Bede may have used *clausulae*.[83]   According to the *OED*, a clausula is 'the close or end of a period, esp. one in ancient or medieval Latin having a definable cadence'.[84]   Cicero used Asiatic metres (dependent on syllable length, not stress) in his orations at the ends of his sentences.   As Oberhelman and others have pointed out, during the fourth and fifth centuries, accent created by syllable length (as in Classical Latin poetry, referred to throughout as metrical stress) became modified by stress accent (familiar to English-speakers in Shakespeare's iambic pentameter, referred to as rhythmical stress).   Metrical forms were chosen which could also be scanned rhythmically.   This form became known as the *cursus mixtus*.   By the twelfth century, stress accent was almost exclusively used, and this cadence form was primarily known as *cursus*. Authors between this time may have used either, both (*cursus mixtus*) or no form of cadence.   While, amongst others, Aumont has analysed some metrical clausulae used by fourth- to ninth-century authors, and Cupiccia has analysed Spanish authors from this period, no substantial analysis has yet been undertaken on Bede.[85]   This analysis is valuable not only because a clausula is useful 'oral punctuation' as it were, but also because Augustine, Ambrose and Jerome all used clausulae to a greater or lesser extent,[86] authors whose work Bede read keenly, and whose style he imitated to at least some extent.[87]

We can surmise that Bede observed the clausulae in their work – he was an able poet himself, able to manipulate both metre and rhythm, as demonstrated by his poetic life of Cuthbert and his hymns.[88]   Lapidge notes that Bede used sophisticated metrical techniques.[89]   This is in contrast with Aldhelm, who tended to stick to three of the sixteen possible forms of hexameter line in his poetry.[90]   Did Bede, then, make use of his observation, and use clausulae himself?   Bede does not discuss the form in either *De arte metrica* or *De schematibus et tropis*. Grocock has conducted a brief study of Bedan clausulae. He uses very small sample sizes, which may render his

---

[83] I am indebted to Professor Richard Sharpe for suggesting to me that Bede may have done this.

[84] *Oxford English Dictionary*, 2nd edn, (Oxford, 1989), headword: clausula, 2nd definition.

[85] J. Aumont, *Métrique et stylistique des clausules dans la prose latine: De Cicéron à Pline le Jeune et de César à Florus*, Travaux de Linguistique Quantative 56 (Paris, 1996); M. Cupiccia, 'Clausole quantitative e clausole ritmiche nella prosa latina della Spagna Visigotica', *Filologia Mediolatina* 8 (2001), 25-110.

[86] Oberhelman, *Rhetoric and Homiletics*, p. 87 (Jerome); p. 59 (Ambrose); pp. 96-7.

[87] See chapter II, p. 45.

[88] See for example, M. Lapidge, *Bede the Poet*, Jarrow Lecture (Jarrow, 1993).

[89] Lapidge, 'Bede's Metrical *Vita S. Cuthberti*, pp. 80-1.

[90] M. Lapidge, 'Aldhelm's Latin Poetry and Old English Verse', in his *Anglo-Latin Literature 600-899* (London, 1996), pp. 247-70, p. 252.

conclusions uncertain; however, he does suggest that Bede used clausulae, especially in his preface to the *HE*, a piece written in a high style.[91]

Bede's theological culture has been investigated. Investigations of Bede's literary culture have tended to focus on his debt to Vergil (or his reading of Cicero). An investigation of his use of cadences may shed light on other aspects of his literary culture in which he may have been influenced by his theological reading. As noted below, *cursus mixtus* was used in the liturgy which Bede used at Wearmouth-Jarrow. This too may have influenced him. Cadence is a part of Latin style which may not be immediately obvious to the modern ear; this study has been undertaken in order to provide an outline of Bede's use of cadence in the homilies, so that we may better appreciate his understanding of prose style.

In the past twenty years, a good deal of work has been done on the statistical analysis of clausulae.[92] The statistical method should at least be attempted, for Oberhelman has demonstrated that even a high percentage of cadence forms can arise by chance in Latin prose, and therefore a simple survey of the proportions of different types of clausulae may give misleading results.[93] Several methods have emerged which may be used to test the likelihood of Bede's having used various forms of clausulae. One of these was created by Janson, for the analysis of rhythmical prose, and relies on an internal comparison of the components of a clausula.[94] Another has been refined by Oberhelman, and is best used for determining whether a text is *cursus mixtus* or not, and in the process it can determine whether a text is either metrical or rhythmical. It relies on external comparison with a corpus of control texts.

Aumont uses a variety of complex techniques to determine the likelihood of the occurrence of various forms of metrical clausulae.[95] He pays great attention to the location of word breaks. This leads to a long and unwieldy process of analysis, in which the likelihood of each individual formation of a specific metric form is examined. This method was inappropriate for analysing Bede's use of clausulae in

---

[91] Grocock, 'Bede and the Golden Age', pp. 378-9.
[92] For the following discussion of statistical method, I am indebted to Mrs T. Allan, Senior Lecturer in Health and Care Statistics at City University, London, who provided me with instruction in the statistical sciences.
[93] Oberhelman, *Rhetoric and Homiletics*, pp. 1-18.
[94] T. Janson, *Prose Rhythm in Medieval Latin from the 9th to the 13th Century*, Acta Universitatis Stockholmiensis, Studia Latina Stockholmiensis XX (Stockholm, 1975), pp. 9-14.
[95] Aumont, *Métrique et stylistique*, pp. 15-35.

this study, as the amount of data is insufficient for the results to be significant.[96] He does, however, note the major problem with many of these statistical studies: there is a need to examine an author's lexicon for the metrical forms which may naturally arise.[97]

Janson's method is exclusively for the analysis of *cursus* rhythms, and it breaks down the stress patterns of final words into two components. He focusses exclusively on two-word clausulae, and for the purposes of rhythmical analysis, only two things need to be known: for the penultimate word, only its accent is relevant; for the final word, its accent and its length in syllables need to be known. The penultimate word may have three kind of stress: it may be a monosyllable (*1*); a stress on the penultimate syllable (in words of two or more syllables), known as a paroxytone stress (*p*); or a stress on the antepenultimate syllable (in words of three or more syllables), known as a proparoxytone stress (*pp*). For the final word, these same stresses are also noted, along with the number of syllables, with the exception that a bisyllabic final word is noted as *2*. So for the form *illum deduxit* we simply need to known that the first word is stressed on its penultimate syllable (so denoted as *p*) and the second word contains three syllables, with the stress on the second of these (so denoted as *3p*), giving a form of *p3p* for analysis.

Janson begins by asserting the problems of analysing a (presumed) rhythmical text in comparison with a known non-rhythmical one; he provides figures demonstrating that across authors, there are widely differing rhythmical patterns. He states that there is no such thing as a 'neutral distribution' of cadences against which to test.[98] His solution to that problem is to attempt an 'internal comparison'.

This method is intended to account for the fact that paroxytone-stressed words are more common than other forms in Latin, and will therefore appear more often in combinations.   First, the occurrence of each component of a combination (*p4p*, for example) must be determined, and converted into a proportion of total occurrences.[99] So in Bede, the form *p* in the penultimate word occurs 241 times out of the 367 cadences sampled, giving us a proportion of 65.6%. The form *4p* for the final word occurs 56 times out of 367, giving a proportion of 15.2%. Janson uses the

---

[96] Aumont, *Métrique et stylistique*, p. 61.
[97] Aumont, *Métrique et stylistique*, p. 65. As Aumont has noted, the future of such analysis almost certainly lies in the use of computers to allow researchers to handle a larger dataset.

[98] Janson, *Prose Rhythm*, p. 18.
[99] I use the data I have collected for Bede, presented in table 27, appendix B, p. 140.

rule that the probability of two unrelated events occurring separately is the product of the probability of the two individual events, so in this case, the probability of *p* multiplied by the probability of *4p*, which gives a proportion of 9.97%.[100] This gives the 'expected' result – that is, the proportion of cadences which we would expect to find in this form, *p4p*. When analysed as a proportion, we would expect to find 37 occurrences of this form out of the 367. Janson then goes on to use the χ^2 test to determine the likelihood that the difference between the expected number of occurrence (37) and the actual number of occurrences (39) is statistically significant. The χ^2 test is designed to test whether the occurrence of a particular factor is significant or not, by testing against an 'expected' frequency – that which we would expect to find in the sample through pure chance.[101]

There is an important problem with this method: it assumes that the forms of the penultimate and final words are unrelated. However, the two words are not unrelated; although Latin grammar allows for considerable freedom of word order, the choice of penultimate word is going to have some influence on the final word. This method is also subject to overtesting – for example, if one performs an analysis involving the form *p* too often, then one runs the risk of overestimating its influence in the text. A more cautious statistician would recommend multiplying the probabilities by the number of tests performed on the material to overcome this.[102]

Oberhelman's method is primarily for determining the presence of *cursus mixtus*, and may well prove fruitful for the analysis of Bedan cadences.[103] As Bede lived during the long transition between rhythmical and metrical poetry, so he may have done with prose. This method involves contrasting the text under consideration with metrical, non-metrical, rhythmical and non-rhythmical texts (these categories need not be entirely exclusive). In order to overcome the variation in cadence distribution noted by Janson, several different authors have been sampled, forming the controls for my analysis, against which I compare Bede's cadences. I have used

---

[100] 0.656×0.152=0.0997.

[101] See R. R. Pagano, *Understanding Statistics in the Behavioral Sciences* 3rd edn (St Paul, Minn., 1990), p. 403. See appendix B, equation 2, p. 148.

[102] This is known as the Bonferroni adjustment. Not all statisticians agree that it should be used, as it may give an excessively conservative answer. However, there is agreement that some adjustment should be used, to avoid false results through overtesting. J. M. Bland and D. G. Altman wrote an article discussing its use: 'Multiple Significance Tests: The Bonferroni Method', *British Medical Journal* 310 (1995), p. 170. This article is available online at http://bmj.bmjjournals.com/cgi/content/full/310/6973/170 , last accessed May 2005.

[103] Oberhelman, *Rhetoric and Homiletics*, pp. 9-19.

the data of Oberhelman, who samples texts by Cicero, Descartes, Polydore, Dante, Gilbert of Sempringham and John of Salisbury. He chose these texts based on previous studies showing their use of cadences: Polydore and Descartes are non-metrical, non-rhythmical authors; Cicero uses metrical cadences, but not rhythmical; Dante, Gilbert and John all use rhythmical cadences, but do not seek out metrical ones. Oberhelman demonstrates this while explaining his methodology.[104] This choice of control texts appears well thought out; Oberhelman has refined this method in several exploratory articles. Yet the sample is still imperfect – it is merely a tiny fraction of the Latin prose surviving in the world.

In many ways, Oberhelman's analysis is more cautious than Janson's, using conservative figures. For each control sample, a '99% confidence interval' has been taken.[105] This is a method which enables us to determine the likelihood that a given sample lies within the normal range. It is used to determine the expected frequencies in the control group, which are then tested against when performing the χ^2 test. However, there are minor inaccuracies in Oberhelman's text which lessen one's confidence in the analysis.[106]

Neither method is wholly reliable; however, Oberhelman's method provides a useful starting point for analysing texts, and supplying suggestions. I have nevertheless decided to use statistical methods as they are now commonly used for such analysis, and in any event, the raw data may be useful for future studies. In my analysis, I have sampled a random sentence from each page of the CCSL edition of Bede's homilies. I have not included sentences in which Bede is quoting from another source, nor any sentences where there would be a question of elision, as it is unclear what the general practice may have been at the time. Of the remaining sentences, samples were taken at approximately 25-line intervals. This provides a sample of 367 sentence ends for analysis (Oberhelman suggests a minimum of approximately 150).[107] I have scanned them, which provided a metrical pattern of long and short syllables, and a rhythmical pattern of stressed and unstressed syllables. The rhythmical patterns are noted both in terms of paroxytone and

---

[104] Oberhelman, *Rhetoric and Homiletics*, pp. 9-11, 15-17.
[105] See appendix B, equation 1, p. 133.
[106] There is an error in his table I, where the *medius* form is listed as occurring eighty-four times, when in fact it only occurs sixty-eight times, as given elsewhere in the table.
[107] Oberhelman, *Rhetoric and Homiletics*, p. 16.

proparoxytone stress, and in terms of the *cursus mixtus* forms (*planus*, *tardus*, etc.).[108] The metrical patterns are noted in terms of the Classical forms (cretic-spondee, ditrochee, etc.).[109] The raw data are found in tables 6, 7, and 27 in appendix B. The comparative data, taken from Oberhelman's tables, are found in tables 7 and 8, also in appendix B.

First, I tested Bede for rhythmicity; I tested the occurrence of *planus*, *tardus* and *velox* forms in Bede against those in Descartes, Polydore and Cicero (the non-rhythmical authors), and then against Dante, Gilbert and John of Salisbury (the rhythmical authors). I began by ascertaining the 99% confidence interval for the proportion of these forms in my control texts.[110] Then, I used the χ^2 test to ascertain Bede's rhythmicity.[111] Bede's homilies are significantly more rhythmical than the non-rhythmical control texts;[112] but are significantly less so than the rhythmical controls.[113] 65.3% of Bede's cadences contained a *planus*, *tardus* or *velox* rhythm, compared to 53.2% of the non-rhythmical control texts, and 79.5% of the rhythmical controls. Oberhelman suggests that unless the proportion of the three main rhythmical forms is more than 75%, further tests should be undertaken to determine rhythmicity.[114] Therefore, I then tested the occurrence of *trispondaicus* forms in Bede against those in the control texts,[115] with the results from Dante and John of Salisbury covered separately, as they both eschewed *trispondaicus* forms in their prose.

There are no significant differences between the frequency of *trispondaicus* forms in Bede and in the non-rhythmical control texts.[116] He does, however, use significantly more *trispondaicus* forms than Dante and John of Salisbury, which is to be expected.[117] However, there is no significant difference between Bede's use of

---

[108] Stressed syllables are represented by /, unstressed by x and lesser stressed syllables by \. *Planus* = / x x / x ; *tardus* = / x x / x x ; *velox* = / x x \ x / x ; *medius* = / x / x x ; *trispondaicus* = / x x x / x ; *dispondeus dactylicus* = / x x x / x x.

[109] See p. 83.

[110] See appendix B, tables 9-10, pp. 133-4.

[111] See appendix B, tables 18-19, p. 136.

[112] See appendix B, table 18, p. 136.

[113] Table 19, p. 136.

[114] Oberhelman, *Rhetoric and Homiletics*, p. 18.

[115] Table 20 (non-rhythmical control texts); table 21 (Dante and John); table 22 (Gilbert), pp. 150-1. Tables 11-13 set out the 99% confidence interval for these calculations, p. 147.

[116] Table 20, p. 137.

[117] Table 21, p. 137.

trispondaicus forms and that of Gilbert.[118] These figures suggest that Bede did in fact use *cursus* rhythms to help his audience notice a sentence end.

It is not immediately apparent that Bede was using *cursus mixtus*, as Oberhelman deems the raw proportions too small to determine this.[119] Therefore, I tested some of the more common metrical patterns: cretic spondee (- ˘ - ˘ x), dicretic (- ˘ - - ˘ x), ditrochee (˘ ˘ ˘ - ˘ - x), cretic-tribrach (- ˘ - ˘ ˘ x), dispondee (- - - x), spondee-cretic (- - - ˘ x) and cretic-iambus (- ˘ - ˘ - ˘ x).[120] I performed four tests, testing Bede against: Descartes and Polydore (non-metrical, non-rhythmical authors) Cicero (a metrical author); Dante and John, and Gilbert (these last three are non-metrical, but rhythmical authors). Once again, I separated Gilbert off in case his different rhythmical patterns caused a different proportion of metrical patterns to arise. I performed the χ^2 test,[121] and found no statistical difference in the global patterns employed by Bede and any of the control texts, except Gilbert, than whom Bede used significantly fewer metrical forms. Without further data then, it can be shown that Bede did use *cursus* forms, but he may not have used metrical, and therefore *cursus mixtus* forms; the results are inconclusive on this matter.

In order to understand Bede's use of rhythmical cadences, I attempted Janson's method of internal comparison. First, I generated the expected cadence forms, by multiplying the probabilities that each part of the cadence will occur separately, then performing a χ^2 test on the result.[122] There are three cadence forms which appear significant: *12*, *p2* and *pp2*. Bede uses a very high number of *12* forms according to this analysis, but uses far fewer *p2* forms than expected, given the popularity of *p*. For *pp2* he uses a higher than expected number. This suggests that Bede was fond of particular *2* forms. There is the problem that this assumes that the penultimate word does not influence the choice of final word, which is not necessarily the case, as there are grammatical constraints.[123] The assumption that the variables are independent has set up a situation in which it is impossible to measure

---

[118] Table 22, p. 138.
[119] Oberhelman, *Rhetoric and Homiletics*, pp. 18-9.
[120] See table 6 for the data for Bede, and table 7 for the control authors, p. 132.
[121] See tables 14-17, pp. 133-4 for the 99% confidence interval, and tables 23-26, pp. 138-140 for the test.
[122] See tables 28 and 29, pp. 153-4. I used the table for the significance thresholds given in Pagano, which gives the number which the χ^2 must exceed if it is to be significant. With one degree of freedom, where $\alpha = 0.05$, the χ^2 value must be greater than 3.81. (Pagano, *Understanding Statistics*, p. 533).
[123] See above, p. 80.

the cadences accurately. Therefore, I pursued another method of internal comparison, using McNemar's test.[124] This is a test designed to use matching pairs, in which the presence and absence of related factors can be measured. For each cadence form, a table is constructed thus:

	1 present	*1* not present	total
4p present	3	53	56
4p not present	27	284	311
total	30	337	367

When McNemar's test is performed,[125] the results give the likelihood that the result is due to chance: in this case 0.37%. Because of the multiple tests performed on the material, some adjustment must be made to account for this overtesting,[126] giving a result of 6.7%, which is slightly higher than the threshold value of the test, suggesting that it is not statistically significant. However, in cases where the result is significant, the entries in the off-diagonal cells (27 and 53 in the above example) will reveal Bede's preferred cadence.[127]

For the *14p, 13pp, 1 other, pp4pp* and *pp3p* cadences, McNemar's test suggests that their occurrences could simply be due to chance.[128] In all remaining cases, Bede prefers not to use cadences where the penultimate word is a monosyllable,[129] instead strongly favouring all cadences beginning with *p*. He also favours, though to a lesser extent, certain cadences beginning *pp*, (the *pp4p, pp3pp pp2* and *pp other* forms), despite their relative lack of frequency in Latin.[130]

While we have found useful information about Bede's use of individual cadences in his homilies, a weakness of this revised method is that it strips him of his context − his choices cannot be evaluated in the light of his sources or his contemporaries. This statistical research could be fruitfully expanded in other directions, for example using Oberhelman's method.

First, some other genres of Bede's writing could be surveyed; it is notable that Augustine, Ambrose and Gregory (Bede's stylistic models) tend not to use cadences in their sermons as much as in some of their other writings. This made the late Latin sermon a genre which did not necessarily attract the use of formal

---

[124] Equation 3, appendix B, p. 141.
[125] Table 30, p. 142.
[126] See above, p. 81.
[127] Equation 3, appendix B, p. 142.
[128] Tables 30 (p. 142), 33 (p. 143), 35 (p. 144), 43 (p. 148), 44 (p. 149).
[129] Tables 31 (p. 142), 32 (p. 143), 34 (p. 144).
[130] Tables 37-42 (pp. 145-8), 45-7 (pp. 149-52).

cadences. Second, a more extensive analysis of the homilies could be undertaken, to give a more complete data-set.[131] Ideally, this would include a survey of clausulae at clause endings, a feature which becomes prominent in the twelfth century, although it is entirely possible that they were used previously. Third, there could be a survey of the practice of Bede's contemporaries and near-contemporaries (such as Aldhelm and Alcuin) to see whether Bede is unique in his use of rhythmical cadences. There is still the problem of evaluating the reliability of the control texts, and adjusting for forms that occur naturally in Latin prose. Further data are likely to increase our understanding of how cadences function in prose.

The use of the cadences analysed in this chapter is not exclusive to Bede. He was certainly exposed to *cursus* rhythms in the liturgy, as well as in the works of the Church Fathers.[132] In particular, Bede's theology was greatly influenced by these fourth and fifth century authors. Their influence upon his style is equally important, and the likelihood that Bede used *cursus mixtus* suggests that he was influenced by their use of this feature.[133] The presence of these rhythms in the liturgy to which Bede was exposed is of particular interest when considering his homilies. West notes that Bede used phrases from the liturgy in his homilies;[134] might Bede not also have used their familiar cadences, to blend the homilies in more seamlessly? It seems likely that he has done so. My study, alongside Grocock's preliminary survey, suggests that we should look further to find cadences in Bede. Moreover, Bede's understanding of Classical culture has been much investigated in the past, but the question of whether he used metrical cadences should be a part of future investigation.

It can be seen that Bede's style is full of apparent contradictions: he may often write convoluted Latin sentences, but he has clearly mastered many aspects of Latin style. I have shown that he is highly likely to have used rhythmical cadences and there are strong suggestions that he may have used metrical cadences. He can use parallelism and chiasmus – rhetorical forms which occur in both Old English and Latin. According to Ray, Bede can use forensic rhetorical argument. Perhaps he is trying to form a new way of reading biblical commentary; he is providing a structure

---

[131] Grocock undertook a preliminary analysis. Grocock, 'Bede and the Golden Age', pp. 378-9.

[132] D. M. Hope, *The Leonine Sacramentary: A Reassessment of its Nature and Purpose* (Oxford, 1971), pp. 154-5.

[133] See p. 83 above.

[134] West, 'Liturgical Style and Structure in Bede's Homily for the Easter Vigil', pp. 6-8 and 'Liturgical Style and Structure in Bede's Christmas Homilies', pp. 437-8.

of many layers – some of which open up instantly and are apparent to the listener or reader at once, others which lie dormant until ruminated upon. As shown above, Bede attaches considerable importance to the idea of *ruminatio*;[135] perhaps he desires his readers to ruminate upon each sentence, to take the time to pick it apart and thus meditate upon it. This process, unfamiliar to the modern reader, was a part of life for many monastics.

---

[135] See Introduction, p. 7 and L. T. Martin, 'Bede's Structural Use of Word-Play as a Way to Teach', in *From the Cloister to the Classroom: Monastic and Scholastic Approaches to Truth*, ed. E. Rozanne Elder (Kalamazoo, 1986), pp. 27-46, p. 30.

Chapter IV: The Grammar of Legibility: A Manuscript from Wearmouth-Jarrow

We owe the term 'grammar of legibility' to Malcolm Parkes. In his opinion, the graphic distinctions introduced into copies of texts from the seventh century onwards indicate a new way of perceiving the text as a purely written entity. For Parkes,

> a written text presupposes an indeterminate audience disseminated over distance or time, or both. A scribe had no immediate respondent to interact with, therefore he had to observe a kind of decorum in his copy in order to ensure that the message of the text was easily understood. This decorum – the rules governing the relationships between this complex of graphic conventions and the message of a text conveyed in the written medium – may be described as "the grammar of legibility".[1]

So this term, 'grammar of legibility', can be used to describe the relationship between scribe and reader, a relationship in which the scribe anticipates the readers' needs in apprehending the text, and accommodates those needs by presenting the text in a particular manner.[2] However, this relationship between scribe and reader can also operate in more complex ways. The reader may become a glossator, and therefore become an intermediary between the scribe and subsequent readers. The need for this 'grammar of legibility' arose when new generations of readers in the more remote parts of Europe wished to read and consult ancient texts in what was for them an alien, second language.[3] The new problems found by those learning Latin sparked the corresponding development of new solutions: basic grammars were written, particularly in Southern England, and page layout was improved to help learners with what was for them a written language, not the language of everyday conversation.[4] Two important developments in page layout were the introduction of word-separation, discussed by Tunbridge in her doctoral thesis,[5] and the increasing use of punctuation.

---

[1] M. B. Parkes, *Pause and Effect: An Introduction to the History of Punctuation in the West* (Aldershot, 1992), p. 23. Chapter 2 of his book expands upon his article, 'The Contribution of Insular Scribes in the seventh and eighth centuries to the "Grammar of Legibility"', in his *Scribes, Scripts and Readers* (London, 1991), pp. 1-18.

[2] Or it can be used to describe the converse: how the scribe *fails* to accommodate these needs, and produces a near-illegible, near-incomprehensible text. Accuracy is an important part of the grammar of legibility – a legible text might have poor, mangled Latin.

[3] Parkes, *Pause and Effect*, p. 19.

[4] Parkes, *Pause and Effect*, p. 23. V. Law, *The Insular Latin Grammarians* (Woodbridge, 1982), especially ch. 4 and 5. Her 'Grammar, Latin (Study of)', in *The Blackwell Encyclopaedia of Anglo-Saxon England*, ed. M. Lapidge *et al.* (Oxford, 1999), pp. 217-8, contains a useful summary.

[5] Tunbridge, *A Study of Scribal Practices*, pp. 127-35.

Punctuation is essentially a guide to interpretation, and it is a phenomenon of written language, though a text may be pointed with stress marks for reading aloud.[6] The beginnings of punctuation lie with the teachers of grammar, who made an exposition of a text to their pupils. Either teacher or pupil would mark up the text, indicating where words should be separated or linked, the vowel length and pauses. Grammatical treatises and commentaries were written, and copies of the text marked up, to aid comprehension.[7] By the sixth century, scribes began to insert punctuation into their texts.[8]

Isidore of Seville (*c*.560–636) in his *Etymologiae* describes a system of punctuation similar to that first set out by Donatus. It used points of various heights (*distinctiones*), and related them to the rhetoricians' parts of discourse.[9] It will be shown later on that points at various heights are by no means irrelevant to the system of punctuation in the eighth-century manuscript which is discussed later in this chapter. Some readers required help not only with sentence boundaries, but also with the boundaries of the clauses within it; the *distinctiones* were intended to provide this help. By this time, the *diple* (a mark rather like a bass clef) had a special function – it was used to indicate Scriptural quotations; we shall encounter this later. A new feature, the *positura*, was used to separate section ends from beginnings; it was a mark indicating the larger structure of a work, rather than the grammatical units. This indicates that scribes were working on ways of marking off larger units of a text.[10] The *Liber etymologiarum* was immensely influential in the Early Middle Ages, particularly among the Irish. With their new minuscule scripts, these new conventions developed.[11] The Anglo-Saxons learnt 'the practices of word-separation, layout and punctuation from Irish teachers.'[12] At Wearmouth-Jarrow, the scriptorium introduced a hierarchy of scripts, using capitular uncial and insular minuscule to distinguish parts of the text, using scripts modelled on those found in their books

---

[6] L. Boyle, *"Vox paginae": An Oral Dimension of Texts* (Rome, 1999), p. 25.

[7] Parkes, *Pause and Effect,* pp. 11-13.

[8] Parkes, *Pause and Effect*, p. 16.

[9] Isidore, *Isidori Hispalensis episcopi etymologiarum sive originum libri xx*, (*Etymologiae*), ed. W. M. Lindsay (Oxford, 1911), I.xx.2.

[10] Isidore, *Etymologiae*, I,xxi.13.

[11] B. Bischoff, 'Die europäische Verbreitung der Werke Isidors von Sevilla', in *Isidoriana: colleción de estudios sobre Isidoro de Sevilla*, ed. M. C. Díaz y Díaz (Leon, 1961), pp. 317-44, especially pp. 327-36. This is particularly true at Wearmouth-Jarrow, where scribes tended to follow their exemplars faithfully, and it is only with the introduction of minuscule scripts that we find the regular use of punctuation. See further Tunbridge, *Scribal Practices*, pp. 217-27.

[12] Parkes, *Pause and Effect*, p. 26.

imported from Italy.[13] The system of *distinctiones* was not the only system in use: there was punctuation *per cola et commata*, which was used by Jerome in the Vulgate Bible; that was primarily a matter of layout, not of marks, though it too was based upon marking out clauses.[14]

The systems in use were by no means consistent, even if they were derived from the same source. This is true even of manuscripts produced at Wearmouth-Jarrow.[15] By the Carolingian era, new systems of punctuation had begun to displace *distinctiones*, which can be seen in some of the manuscripts discussed in chapter V.[16]

One may see many features pertaining to the 'grammar of legibility' in the layout of Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Bodley 819, a particularly interesting manuscript for several reasons.[17] It is a copy of Bede's Commentary on Proverbs, dating from the first half of the eighth century,[18] copied in scripts associated with Wearmouth-Jarrow, Bede's own monastery.[19] It is the only manuscript of one of Bede's biblical commentaries to survive in a copy from his own monastery.[20] There are no such manuscripts of the homilies which survive, making Bodley 819 a useful study of how Bede's exegetical writing was presented by scribes from his own monastery not long after his death. It appears to be the work of one scribe, with

---

[13] Parkes, *Pause and Effect*, p. 26.

[14] The *cola et commata* system is most useful for those reading aloud, and it was, in my opinion designed for that very purpose. On this system, see Parkes, *Pause and Effect*, p. 16.

[15] The Codex Amiatinus is laid out *per cola et commata*, whereas the manuscripts in insular minuscule contain points.

[16] See pp. 108-111 below, for example.

[17] The discussion which follows develops part of my paper, 'Bede: Educating the Educators of Barbarians', *Quaestio: Selected Proceedings of the Cambridge Colloquium in Anglo-Saxon, Norse and Celtic* 3 (2002).

[18] Parkes, *Pause and Effect*, p. 181. Other, later dates have been suggested, for example s.viii², by T. J. Brown, in 'Late Antique and Early Anglo-Saxon Books' in *Manuscripts at Oxford: R. W. Hunt Memorial Exhibition*, ed. A. C. de la Mare and B. C. Barker-Benfield (Oxford, 1980), pp. 11-14, p. 14. For a discussion of Bede's Commentary on Proverbs, and its use of Salonius of Vienne, see Laistner, 'The Library', pp. 136-38.

[19] M. B. Parkes, *The Scriptorium of Monkwearmouth-Jarrow*, Jarrow Lecture (Jarrow, 1982), p. 12. In this lecture, Parkes also discusses the punctuation of other manuscripts from the same monastery.

[20] The other surviving manuscripts (listed by Parkes, *The Scriptorium*, pp. 3-4 and p. 12) are Bible fragments: London, British Library, Additional MSS 37777 and 45025, Loan 81 (Kingston Lacy fragment), and Loan 74 (The Stonyhurst Gospel); Utrecht, University Library MS 32, ff. 94-115; Durham, Cathedral Library, MS A.II.17, ff. 103-11; supply leaves in Würzburg, Universitätsbibliothek, MS Mp.Th.F.68 manuscripts of the *HE* (including the Moore Bede, Cambridge, University Library, MS Kk.v.16 and the Leningrad Bede, St Petersburg, M. E. Saltykov-Schedrin Public Library, MS Lat. Q.v.1.18) and London, British Library, MS Cotton Tiberius A XIV; fragments of *DTR*, Bückeburg, Niedersächsisches Staatsarchiv, dep. 3, Bedafragment III-VI B plus Münster-in-Westfalen, Staatsarchiv, MSC I 234, ff. 1v and 12v, and Darmstadt, Hessische Landes- und Hochschulbibliothek, MS 4262; as well as a fragment of Gregory's *Moralia in Iob*, New Haven, Yale, Beinecke Library, MS 516.

some contemporaneous corrections in a second hand. In the tenth century it was glossed, probably by Aldred, the glossator of the Lindisfarne Gospels (London, British Library, MS Cotton Nero D.IV).[21] Alterations 'to punctuation and abbreviations were made at Durham Cathedral Priory in the twelfth century, in preparation for the copying of London, British Library, MS Harley 4688, using this manuscript as an exemplar.'[22] It was also on this occasion that the text of f. 74 was recopied, as the script on this leaf dates from the twelfth century,[23] and the ink appears to correspond with that used in the alterations to the punctuation.[24] There are 115 folios. The manuscript is incomplete, lacking at least the first quire and the outer sheet of the second quire, several sheets of Book III and the outer sheet of the final quire. The quires are formed of gatherings of four bifolia, and there were originally 16 quires, as can be determined from the quire numbering. The second quire (now the first), has lost some leaves, and the remaining ones have been rearranged, so that the penultimate folio is now the first, disrupting the order of the text. At the end of some quires, the number of the following quire has a quire marking, surrounded by a decoration of leaves.[25] The ending of the second quire (now the first quire) is not marked, and this is the case for most of the quires. The numbering is very erratic, with some numbers added in the twelfth century, and some of the original quire numbers also remaining.

The text is beautifully laid out and is very easy to read. There are twenty-two lines to a page. Occasionally at the last line of a page, a word is added, or the end of a word is added, for example, as at f. 4r, where the -mur of *percepimur* is found below the final line. The *lemmata* from the text of Proverbs are copied in 'the Amiatinus form of Capitular Uncial', while 'the commentary was copied in the

---

[21] T. J. Kendrick, *et al.*, ed., *Evangeliorum quattuor codex Lindisfarnensis: MS BL Cotton Nero D.IV*, 2 vols. (Lausanne, 1960), vol. II, p. 33.

[22] T. J. Brown, 'Late Antique and Early Anglo-Saxon Books', p. 14. Following the designations in the CCSL edition, I shall call the four hands I identify in this manuscript O^1, the scribe of the main text; O^2, the hand of the eighth-century corrector (possibly the same person as the scribe); O^3, the hand of Aldred; and O^4, the hand of the twelfth century editor who prepared the manuscript for copying.

[23] F. Madan and H. H. E. Craster, *A Summary Catalogue of Western Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library at Oxford* (Oxford, 1933), vol. II part I, p. 502, no. 2699.

[24] Images of small portions of the manuscript may be found in Parkes' *The Scriptorium*, p. 13, f. 16; the rest of this leaf can be seen in his *Pause and Effect*, pp. 180-81; T. J. Brown in 'Late Antique and Early Anglo-Saxon Books', has a facsimile of f. 11r on p. 1; and a part of f. 29r is reproduced in E. A. Lowe's *Codices Latini Antiquiores* (Oxford, 1934-72), II. 235. All these reproductions are in black and white, which makes it almost impossible to see contrast in the ink colours used.

[25] For example, ff. 11v, 19v, 26v.

distinctively disciplined Wearmouth-Jarrow minuscule'.[26] The *lemmata* are distinguished from the commentary in two further ways: firstly, in the margin beside the first line of the *lemma* we find a *diple* (and often a smaller *diple, which looks more like* ꜧ, by the side of the other lines); secondly, at the transition from text to commentary and back again, there is the *hedera*, which is leaf-shaped.[27] The *hederae* were sometimes later erased.[28] The smaller *diple* may also be seen in the margin opposite lines of the commentary which contain biblical quotations, for example on f. 16v, where Bede quotes Ps. 28:12, *quia tenebrae non obscurabuntur*.[29] While these are found throughout the manuscript, they do not mark out every quotation from scripture, but merely serve as an occasional guide.[30] The scriptural quotations embodied in the text, though occasionally marked out with small *diple*, are in the same minuscule script as the rest of the commentary, not in the uncial of the *lemma*.

The *lemmata* are not always laid out as one might expect from the sequence in the Vulgate or Vetus Latina Bible. While the verses are cited in order, the physical arrangement of a given verse may have its words in an unexpected sequence. The last lines of the lemma sometimes appear before the beginning of the verse quoted, on the line above.[31]

So the lemma can run :

> text of commentary: Γ LEMMA ROW II OR III
> **B**EGINNING OF LEMMA
> LEMMA ROW II text of commentary

For example:

> ……Γ LOCUTA EST
> **Q**UIS EST PARVULUS DECLINET AD ME ET UECORDI

The start of the *lemma* is still marked out with the large *diple*. The fact that some of the *lemma* is displaced is indicated with a *paragraphus* (indicated in the example above with the Γ symbol). This arrangement seems to be used in order to use the space as efficiently as possible. However, this *paragraphus* and the large

---

[26] Parkes, *The Scriptorium*, p. 12.
[27] Parkes, *The Scriptorium*, p .12.
[28] See below, p. 100.
[29] *In Proverbia Salomonis*, ed. D. Hurst, CCSL 119B (Turnholt, 1983), I.v.139.
[30] See for example, f. 14v; CCSL 119B, p. 50, I.v.74.
[31] For an example, see f. 28r, line 15, CCSL 119B, p. 64, I.ix.65.

initial at the beginning of the line, allow one to follow the order of the text even though at first sight it seems slightly displaced.

There are no abbreviations used in the *lemmata*. The words themselves are unshortened, although Bede does not include all of the text of Proverbs, and some of this text was filled in later by Aldred. The *lemmata* thus appear to be the primary means of navigating the text.

The commentary is written in insular minuscule. The word-separation is relatively clear, though not always sufficiently large, it appears, for the twelfth-century editor,[32] who inserted fine lines indicating where two words close together should be separated.[33] These fine lines can also be found separating words in the *lemmata*. The prepositions are usually attached to the next word, and the twelfth century editor has occasionally separated them. But in most respects, the word divisions are as one would expect from modern custom. Apart from that, abbreviations are used relatively sparingly, though they are not eschewed altogether. Such abbreviations as are used are not used consistently. One will not find *est* abbreviated at all places, nor *autem* nor *quod*, though these are commonly abbreviated, as is final -m. More rarely *ergo* and *enim* are abbreviated.

The overall structure of the work is indicated for the reader. Each book begins with an elaborate initial letter. The initial of the first book has of course been lost as the first quire no longer exists. However, books II and III begin with their own initials. So on f. 29r there is a large initial 'P', and on f. 74v there is an initial 'H'. Both these exhibit typical features of insular art of that time, and are very reminiscent of the vine scrolls found on the binding of the Stonyhurst Gospel and the interlaces of the Lindisfarne Gospels. The books also have an incipit: book II begins: *incipit liber ii*. At the beginning of book III the incipit is written in silver ink. It seems unique in the period to use such high-grade ink for an incipit, but the script is undoubtedly contemporary. With the incipit phrase there is also a small decoration of leaves, slightly different from the leaves found as decoration round the quire numbering and the *hedera*, ♠. The decoration is also very slightly different for each book.

---

[32] This editor is designated as O^4 in the CCSL edition. See below, pp. 99-101.

[33] For example, see f. 17v.

The hierarchy of the structure is further indicated by the initial 'M' used to begin the *Mulierem fortem* section, which begins on f. 105v and completes the work.[34] All the other biblical *lemmata* begin with identically sized capitals; it is only at the beginning of the books and at the beginning of the *Mulierem fortem* section that we have varying sized initials. The 'M' is not decorated at all, it is simply rather larger than usual, descending two lines instead of one. This makes it considerably smaller than the decorated initials used to begin the books, which are approximately six lines in height. The *Mulierem fortem* section was frequently copied on its own, and often travelled separately from the rest of the work.[35] The larger initial letter at the beginning of the *lemma* for that section indicates that very early on this section was recognised as in some way marked out from the rest, if not that it was so distinguished by Bede himself. This section is a beautiful piece of ecclesiological exegesis, which was of particular interest to medieval readers, and was often copied in the twelfth century.

Furthermore, smaller divisions are from time to time indicated by a small insular 'g' in the margin at the beginning of each new chapter of Proverbs, for example at ff. 13v[36] and 17r.[37] The marks become sparser as one moves through the manuscript, and after f. 50, they virtually disappear. For the most part, they correspond with modern chapter breaks, perhaps beginning the subdivisions which Hurst uses in his edition, where the books are divided according to the chapters of Proverbs. The reason the 'g' is used as the marker is unclear.

There are other features of note, one of which I have been unable to date, and that is what resembles a capital 'I' in red ink alongside the *lemma* at f. 83v.[38] I am unable to determine the significance of this. It is presumably some kind of highlighting mark, though I have not been able to ascertain why this particular verse deserves special attention.

On f. 17v there is some Greek included in the text.[39] It is marked over the top with a scroll decoration. This again is a way of highlighting an unusual or potentially difficult feature of the text. The Greek is very carefully and accurately written, and

---

[34] CCSL 119B, p. 149, III.xxxi.74.

[35] See Laistner and King, *A Hand-list*, pp. 56-67. They date Bodley 819 to s.viii-ix.

[36] CCSL 119B, p. 49, I.v.1.

[37] CCSL 119B, p. 52, I.vi.1.

[38] CCSL 119B, p. 128, III.xxv.145.

[39] CCSL 119B, p. 53, I.vi.27, where the Greek is written as three words, unlike the manuscript where there is no separation.

is then translated for us by Bede. There are other places in the text where Bede uses a Greek word, but this manuscript does not always use Greek letters there, perhaps indicating that the exemplar was harder to read, or that Bede was not consistent in his use of Greek script in his autographs.[40] This may support the idea that he was often dictating his work.

The overall impression of the manuscript is that it was designed to be particularly easy to read. For example at one point, there is a hole in the vellum (f. 28r). The scribe has had to break up the word *divinare* around the hole and he has marked a set of dots over the imperfection in the vellum in order to lead the eye across to continue reading.[41] This is a very unusual scribal aid to readers. This indicates that in Wearmouth-Jarrow, there was great consideration given to the readability of a text – that they were aware of the need for a 'grammar of legibility'.

This manuscript also contains corrections which are contemporary with the main text. This can be seen at f. 2v, line 1, and f. 20r line 20, where *divinae* is added above the line. The ink is dark, whereas the tenth-century glossator's ink on this folio is much lighter. The 'a' is open-topped, which is characteristic of Anglo-Saxon hands of this period, and the 'd' and 'e' have the same form as the letters of the main hand, and are dissimilar to O^3 (Aldred) and O^4 (the twelfth-century editor). This can also be seen on f. 1r where one can see that one word, *populo*, has been added by O^4 above the line; however there has also been a correction in an insular minuscule hand, O^2 (the eighth-century corrector). The pen used is very fine and, on some of the folios where there is discolouration, this makes it particularly difficult to distinguish in some cases between the ink of the corrector and alterations made by the subsequent glossator and editor. Where the corrector adds a word, three small dots lead up to the added word from between the two words between which it should be inserted. These are reminiscent of the symbol used by proof-readers today to indicate an addition above the line. This speaks of consideration for the reader and of an effort to enable the reader to grasp more readily the meaning of the text, even when the scribe has made an error. The eighth-century corrector's hand can also be seen at several other places where corrections have been made, though it cannot

---

[40] See for example CCSL 119B, p. 61, I.vii.63, where Bodley 819 (manuscript O) has *yperifanos* in Roman letters.

[41] Dots are a decorative feature frequently used in Hiberno-Saxon art. They can be found surrounding the initial letters of the Lindisfarne Gospels.

always be identified certainly.[42] Quite often the correction is of an 'e' to an 'i' at the end of a third declension noun or adjective. It is much more difficult to demonstrate that this correction is contemporaneous with the text as the forms of the letters are not sufficiently different from that of later hands for one to be certain, especially on folios where the later inks are dark, or on discoloured folios. However, in the light of other indications one can assume that at least some of these corrections are due to the early Anglo-Saxon corrector rather than any of his successors.

At f. 82v, line 17, there is a small *signe de renvoi* indicated in the middle of the line, and in the margin we have *apostolus* in the hand of the corrector. The spacing here is such that *apostolus* would have interfered with the letters in words on either side of it, as it is such a long word, and therefore the corrector has carefully moved it out to the margin.

It is possible that this corrector should be identified with the scribe. However, I do not think the two hands are sufficiently alike, though there is very little text from which to make an accurate comparison of letter-forms.

When one considers the punctuation, it can be seen that most points are contemporaneous with the main hand, and that they are in the same ink. As a general rule, points appear to be in the eighth-century ink and pen, rather than in those of later annotators. This can most easily be seen on f. 19-20, where the glossator's ink is much lighter, as is that of the twelfth-century editor, whereas the eighth-century ink is very dark. As previously mentioned, on some folios, particularly towards the beginning and the end of the manuscript, the parchment has darkened sufficiently so that the ink colours are much more difficult to distinguish. And on any given folio in between, the glossator's ink can be lighter or darker, or the original scribe's ink can be lighter or darker, thus making it difficult to distinguish between the two. However, having obtained the general principle from the folios where the distinction is very clear, one can examine the more difficult leaves in the light of this. In the oldest ink, we find points at two heights: on the base line and above the line, slightly below the level of the main body of the letters. These points do not necessarily

---

[42] For example, at f. 20r, line 11, and f. 112 r. 112r can certainly be identified as the eighth-century corrector, but at 20r, line 11 it is less easy to be sure.

correspond to the breaks that we as modern readers would make; however, they are used very consistently.

The points that are used have certain syntactic functions. A point is mainly used at the close of a syntactic unit containing a verb, whether in the indicative or subjunctive, whether in a main or subordinate clause. We can see the points marking the end of a main clause at f. 83v.[43] We can see also at the beginning of f. 13v[44] how the point is used to mark out subordinate clauses.

The point is not used to show *all* subordinate clauses in a sentence, though it is often used for that purpose. It is not used to mark out clauses containing gerunds, gerundives or other participle forms unless there is part of the verb *esse* either written or assumed, converting it into a main verb. The point is not always placed directly after the verb, but after whatever is included within the whole verb-clause, including any noun phrases or adjectives that may follow the verb. Thus it renders slightly easier one of the more difficult features of Bede's Latin, which is the occasional postponement of a noun or adjective to a position after the verb with which it belongs.[45]

The point also marks paratactic constructions, clauses connected by *et*, *-que*, or *sed*, for example f. 17v, lines 20-1.[46] The point can be used to mark balanced clauses, as shown previously, or even, as in this case, phrases. This parataxis, the marking out of parallel phrases, the juxtaposition, rather than the subordination of two simple clauses to produce a desired effect, is perhaps influenced by Old English grammar, where parataxis is common.[47] *Et* is considered a reasonable word to be used at the beginning of a clause continuing the commentary, and it is set up as a point of conjunction around which the larger structure (whether a sentence or a clause) works. For example, at f. 14v, line 5,[48] the point is functioning almost as a

---

[43] CCSL 119B, p. 128, III.xxv.147.

[44] CCSL 119B, p. 49, I.v.29-34.

[45] Bede may be postponing these words in order to use clausulae, the rhythmical form which indicates a clause ending. In order to have a valid clausular rhythm, the order verb+noun or verb+adjective must normally be used.   See chapter III for further analysis.

[46] CCSL 119B, p. 53, I.vi.25-6.

[47] B. Mitchell and F. C. Robinson, *A Guide to Old English*, 5th edn. (Oxford, 1992), p. 100. Another feature of Old English poetic composition is frequent repetition of an idea in different words. This is found in the homilies – perhaps indicating that they were intended to be read aloud.   Bede's use of parataxis and subordination deserves more attention. Might the use of the point to indicate parataxis as well as subordination indicate that the two were considered broadly equivalent in their grammatical function, with the point indicating a relationship between two clauses, not necessarily the *nature* of that relationship (*i.e.*, whether the clauses are paratactic or subordinate)?

[48] CCSL 119B, p. 50, I.v.67.

semi-colon. Yet points are not always used to mark out balancing clauses around *et*, as we can see at f. 14v, lines 11-12: 'merito scilicet fidei et scientiae maioris'.[49] The points are also used to mark off asides, as is shown at f. 14v. lines 6-7, where the points bracket off a phrase where Bede says 'id est conventum plurimorum ad invicem.'[50]

The points can also be used to mark out scriptural quotations, for instance at f. 14v. lines 13-14.[51] Here the point marks the beginning of the quotation, after Bede has said 'dicit Deus . Congregetur aqua in congregationem unam.', and the end of the quotation where Bede returns to direct commentary. They are not always used to mark out all of the scriptural quotation, for example at f. 16v,[52] where the points mark the grammatical breaks, as the quotation is wholly assimilated into the main text. Nor are they used throughout the manuscript; particularly towards the end of the manuscript where the punctuation is generally sparser (though still present), they are not used for this purpose. However, the very occurrence of this at all aids the reader in picking their way through the grammar, since the grammar of the quotations can step outside the grammar of the rest of Bede's sentence, as it is treated as direct speech. Without punctuation this would be difficult to read, as it could appear that there were too many verbs or subjects for one sentence.

The punctuation does not follow the system delineated in Isidore's *Liber etymologiarum*[53] or in Augustine's *De doctrina Christiana* IV.vii.11 where he talks about *membra* and *caesus*.[54] Though Bede undoubtedly knew both these texts, at least through extracts, the points do not match the systems described, since in Bodley 819 there is no differentiation of the height of the points to indicate different clauses in the sentence. In fact the actual height of the points seems to be rather random, grammatically speaking. While on one folio one might think one can discern a given system, on another folio it does not work consistently, or is inverted. It seems that the height of the point is more determined by the letters that surround it than by grammatical usage. If a letter has a particularly curved tail or a strong cross stroke,

---

[49] CCSL 119B, p. 50, I.v.72-3.
[50] CCSL 119B, p. 50, I.v.68.
[51] CCSL 119B, p. 50, I.v.74.
[52] CCSL 119B, p. 51, I.v.139-40.
[53] Isidore, *Etymologiae* I.xx. Parkes, in *Pause and Effect*, gives a cogent summary on pp. 21-2.
[54] *Saint Augustine: On Christian Doctrine*, trans. D. W. Robertson, Jr, (Indianapolis, 1958), pp. 124-5, with examples on pages 125-32. *Membra* and *caesus* are synonymous with *cola* and *commata*.

the point will be placed in such a location where it cannot be confused with the flourish on the letter. So while this system might not have the full versatility of a three- or even a two-height system of *distinctiones*, what it does have is a guarantee of legibility. And in a sense, the differentiation of the grammatical clauses is not so important once one has identified that points mark out clauses, as at a stroke this renders the whole work much easier to read. Once one has discovered which words are surrounding which verb, the precise nature of that clause in relation to those around it is much easier to determine. The use of the punctuation is thus in keeping with the attitude to the reader displayed in the rest of the manuscript.

The third hand which we find in this manuscript is the hand of the tenth-century glossator, found on folios 1-50. This is Aldred's hand, identified by Julian Brown in the facsimile edition of the Lindisfarne Gospels.[55] He lists sixteen points of comparison between Aldred's handwriting in the Lindisfarne Gospels, the Durham Ritual (Durham, Cathedral Library, MS A.IV.19) and Bodley 819.[56] T. J. Brown has extensively described the nature of the glosses and the identification of the hand. Aldred's hand mostly expands the *lemmata* so that on the folios that he has worked on, we have a complete text of Proverbs. Secondly, there is a small amount of exegesis of both *lemma* and commentary, introduced by the words *id est*. It may be his hand that introduced some of the marginal crosses – there are two forms of the marginal cross: one with bars across the end and one without. The ones without the bars seem to be the older, see for example ff. 11r and 21r.[57] The later crosses are almost certainly from the twelfth century, see for example ff. 13v and 17v.[58] I presume that the crosses are there to point out verses of especial interest to the reader. Aldred's hand in this manuscript provides one of our best pieces of evidence for assuming that this manuscript was, as Gneuss says, at Chester-le-Street before it went to Durham.[59] His glosses indicate that in Chester-le-Street there may have been a desire for a complete text of the Bible book within a biblical commentary – to have the whole biblical text visible in the manuscript as it was being read, accompanied by

---

[55] Kendrick, *Evangeliorum*, vol. II, pp. 33-6.

[56] Kendrick, *Evangeliorum*, vol. II, pp. 33-6; T. J. Brown *et al*., ed., *The Durham Ritual: A Southern English Collectar of the Tenth Century with Northumbrian Additions. Durham Cathedral Library A.IV.19*, Early English Manuscripts in Facsimile 16 (Copenhagen, 1969).

[57] CCSL 119B, I.iv.52 and I.vii.1.

[58] CCSL 119B, p. 49, I.v.40, and p. 52, I.vi.4.

[59] H. Gneuss, *Handlist of Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts: A List of Manuscripts and Manuscript Fragments Written or Owned in England up to 1100*, Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies 241 (Tempe, 2001), no. 604.

additional notes to explore the *lemma* and commentary which were desired. This may suggest that some readers were having problems dealing with Bede's work, or it may be that Aldred was writing notes for himself; no colophon survives, but the first and last leaves of the manuscript are lacking, and they might not have been so when Aldred was at work. But why did Aldred gloss in Latin? His Gospel glosses are in Old English. Perhaps it was because an Old English gloss of the Gospels was needed for a large number of readers, all of whom should have some knowledge of the Gospels. However, Bede's commentary on Proverbs was of much more limited interest, and so any comments could be made in Latin, as someone who had poor Latin was unlikely to be reading it, and could more profitably be studying the relatively easy Latin of the Gospel text.

In the twelfth century, the manuscript was certainly in Durham, as that is where Harley 4688 was written and that manuscript was copied from Bodley 819.[60] At that point, as T. J. Brown suggests, the manuscript was worked over in preparation for copying and the punctuation was completely revised, the abbreviations were altered. The quire numbers were emended. The fine lines, as mentioned above, were introduced to demonstrate where word separation should occur, as the corrector clearly thought that the copyist would need this extra assistance to provide a legible manuscript for a twelfth-century audience. The punctuation was changed to the system that was then current throughout most of Western Europe. This was first found in liturgical texts in the eighth century. It consisted of four main symbols: the *punctus elevatus*, *punctus flexus*, *punctus interrogativus* and *punctus versus*.[61] The origins of these symbols, known as *positurae*, are obscure, yet they fulfilled the need for 'more accurate indication of the nature of pauses required to elucidate the sense of a text when it was to be intoned or sung in the liturgy.'[62] The earliest securely dated *positurae* are from the 780s, and were further developed at the court of Charlemagne, where their clarity made them most useful to the correctors of manuscripts.[63]

---

[60] As mentioned above, p. 90, n.22.
[61] Parkes *Pause and Effect*, p. 36. A depiction of these symbols can be found on p. 302.
[62] Parkes, *Pause and Effect*, p. 36.
[63] Parkes, *Pause and Effect*, pp. 36-7.

When the punctuation was edited, the *punctus elevatus* and *punctus versus* were added to the existing point. One can see where a low point has been turned into the tail of a *punctus versus*, or a high point into the uplift of the *punctus elevatus*, or simply where an existing point has a tail added above or below it. The *hederae* are sometimes erased and repunctuated with *puncti versi*, or a *punctus versus* is added as well as the *hedera*, as Parkes has already shown.[64] Quire numbers, especially of later quires, are erased; the leaves, however, are usually left, indicating where the erasure has occurred, and the new quire numbers added, though outside the area marked out by the leaves, see for example, f. 111v. Sometimes the original quire numbering is left untouched, and the new number added below and to one side, as it is at f. 19v.

The abbreviations are frequently altered, for example on ff. 4r and 5r we can see that the abbreviations for *ergo*, *autem* and *quod* are usually changed. The abbreviation for *est* is left unaltered – it was still current and well understood, but the earlier Insular abbreviations had been changed to more modern versions, as they were dissimilar enough to cause confusion, particularly the q- initial abbreviations.[65]

The spelling of the manuscript is also altered. One interesting example is at f. 23r, line 6, where *temtat* is corrected to *temptat*. Similarly at f. 9r line 12, *inrident* is corrected to *irrident* – that particular correction is very common, where by the twelfth century, assimilation of the two consonants had occurred and the etymological origin of the word had become slightly obscured. The spelling must have seemed rather archaic, though this lack of assimilation of these consonants can be seen in his work on spelling, *De orthographia*.[66] All this indicates a particular concern for the legibility of the text in the twelfth century, and how a medieval reader is able to interact with that text, continuing the tradition of the scriptorium of Jarrow. To the twelfth-century editor, it was quite clear that for a current readership, a manuscript could not have old-fashioned abbreviations and unusual spelling and what they would have considered to be an inadequate system of punctuation.

The system of punctuation introduced by the twelfth-century editor is much more sophisticated than that of the eighth. There are four marks that can be found;

---

[64] Parkes, *The Scriptorium*, p. 12.

[65] This indicates that the editor of the manuscript was familiar with the older forms, as well as the modern ones. Perhaps this indicates that Durham at that time still had a number of early Insular manuscripts, and that at least some of the monks at Durham were aware of the conventions governing their presentation.

[66] See Bede, *De orthographia*, ed. C. W. Jones, CCSL 123A (Turnholt, 1975), pp. 30-31.

one is the simple point. This is usually left untouched from the eighth-century original. There seem to be very few, if any, points added in the twelfth century. We also find the *punctus elevatus*, which is mostly a new addition; the *punctus versus*, which is usually a conversion of an existing point; and an eighth-century point over a *virgula plana* ⫶ , which latter form was used by some scribes to mark a final pause.[67] The *virgula plana* combined with the point is not a piece of punctuation that appears to be in common use (Parkes does not mention it). An underline is sometimes used to indicate a deletion, but these points are used in a grammatical context which would normally demand a *punctus versus* or a *punctus elevatus*. This form seems to be in the twelfth-century ink for the majority of cases. There are a few instances where the colour of the ink is very difficult to determine. However, given that this point and *virgula plana* are not used consistently, it might be thought that the *virgula plana* was a later addition, and the preponderance of examples suggests that this is indeed the case. This can be seen at f. 17v, lines 20-22,[68] where ' ⫶unde et graece απoτoυΔρκιν. id est a uidendo dorcas nuncupatur⫶ ', but earlier on the same leaf it functions as a *punctus versus*.[69]

The points of the original are only left unchanged in the cases where they have been used to mark out parallel phrases or small clauses, for example 'ecclesia convocatio . et synagoga congregatio',[70] except where a point indicates the end of a sentence, then the *punctus versus* is used. The *punctus elevatus* is used more commonly to break up the minor clauses within a sentence, and as this is not always done in the original text, this is the piece of punctuation that is most frequently added to the text, rather than being formed over an existing punctuation mark. The *virgula plana* and the *punctus versus* are used to indicate something more final. This leaves us with the question – why was the *punctus versus* not used where the *virgula plana* was, especially as there was already an existing point which could easily have been converted, as we have seen above? Further research into these two punctuation marks may reveal differences in their use.

Again, these alterations render the text accessible to its desired audience, with the spelling and punctuation conventions that they had come to expect. Folio 74 is

---

[67] Parkes, *Pause and Effect*, p. 307. This form in Isidore is used to indicate something doubtful in the text – this seems unlikely in this context. Isidore, *Etymologiae* I.xxi.4.
[68] CCSL 119B, p. 53, I.vi.26.
[69] CCSL 119B, p. 53, I.vi.19.
[70] CCSL 119B, p. 50, I.v.69, f. 14v, l.8.

clearly laid out, with punctuation included, demonstrating the same attitude that the original scribe betrayed. Ironically, it is all these layers of adaptation and updating that render this manuscript so hard to understand now, even though the script is perfectly legible. The multiple revisions have cluttered the page and distracted from the earliest features, making it difficult to appreciate the eighth-century 'grammar of legibility'. This may lead us to assume that the eighth-century 'grammar of legibility' was in some way defective; however, the norms governing such a grammar change constantly. The norms in use in the twelfth century are as incomprehensible to the average twenty-first-century reader as the eighth-century customs were to twelfth-century readers.

Furthermore, we can consider the provenance of the text of the manuscript and consider how this may inform us of the text's audience, and its relationship to the author's text. If we compare Bodley 819 with other manuscripts known to have come from Wearmouth-Jarrow, we can see at once that it is a relatively high-grade manuscript.[71] It does not compare to the copy of the *HE* that is in the Public Library in St Petersburg (the Leningrad Bede),[72] with its elaborate illuminated initials throughout, nor with what remains of the Cotton manuscript of the same work. However, if one compares it to the Moore Bede, it is quite clearly a more considered piece of work and very well presented. If nothing else, this is characteristic of the presentation of manuscripts from Wearmouth-Jarrow, which tend to be of very high quality throughout.[73] In my opinion, the hands of the manuscript are most similar to scribes B and D of the Leningrad Bede, particularly with regard to word-spacing, and the loops on the letter 'e'.[74] I would hesitate to identify the scribe with either of these latter, however, the general similarity would suggest that the date of writing was close to that of the Leningrad Bede, simply from the style of the manuscript and the

---

[71] Parkes, *The Scriptorium*, *passim*.

[72] O. Arngart, ed., *The Leningrad Bede: An Eighth Century Manuscript of the Venerable Bede's Historia Ecclesiastica Gentis Anglorum in the Public Library, Leningrad*, Early English Manuscripts in Facsimile 2, (Copenhagen, 1952).

[73] Parkes, *The Scriptorium* , p. 17.

[74] Both Parkes and Tunbridge have speculated that scribe D could have been Bede. If one could identify D as the scribe of Bodley 819, it would lessen the force of this suggestion. The scribe of Bodley 819 is considerably more careless in his copying, making many more errors. Given the great similarity between the hands at Wearmouth-Jarrow, I would not want to identify either B or D with the scribe of Bodley 819, though these are the hands which show the closest correspondence. Parkes, *The Scriptorium*, p. 27, fn. 45; Tunbridge, *Scribal Practices*, p. 226, fn. 79. Some commentators have identified hand D as Bede, though Michael Lapidge dismisses this in his article 'Autographs of Insular Latin Authors of the Early Middle Ages' in *Gli autografi medievali. Problemi paleografici e filologici*, ed. P. Chiesa and L. Pinelli (Spoleto, 1994), pp.103-44.

care taken in presentation. Bodley 819 presumably dates from the time after the demand for manuscripts increased, as it is not in capitular uncial, as the fragments of Bede's *De temporum ratione* are, which was completed in 725.[75] Even though these were manuscripts of works by a house author, they were considered sufficiently prestigious to be presented in the best possible script and format.

The text of the manuscript does not greatly help us to reach any conclusion about who received this manuscript, nor about Bede's authorial text. If one examines the text that is in Bodley 819 and the text that is published by Hurst in his CCSL edition, he reconstructs the text α, which is very close to three manuscripts, L, N and O. L is Vatican B. A. V., MS Pal. Lat. 284, s.ix[1], N is Laon, Bibliothèque Municipale, MS 55, s.ix, and O is Bodley 819. Bodley 819 differs from the α-text in only small points and often these points have been corrected by the eighth-century corrector. But it contains many more errors than the Leningrad Bede, even within the first book. Since this text has errors in it, this then raises the question of from what kind of copy the scribe of Bodley 819 was working? There are two possibilities. Either the scribe was not as careful as it at first appears, and failed to make an entirely faithful reproduction of Bede's text. Or O is from a copy at one remove from Bede, though still probably made at his monastery.[76] The main difference between Bodley 819 and the α-text is that the biblical *lemmata* appear to be slightly different. Otherwise, all the manuscripts appear to be very faithful copies of α, containing only small slips, which, for the most part, do not obscure the sense. The biblical *lemmata* might actually be considered to be the part of the text that is most likely to be altered, as different translations of the Bible were current in different times and in different places, and therefore the text of the *lemmata* might well be altered to fit the local preference. The biblical text as used in Bodley 819 is not that of the Vulgate text of Proverbs – however, Bede does not faithfully follow the Vulgate by any means, and it is certain that he had available to him some books of the Vetus Latina, as well as some variants of the Vulgate, presumably used in the preparation of the Amiatinus text.[77] Therefore I would not say that deviation from

---

[75] Parkes, *Pause and Effect*, p. 4.

[76] The question here is what level of variation of quality can one expect from one scriptorium. The Moore Bede looks much less tidy than the Leningrad Bede. Bodley 819 is well-presented, but the text is slightly defective in comparison to other manuscripts from the monastery.

[77] The Codex Amiatinus was one of the three great pandects prepared at Wearmouth-Jarrow during the abbacy of Ceolfrith. See R. Marsden, *The Text of the Old Testament in Anglo-Saxon England* (Cambridge, 1995), for further information about the versions Bede used.

the Codex Amiatinus Vulgate text indicates any distance from the authorial manuscript.

Is it possible that this manuscript was commissioned by Lindisfarne? It is reasonable to assume that if Aldred was able to annotate it in the late tenth century it was at Chester-le-Street, with the Lindisfarne community, and subsequently it travelled to Durham, also with the Lindisfarne community. The library from Wearmouth-Jarrow scarcely survives at all – there are very few books that can be said to have been there: the now-lost Codex Grandior of Cassiodorus, the Laudian Acts (Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Laud Graec. 35) and the copies that the scriptorium produced are the only ones that can be said to have been there, and survived. However, the vastly different histories of these manuscripts suggest that the copies produced in-house were intended to be sent out, not kept, though the evidence of the surviving pandect fragments shows that they did keep high-quality manuscripts for their own use, and given that in the tenth century our manuscript was at Chester-le-Street it could previously have been at Lindisfarne. This could also be confirmed by the provenance of the Stonyhurst Gospel, which was copied at Wearmouth-Jarrow, but was found in Cuthbert's coffin.[78] Or perhaps it could have been at Wearmouth-Jarrow until the ninth century (by which time the monastery had fallen from notice – we do not know when it failed), when the Cuthbert community was gaining land, and the community of Cuthbert might have then obtained the manuscript along with the monastery buildings, and perhaps the remnants of the Wearmouth-Jarrow community.

This manuscript can confirm a certain close relationship between the scriptoria of Wearmouth-Jarrow and Lindisfarne. While this manuscript seems most likely to have been written at Wearmouth-Jarrow, possibly for the Lindisfarne community, at any rate the Lindisfarne community were able to obtain a copy of it, and to begin the process of glossation. We can deduce that there was an interchange of books between the two monasteries – Lindisfarne appears to have had access to the Italo-Northumbrian texts of the Bible, from Wearmouth-Jarrow.[79] Lindisfarne certainly commissioned Bede to write his prose Life of Cuthbert[80] – it is not

---

[78] T. J. Brown, ed., *The Stonyhurst Gospel of Saint John*, p. 6.
[79] Kendrick, *Evangeliorum*, II, p. 12.
[80] Bede, *Two Lives of Saint Cuthbert: A Life by an Anonymous Monk of Lindisfarne and Bede's Prose Life*, ed. and trans. B. Colgrave (Cambridge, 1940), Prologue to Bede's *Life*, pp. 142-3.

improbable that they commissioned either the commentary on Proverbs itself, or at least a copy of the text.

The format of the manuscript I believe betrays the direction of the leaders of the scriptorium at Wearmouth-Jarrow, a scriptorium that was clearly very concentrated on presentation, accuracy and legibility – it is no good having a decorative book if one cannot understand it. The inclusion of punctuation is one interesting indication of this attitude. While Bodley 819 was probably produced in the scriptorium in the 740s or 750s, it is likely that the careful habits of scribes were set up early on in the working life of the scriptorium, under Abbot Ceolfrith, when the great pandects were produced, and that thereafter these high standards were maintained. The introduction of the new insular minuscule hand brought new challenges of layout, and allowed the creation of new conventions. Punctuation implies attention not only to the aesthetic aspects of page design, but also to the communicative aspect – the book is designed to be read, and it is designed to be read even by readers with a less-than-perfect grasp of Latin. That punctuation was also used in other insular minuscule manuscripts from Wearmouth-Jarrow which suggests that the author of the text, Bede himself, might well have included punctuation in his original drafts. Indeed, for reading texts with his students, he presumably marked up copies, just as the teachers of Antiquity did.[81] So through work of the scriptorium, it is possible to get a glimpse of Bede's classroom. The 'grammar of legibility' was well understood by the scribes at Wearmouth-Jarrow, including the ways in which this visual grammar could interact with Latin grammar, for the benefit of the reader. Bodley 819 provides the paradigm for manuscript presentation, particularly in the matter of punctuation. The punctuation of later manuscripts of Bede can now be explored,[82] to determine whether it might be traced back to the manuscripts produced at Wearmouth-Jarrow, and to see how the legacy of that scriptorium was developed by later scribes.[83] In Bodley 819, some part of this later tradition can already be detected in the glossing of Aldred, explaining and expanding upon Bede, and in the editing of the manuscript in the twelfth century, when the conventions of punctuation and abbreviation were revised and updated, to allow a more modern audience to

---

[81] See above, p. 88.
[82] See chapter V, pp. 114-5.
[83] Parkes has already begun this, with a brief examination of some manuscripts of Bede's commentary on Luke. However, I will be focussing on the homilies. Parkes, *The Scriptorium*, pp. 17-20.

understand Bede.[84] This process can be considered to have been continued in the present CCSL edition, with its modern system of punctuation and its normalised spelling.

---

[84] In order to appreciate this manuscript fully, one would need a full colour facsimile and transcription, with accompanying notes exploring the nature of Aldred's glosses.

Chapter V: The Textual History and Dissemination of Bede's Homilies on the Continent in the Ninth to Eleventh Centuries: An Analysis of the Manuscripts and their Use

Bede's homilies were transmitted in two formats: as a collection of fifty homilies (as in the modern printed edition)[1] and as one or more homilies scattered through a larger homiliary.[2] I have examined all the pre-eleventh-century manuscripts of the fifty homilies listed in Hurst's edition now surviving on the continent, and a selection of other homiliaries, in order to understand better the dissemination of the homilies throughout Carolingian Europe, and to understand how readers and scribes responded to Bede's text.[3] There follows a description of each of the manuscripts I have seen, in which I discuss features of interest, particularly those relating to use. The manuscripts may have been used in the liturgy, or in private reading, or both. The detailed descriptions outline the reasons for believing that an individual manuscript has been used in a particular way. The continental manuscripts of the homilies are of particular interest, as they are the earliest witnesses to the text. With one exception (Lincoln, Cathedral Library, MS 182, s.x-xi), the manuscripts now surviving in England date from the end of the twelfth century or later, and cannot inform us about Anglo-Saxon usage of the homilies. Further research involving the remaining manuscripts is desirable. General homiliaries have also been examined, since a Carolingian audience was most likely to encounter Bede's homilies in that context.[4] The manuscript descriptions are contained in appendix C.[5]

---

[1] As contained in Hurst's edition, CCSL 122.

[2] This is reflected in Hurst's choice of manuscripts for his edition. His is the most complete listing available at present, and he lists twenty-one manuscripts of the entire collection, and four manuscripts containing larger homiliaries. (CCSL 122, pp. xvii-xxi).

[3] Manuscripts of the fifty homilies seen: Boulogne-sur-Mer, Bibliothèque Municipale, MS 75; Paris, Bibliothèque national (B.n.f.), MS lat. 2369; Paris, B.n.f., MS lat. 2370; Paris, B.n.f., MS nov. acq. lat. 1450; Zurich, Zentralbibliothek, MS C42 (277); Engelberg, Stiftsbibliothek, Cod. 47; Munich, Staatsbibliothek, Clm 18120. Other homiliaries seen: Cologne, Dombibliothek, Cod. 172; Karlsruhe, Hof- und Landesbibliothek, MS Aug. 19; Karlsruhe, Hof- und Landesbibliothek, MS Aug. 37; St Gall, Klosterbibliothek Cod. 433; St Gall, Klosterbibliothek, Cod. 434; Munich, Staatsbibliothek Clm 4533; Munich, Staatsbibliothek Clm 4534.

[4] See Introduction, pp. 19-20.

[5] On p. 151, below.

The Dissemination of the Manuscripts

The ordering of the homilies within the manuscripts can provide us with important evidence for their interrelationship, illustrating the diffusion of the homilies across Western Europe. Hurst, in the CCSL edition, also proposed a set of groupings, marking the divergence from the original collection.

Hurst has grouped the manuscripts used in his edition according to Insular features and the use of homily I.13 for the feast of Benedict Biscop (rather than its being transferred to the feast day of the founder of Benedictine monasticism). Hurst groups the copies of the fifty homilies into four groups, the first of which has two classes:

IA – the Zurich C42 and Boulogne 75 manuscripts, which preserve the entire texts of the homilies.

IB – Paris n.a. 1450, Paris lat. 2369, Paris lat. 2370, which lack some homilies, but preserve (along with Zurich C42 and Boulogne 75) traces of insular exemplars. Four out of these five manuscripts also preserve I.13 for the feast of Benedict Biscop (Paris lat. 2369 lacks this homily altogether).[6] The other codices Hurst used in his edition move this feast to the feast day of the more famous Abbot Benedict, showing, in Hurst's opinion, a loss of understanding in the tradition.

Hurst then has a group of two classes of English codices (IIA and IIB),[7] followed by a group of ancient lectionaries (III).[8] Finally, he lists other codices to which he does not refer in his edition (in the section marked *alii codices*).[9]

A different grouping can be made using the order of the homilies within the collection. The Boulogne 75 and Zurich C42 manuscripts both preserve the homilies in identical order.[10] Some of the homilies are, by nature, associated with particular feast days, or days close to them (those for Christmas, Easter, Pentecost and

---

[6] Hurst, CCSL 122, p. xviii.

[7] Hurst, CCSL 122, pp. xvii-xix. IIA: Lincoln, Cathedral Library, MS 182; Oxford, Merton College, MS 177. IIB: Oxford, Merton College, MS 176; Oxford, Lincoln College, MS Lat. 30.

[8] Hurst, CCSL 122, pp. xix-xx. III: Vatican, B. A. V., MS Reginensis Lat. 38; Cambrai, Bibliothèque Cathedrale, MS 365; Karlsruhe 19; Karlsruhe 37.

[9] Hurst, CCSL 122, pp. xx-xxi. *Alii codices*: Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, MS Görres 86; Cambridge, Trinity College, MS 126; Charleville, Bibliothèque Publique, MS 162; Engelberg 47; Montpellier, École de Médecine, MS 66; Oxford, Merton College, MS 175; Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, MS Lat. 2371; Paris, Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal, MS 319; Shrewsbury, Shrewsbury School Library, MS 39; Tours, Bibliothèque Publique, MS 336; Vitry-le-François, Bibliothèque Publique, MS 37.

[10] See table 48, p. 166.

Ascension).[11] Other homilies, such as those for Advent and Lent, do not have to be read in a particular order – local lectionary variants might mean that these homilies could appear in several different orders. Bearing this in mind, it is notable that both the Boulogne 75 and Zurich C42 manuscripts (our earliest witnesses to the collection of fifty homilies) have homilies I.3, I.4 and I.6 (for the last two Sundays of Advent and the first mass of Christmas) at the end of the homiliary, rather than with the other Advent and Christmas homilies at the beginning.[12] This ordering is preserved in many of the continental manuscripts, with three exceptions.[13]

From the description of the order given in Lauer,[14] Paris lat. 2371 has the disordered last homilies, as does Tours 336.[15] It is possible that Vitry-le-François 37 has this ordering also (it begins with I.3).[16] Paris n.a. 1450 has a Cluny provenance, and it seems, from the general accord between it and the Zurich C42 and Boulogne 75 orderings, that the scribe realised the order was incorrect and put the Christmas homily in its rightful place. This suggests that a circular homiliary, running from Advent to Advent, was perfectly acceptable.

The three manuscripts now in Paris (2369, 2370 and n.a. 1450) each have a French origin, specifically from the Burgundy and Jura areas.[17] Paris n.a. 1450 preserves a very similar order to the Boulogne 75 and Zurich C42 manuscripts, but is considerably different from the orders of Paris lat. 2369 and Paris lat. 2370; these latter two have a similar geographical origin, and thus may have had a different exemplar to most of the other continental manuscripts. Their order also appears (to a certain extent) to underlie the order of homilies in the PL edition. I shall not discuss this order further, as it was published before Morin's work to ascertain the original fifty homilies, and some genuine homilies by Bede are relegated to Migne's class of

---

[11] In this instance, by 'close to', I mean that to a certain extent, a homily for Pentecost may also be given on the Octave of Pentecost. See appendix F, pp. 181-7, for examples and discussion.

[12] I have been unable to ascertain a palaeographical reason for this. The homilies in question are the last two of Advent and the second homily of Christmas (see table 48). The homily for the Christmas vigil (I.5) is grouped with the other Christmas homilies at the beginning of the manuscripts. This makes it unlikely that a quire has dropped out and been rebound. This ordering is the one listed by Morin. Hurst has revised it (and Hurst's is the numbering I use).

[13] Paris n.a. 1450, where the order is I.1, 2, 5, 6, 7, with I.3 and I.4 at the end; Paris lat. 2370, I.3, 4, 1, 2, 5, 7, (I.6 is lacking); Paris lat. 2369 I.3, 4, 1, 2, 5, 8, 9, (I.6 and I.7 are lacking).

[14] Lauer, *Bibliothèque Nationale*, p. 429.

[15] M. Collon, ed., *Catalogue Général des manuscrits des bibliothèques publiques de France* XXXVII (Paris, 1900), pp. 255-6, provenance: Tours.

[16] *Catalogue Général des manuscrits des bibliothèques publiques de France* XIII (Paris, 1891), pp. 23-4. Provenance: Trois Fontaines, Marne.

[17] See manuscript descriptions, appendix C.

apocrypha.[18] The manuscripts now in Merton College, Oxford (Merton 175, 176 and 177) and Lincoln College, Oxford, lat. 30 all start with homily I.1, but without examining the manuscripts themselves, the rest of the ordering is impossible to determine.[19] Cambridge, Trinity College 126 seems to exhibit an ordering significantly at variance with those found on the continent.[20] The order of the homilies in the English manuscripts needs further examination.

The fact that this disordering of the Advent and Christmas homilies has entered the tradition so early and spread so wide suggests that one of the earliest manuscripts,[21] probably an eighth-century Anglo-Saxon exemplar (such as the manuscripts Hurst postulated underlay the Boulogne 75, Zurich C42 and the three Paris manuscripts)[22] had this sequence, which was dutifully copied by subsequent Carolingian scribes. That Paris lat. 2369 and 2370 preserve a more conventional ordering for these homilies suggests that another exemplar may have existed, though we should not exclude the idea that a copyist may have chosen to reorder these homilies.[23] (Though this is somewhat unlikely, given the significant variance between the orderings.) However, the order is sufficiently different from the rest that, given the respect with which scribes treated these texts,[24] it seems more likely that these manuscripts were copied from a different exemplar. This leads me to posit the existence of an Anglo-Saxon exemplar which is at the head of the transmission of the majority of continental manuscripts, with a second Anglo-Saxon exemplar at the head of the manuscript tradition of Paris lat. 2369 and 2370, which also have insular features, but which preserve a more explicable ordering of the Advent and Christmas homilies.

Unfortunately, the provenance of most of the earliest manuscripts containing the fifty homilies is unknown. Paris n.a. 1450, which has a provenance of Cluny, is

---

[18] For example, I.6 and II.25. Morin, 'Le recueil primitif', pp. 316-26. I discuss the ordering of the homilies in detail in appendix F.

[19] H. O. Coxe, *Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Oxford Colleges: CataloguecCodicum manu scriptorum qui in collegiis aliusqe Oxoniensibus hodie adservantur*, vol. I (Oxford, 1852), Merton 175, 176 and 177, pp. 68-71; Lincoln lat. 30, p. 28.

[20] M. R. James, *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Western Manuscripts in the Library of Trinity College, Cambridge* (Cambridge, 1900), vol. I, pp. 149-50. The order of the homilies is as follows: I.1, I.3, I.4, I.2, I.5, I.6, I.7, I.8, I.9, I.10, I.11, I.12, I.14, I.18, I.19, I.23.

[21] See table 48, appendix D, p. 165.

[22] Hurst, CCSL 122, p. xviii.

[23] This seems the most likely explanation for the ordering of Paris n.a. 1450. It is not possible that Paris lat. 2370 was copied from Paris lat. 2369, as they both preserve different orders of the manuscripts and omit different homilies. It would seem that they share a common Anglo-Saxon ancestor, however.

[24] See p. 115.

an exception, and it is a witness to a corrected ordering of the Advent and Christmas homilies. The Zurich C42 manuscript was written at St Gall in the ninth century. The provenance of the Boulogne 75 manuscript is unknown, though it is likely to be from St Omer, as many manuscripts from that library ended up in Boulogne. The Paris manuscripts preserving the variant order are from the Jura; other manuscripts from French centres appear to follow the main tradition.

The Cultural Milieu

St Gall in the ninth century had many insular and Carolingian contacts. This put it in an ideal position for the collection and dissemination of texts. However, precisely because of this position, it leaves us able only to conjecture about the continental history of the Anglo-Saxon exemplar used.[25] There are two main possibilities: that the exemplar first came to the Continent with the Bonifatian mission, or that it was brought by Alcuin to the court of Charlemagne.[26] There are other possibilities. Ganz has shown that Corbie had strong insular and Carolingian connections – one abbot corresponded with Boniface, and another was Charlemagne's cousin, Adalhard, who was in correspondence with Paul the Deacon. This house founded the monastery of St Omer, the likely provenance of Boulogne 75.[27]

Boniface (c.675–754) and his successor, Lull of Mainz (c.710–786) both kept up a correspondence with Boniface's contacts in his native land. Among other things, they requested that books be sent out to the newly-evangelised territories. Boniface specifically asked Bishop Daniel of Winchester for a copy of Bede's homilies, and Lull famously corresponded with the Wearmouth-Jarrow monastery.[28] Boniface had also founded monasteries, such as Fulda, whose scriptoria quickly began copying books. In the early ninth century, Fulda and St Gall exchanged books and personnel, thus providing one possible route of transmission for the exemplar.[29]

---

[25] It is also possible that several Anglo-Saxon exemplars circulating in the eighth century preserved this order, though I think this is unlikely, as the ordering makes little sense.

[26] This would correspond to the two entry points into Carolingian Europe of the insular Vulgate text. See. R. Loewe, 'The Medieval History of the Latin Vulgate', in *The Cambridge History of the Bible: The West from the Fathers of the Church to the Reformation*, ed. G. W. H. Lampe (Cambridge, 1969), pp. 129-34 and B. Fischer, 'Bibelauslegungen des frühen Mittelalters', *Settimane di Studio* 10 (Spoleto, 1963), 586-97.

[27] Ganz, *Corbie*, pp. 24-5, p. 15.

[28] For examples, see *S. Bonifatii et S. Lulli Epistolae*, Monumenta Germaniae Historica, *Epistolae Selectae* 1 (Berlin, 1916), ed. M. Tangl, letters 17, 23 (between Boniface and Daniel, Bishop of Winchester) and *HE* I.27.

[29] J. M. Clark, *The Abbey of St Gall as a Centre of Literature and Art* (Cambridge, 1926), p. 60, p.67.

Alcuin (*c*.735–804) was master of the school at York, whose library contained copies of Bede's works, as Alcuin himself attests in his poem on York. Alcuin also revered Bede as a teacher and scholar. It is not implausible that Alcuin brought copies of Bede's works with him when he joined Charlemagne's court in around 782. A copy of the homilies was certainly available to Carolingian court scholars; Paul the Deacon (*c*.720–*c*.800) made extensive use of Bede's homiliary when compiling his own, at Charlemagne's order.[30]

Charlemagne's Palace school could have had the homilies copied; Charlemagne also encouraged scribes to copy texts, and to copy them well.[31] Merovingian monastic scriptoria and new foundations were all copying texts in the new minuscule script, which we know as Caroline minuscule. The St Gall scriptorium began using this script in the eighth century, and the very fact that it could do this demonstrates its contacts with the rest of the Carolingian empire, and testifies to the fact that books were being exchanged. It is not implausible, therefore, that one of the books that made its way there was a copy of Bede's homilies.[32] St Gall also received books from Alcuin at Tours.[33]

It is also possible that an exemplar was brought to St Gall because of its Irish connections. St Gall himself was Irish, and the later monastery lay near one of the pilgrimage routes to Rome.[34] In essence, there are many possible routes for the transmission of the homilies, whether through St Gall, Corbie, Alcuin, Boniface or some other route. It seems likely, from the proliferation of minor errors in the tradition, that many copies were lost. The localisation of manuscripts containing the homilies in a different order in the Jura as early as the tenth century (manuscripts copied from an Anglo-Saxon exemplar) may make it more likely that the St Gall exemplar was sourced from Anglo-Saxon-influenced sites in Germany. From the evidence of the manuscript layout,[35] it seems clear that St Gall monks were seeing Wearmouth-Jarrow-produced manuscripts, and imitating their design features. Lull,

---

[30] PL 95, col. 1159. See below, pp. 123-4, and Introduction, pp. 19-20 for further discussion of Paul's homiliary.

[31] D. Ganz, 'Chapter 29: Book Production in the Carolingian Empire and the Spread of Caroline Minuscule', in *The New Cambridge Medieval History Volume II: c.700–c.900*, ed. R. McKitterick (Cambridge, 1995), pp. 786-808, p. 793.

[32] It would seem that the Zurich C42 manuscript with its St Gall provenance, is copied from an Anglo-Saxon exemplar, not a Carolingian one, as many insular features are preserved. (Hurst, p. xvii).

[33] Clark, *The Abbey*, p. 60, and Introduction, pp. 22-3 above.

[34] Clark, *The Abbey*, p. 26.

[35] See pp. 128-9.

as also mentioned above,[36] was in correspondence with Wearmouth-Jarrow, and this gives us a plausible route for the transmission of the exemplar.

Manuscript Layout and Use

Bede's homilies were not only transmitted as a collection, they were also disseminated in Carolingian homiliary compilations. This gives a slightly different context for the use of the manuscripts. The most important of these, for our purposes, is the collection made by Paul the Deacon. He used many of Bede's homilies and sections of Bede's biblical commentaries.[37] By contrast, Alan of Farfa includes not one of the fifty homilies in his collection. Homilies by Bede do crop up occasionally in the manuscript tradition of the Alan of Farfa collection, but these collections are not necessarily stable; a text could be added to or removed from the compilation.[38] The large number of Bedan homilies in Paul the Deacon's collection render manuscripts of the homiliary both important textual witnesses and a key means of dissemination of the homilies. Paul the Deacon's homiliary was one of the most frequently copied texts during the Carolingian era.[39] It was composed at the order of Charlemagne, and was designed for use during the Benedictine office.[40] The layout is fundamentally similar to that for Bede's homilies, though the contents list at the front of the manuscripts always contains not only the Gospel reading but also the appropriate feast and the authors of the sermons to be read on that date. This is not necessarily the case in the manuscripts of Bede's homiliary, where the ability to navigate the book for liturgical purposes may not have been quite so important.

The copies of Paul the Deacon's homiliary were designed for public use – the homiliary comes in two or three large volumes, which are rather heavy and so better suited for use on a lectern, from which they might not be moved often.[41] On the other hand, this meant that any one volume was out of use for a significant portion of the year (when it was the season for another volume to be used) and therefore they were available for private study, including private study by those who also gave sermons themselves. This latter possibility was already catered for in the

---

[36] See pp. 125-6.
[37] See Introduction, pp. 19-20.
[38] See Gregoire, *Homéliaires liturgiques médiévaux*, p. 5 and see Introduction, pp. 16-7.
[39] Ganz, 'Chapter 29: Book Production', pp. 800-801.
[40] PL 95, col. 1159. The text here is of Paul's introduction.
[41] See for example, the size of the St Gall manuscripts, pp. 160-1.

Carolingian period, with the manuscripts of the sermons of Caesarius of Arles.[42] (The manuscripts of the fifty homilies tend to be smaller, lighter and generally easier to move). This distinction is reflected in the manuscripts. The manuscripts of Paul's compilation tend to be marked up for public reading, with marginal numbers indicating the appropriate section of the homiletic text. These numbers mark out the relevant passages, which presumably would then be read in order on the relevant feast day. The manuscripts of the fifty homilies also have these numbers (suggesting that the collection had a place in public worship at some stage), but have marginal notes in addition, suggesting that the manuscripts were also read in private.[43] Given the stress on preaching in Carolingian Europe, it would seem likely that readings of Bede's homilies were confined to monastic circles, while lay contact with them would primarily be through summaries or adaptations prepared by priests.

The format of both the books of the fifty homilies and the larger homiliaries is remarkably consistent. Most of the former and some of the latter have a table of contents.[44] For collections of the fifty homilies, the relevant Gospel readings are listed, sometimes with reference to the day for which they were intended; for the larger homiliaries, we have the occasion, the lection, the author and first lines typically listed. Either the first lines of the lection, or the whole lection will be written out, usually under the title, 'Reading from the Gospel of X', followed by either something of this nature: 'Homily on the same lection', 'Homily on the same lection by X' (this is a common form of reference in Paul the Deacon's homiliary), or 'Homily for the feast of X on the same lection.' The first lines of the homily will typically be in capitals, with the rubrics in red. There is remarkable consistency in this format across the manuscripts. The small *diple* is also frequently used to mark out Gospel quotations or the lemma (not necessarily all biblical quotations). In manuscripts of Paul the Deacon's homiliary, the small *diple* is used for this purpose in most of the homilies – it is not confined exclusively to the homilies of Bede. This practice of using the *diple* can be traced back (albeit not exclusively) to Wearmouth-

---

[42] Caesarius of Arles, *Sermones*, ed. G. Morin, CCSL 103 and 104 (Turnholt, 1953). See McKitterick, *The Frankish Church*, p. 90.

[43] See Boulogne 75, p. 109; Zurich C42, p. 110; Engelberg 47, p. 112; Munich 18120, p. 113; Paris lat. 2369, p. 113-4; Paris lat. 2370, p.114-5; Karlsruhe 37, p. 117; St Gall 433, p. 117; St Gall 434, p. 118; Munich 4533, p. 118.

[44] Corbie, for example, started this practice in the mid-ninth century. (Ganz, *Corbie*, p. 65) It may be that this is the earliest occurrence, but it is at least worth speculating whether such a practice arose from the need to navigate large liturgical tomes, such as missals, and Paul the Deacon's homiliary, and the practice was subsequently transferred to other types of book.

Jarrow.[45]   The clarity of layout favoured by the Wearmouth-Jarrow scriptorium workers may well have influenced the Carolingian copyists of homiliaries. Palaeographers have noted the uniformity of layout and script in Carolingian manuscripts, as exemplified in Cologne, Dombibliothek, Codex 92.[46]

At this point it seems fruitful to return to why Bede's homilies might have been popular during the Carolingian era. Charlemagne and his bishops were keen to turn out an educated clergy, who were able to preach to their people. Bede's homilies are not inappropriate texts to study in this context. They are unimpeachably orthodox; they provide a template for teaching about the nature of Christ.[47] They also provide a verse-by-verse analysis of the lection. The collection is useful both for liturgical use or public reading (in the refectory, say) and for private meditation or teaching about the Gospels. The surviving manuscripts show signs of both kinds of use. Collections of homilies are especially important to a clergy required to preach. Collections such as Paul the Deacon's, or homiliaries containing work by recognised authors such as Bede, would have given them material that was doctrinally sound to use as a basis for their own material.

Even in manuscripts clearly marked up for liturgical use, not all the homilies or saints' lives contained therein are numbered, or they are not numbered all the way through. This suggests there was some flexibility of use – not all the homilies were used, yet the scribes copied the entirety of the texts (Karlsruhe 37 is a notable exception), possibly for private study. Bede's homilies are very long, often much longer than other homilies in a collection, so frequently only a portion of the text is numbered. Some manuscripts show very definite signs of liturgical use,[48] containing either neumes or responses, or other such indications. Other manuscripts contain marginal comments, indicative of private study.[49] It is of course possible that these manuscripts were at first intended for liturgical use, but by the thirteenth century liturgical practices and the night office and preaching practices had changed

---

[45] See chapter III, p. 91; Parkes, *Pause and Effect*, p. 27.

[46] B. Bischoff, *Latin Palaeography: Antiquity and the Middle Ages*, trans. D. Ó Croinin and D. Ganz (Cambridge, 1990), p. 206 and Ganz, *Corbie*, p. 65 and p. 122. A digital reproduction of Cologne 92 can be accessed from http://www.ceec.uni-koeln.de , following the link to 'Handschriften'. Last accessed August 2005.

[47] See Introduction, p. 22, and R. McKitterick, *The Carolingians and the Written Word* (Cambridge, 1989), p. 203.

[48] Boulogne 75, Zurich C42, Engelberg 47, Munich 18120, Paris lat. 2369, Paris n.a. 1450, Karlsruhe 19, Karlsruhe 37, St Gall 433, St Gall 434, Munich 4533, Munich 4534.

[49] Boulogne 75, Engelberg 47, Munich 18120, Paris lat. 2369, Paris n.a. 1450, Karlsruhe 37, St Gall 433, St Gall 434, Munich 4533.

sufficiently that the manuscripts then became primarily for private perusal.[50] As has been shown, all the manuscripts which have indications that they were used for private study also contain indications of liturgical use. This seems most likely to have happened to the manuscripts of the homily of Paul the Deacon. The manuscripts of Bede's homilies are more likely to have been primarily intended for private reading, with only a secondary liturgical use, as manuscripts of Paul the Deacon's homiliary and others were widespread, and covered more of the liturgical year, thus making them much more useful than the fifty lections covered by Bede. There are many varieties of private (non-liturgical) use possible. It is possible, though unlikely, that this text was used in the schoolroom. More likely, it was used for private meditation, or as an inspiration for people writing their own sermons. It is a tribute to the flexibility of Bede's writing that it could be used in private or in public for so many purposes.[51]

Punctuation

We have seen how the monks of Wearmouth-Jarrow presented manuscripts, using punctuation and layout to facilitate reading the text. We have seen how difficult it is to read the homilies unpunctuated. The stylistic features which Bede uses to help his audience navigate the text can be enhanced by punctuation.

While the layout differs considerably from manuscript to manuscript, there is a striking correspondence in the use of punctuation. Only a few manuscripts do not use the *diple* on at least some occasions to mark out biblical quotations.[52] While most of the later manuscripts do not use two-level points for punctuation, there is a consistent use of punctuation throughout.[53] All manuscripts use considerably more

---

[50] See d'Avray, *The Preaching of the Friars*, pp. 6-7.

[51] See chapter III, p. 77.

[52] Paris lat. 2370 and St Gall, 433 and 434 do not use the *diple* at all. Zurich C42 and Boulogne 75 use it only sparingly. Since *diple* markings are contemporary with the main hands in every case, Zurich C42 and Boulogne 75 are unlikely to be at the head of transmission, though they are undoubtedly early and good witnesses, preserving other features of Wearmouth-Jarrow manuscripts. Of course, *diples* could be added later, by the scribe, but it would increase labour considerably.

[53] Boulogne 75, Zurich C42, Munich 18120, Paris lat. 2369, Paris n.a. 1450, St Gall 433 all used two-level points, at least originally. Paris n.a. 1450 and St Gall 433 also used the *punctus interrogativus* originally. Engleberg, Paris lat. 2370, Karlsruhe 37, Karlsruhe 19, Cologne 172, St Gall 434, Munich 4533 and 4534 use points, *punctus interrogativus*, *punctus versus* and *punctus elevatus*. See manuscript descriptions in appendix C, and discussions of the punctuation of individual manuscripts below pp. 118-125.

punctuation than the modern editor, suggesting that scribes and scriptoria from the eighth to the twelfth centuries felt the need to aid their readers.

It is uncertain to what extent scribes may have innovated in either their insertion of punctuation, or the alteration of unfamiliar symbols when copying. However, several manuscripts (Boulogne 75, Zurich C42, Munich 18120, Paris lat. 2369, Paris n.a. 1450 and St Gall 433) show signs of having their punctuation augmented, as happened to Bodley 819.[54] This occurs particularly in eighth- to tenth-century manuscripts which used only two points (perhaps also the *punctus interrogativus*) where points have been altered to form either *puncti elevati* or *puncti versi*.[55] The two later manuscripts (Munich 18120 and Paris n.a. 1450) seem to have conservatively copied the punctuation from their exemplar, and were therefore repunctuated in the twelfth or thirteenth centuries. Again this suggests that later readers found earlier methods of punctuation inadequate, and felt the need to punctuate in a more familiar form. A sense of the problems caused by unfamiliar punctuation can be gained by examining the conventions of punctuation in French literature, where direct speech in particular is punctuated differently from English. A similar sense of unfamiliarity may have provoked a twelfth- or thirteenth-century reader to repunctuate.

Interestingly, Paris n.a. 1450 does not include punctuation before *litterae notabiliores* (capitalised letters in the main text), seeing these as sufficient signal that a new syntactic unit is beginning. Differences in practice such as these are highlighted by comparison with other manuscripts. I examined sections of homilies I.7, I.13 and II.6 (chosen for their general interest, and the fact that they could be found in most of the manuscripts I was examining). Generally speaking Engelberg 47 and Munich 18120 both tend to punctuate quite heavily, whereas Paris lat. 2370 is more sparing in its punctuation. All manuscripts tend to punctuate more than the modern editor. As noted above, in my discussion of Bodley 819, there is some punctuation in places which seem unusual to the modern reader.[56]

---

[54] See chapter IV, p. 101.
[55] Boulogne 75, Zurich C42.

[56] See chapter IV, p. 102.

Let us take the first two sentences of homily I.7 (lines 1-11), as found in the CCSL edition as a starting point; two sentences which contain no punctuation other than a comma after *apparuisse* in line eight:

> Nato in Bethleem domino saluatore sicut sacra evangelii testatur historia pastoribus qui in regione eadem erant uigilantes et custodientes uigilias noctis super gregem suum angelus domini magna cum luce apparuit exortumque mundo solem iustitiae non solum caelestis uoce sermonis uerum etiam claritate diuinae lucis astruebat. Nusquam enim in tota ueteris instrumenti serie repperimus angelos qui tam sedulo apparuere patribus cum luce apparuisse, sed hoc priuilegium recte hodierno tempori seruatum est quando *exortum est in tenebris lumen rectis corde misericors et miserator dominus*.[57]

If we examine this passage closely, we can see that it is composed of an ablative absolute, 'nato in Bethleem domino salvatore', with a subclause attached to it, 'sicut sacra evangelii testatur historia', followed by the indirect object *pastoribus*, who then get a relative clause to themselves, 'qui in regione eadem erant vigilantes et custodientes vigilias noctis supra gregem suum', followed by the subject of the sentence: 'angelus domini magna cum luce apparuit'. Then there is a parallel member, with the verb *astruebat*, and the indirect object, *mundo*, and a participle phrase forming the direct object of *astruebat*: *exortumque ... solem iustitiae*, with two ablative constructions: 'non solum caelestis voce sermonis verum etiam claritate divinae lucis'.[58] All the manuscripts punctuate after *historia*, indicating that the ablative absolute and all that goes with it is over; Zurich C42, Engelberg 47, Paris n.a. 1450 and Munich 4533 all punctuate before *sicut* in the first line. Most manuscripts punctuate after *gregem suum* (except Munich 18120), to indicate the end of the relative clause, and Zurich C42, Engelberg 47 and Boulogne 75 punctuate after *erant* also. In the Boulogne 75 manuscript there was a mark after *noctis*, but it was erased. Some features can be ambiguous – Munich 4533 capitalises the 'P' of *pastoribus*, and Zurich C42 the 'A' of *angelus*, even though in both cases a new main clause has not yet begun.

All manuscripts punctuate before *exortumque*; two capitalise it, treating it as a new sentence, which is a legitimate interpretation.[59] All manuscripts punctuate

---

[57] CCSL 122, p. 46. This homily can be found in Zurich C42, Boulogne 75, Engelberg 47, Paris n.a. 1450, Paris lat. 2370, Munich 18120, Munich 4533.

[58] Once again the *non solum ... verum etiam* construction so beloved by Bede appears. (See chapter III, p. 70.)

[59] Zurich C42 and Munich 4533.

before both members of the paratactic construction *non solum ... verum etiam*. This style of punctuation of paratactic members can also be seen in Bodley 819.[60] Boulogne 75 also punctuates after *lucis*, indicating the end of the paratactic construction. All manuscripts punctuate after *astruebat* and capitalise the beginning of the next sentence.

Two manuscripts punctuate after *reperimus*,[61] indicating that the main verb has appeared, although it makes little sense to do so. Engelberg 47 punctuates after *patribus*, at the end of the subclause *tam sedulo apparuere*, but all manuscripts punctuate before *sed*, which most manuscripts capitalise.[62] The punctuation is used to accentuate the structural features, with even the most minimal approach noting the clause where the main verb is to be found.

The first two sentences of I.13 have been studied in the Zurich C42, Engelberg 47, Boulogne 75, St Gall 433, Paris n.a. 1450, Paris lat. 2370 and Munich 18120 manuscripts in which it appears. Here a similar pattern may be found.

> Audiens a domino Petrus quia diues difficile intraret in regnum caelorum sciensque se cum suis condiscipulis ad integrum mundi fallentes spreuisse delicias uoluit agnoscere quid uel ipse uel ceteri mundi contemptores pro maiore mentis uirtute maioris praemii sperare deberent. Et respondens domino ait: *Ecce nos reliquimus omnia et secuti sumus te; quid ergo erit nobis*?[63]

Four manuscripts punctuate after *Petrus*;[64] all punctuate after *caelorum*; the four manuscripts therefore are marking off the clause introduced by *quia*. Munich 18120 is anomalous here; it punctuates after *intraret*, marking the occurrence of the verb of the subclause. Three manuscripts punctuate after *condiscipulis*, marking the beginning of a participle phrase 'ad integrum mundi fallentes … delicias'.[65] All manuscripts punctuate after *delicias*; Engelberg 47 punctuates with a *punctus interrogativus*, marking the question to follow. Again some manuscripts capitalise *Voluit*,[66] although the main verb is to follow. Some manuscripts punctuate before *quid*, before the question is revealed.[67] Several

---

[60] See chapter IV, p. 96.
[61] Zurich C42 and Munich 18120.
[62] Zurich C42, Engelberg 47, Paris n.a. 1450, Paris lat. 2370.
[63] I.13, p. 88.
[64] Zurich C42, Engelberg 47, St Gall 433, Paris lat. 2370.
[65] Zurich C42, Engelberg 47, St Gall 433.
[66] Zurich C42, Boulogne 75.
[67] Zurich C42, St Gall 433, Paris n.a. 1450.

manuscripts punctuate to show the paratactic phrases 'vel ipsi vel ceteri mundi contemptores'.[68] Boulogne 75 and Paris n.a. 1450 punctuate after *ipsi*, St Gall 433 after *contemptores*, and the rest in both places. Engelberg 47, Boulogne 75, St Gall 433 and Paris n.a. 1450 punctuate after *virtute*, to indicate the end of the phrase *pro maiore mentis virtute*, so that the reader needs to seek further words in that phrase, but these manuscripts assign *maioris praemii* to another syntactic function. All manuscripts punctuate before *et* – Zurich C42, Engelberg 47 and Boulogne 75 capitalise it; likewise all manuscripts punctuate before direct speech (in this case a biblical quotation). This recalls the punctuation of Bodley 819.[69] Again, many manuscripts punctuate in the middle of the paratactic phrases (after *omnia*); all manuscripts punctuate before the question *quid erit nobis*, and again at its end (after *nobis*). Three manuscripts use a *punctus interrogativus* here.[70]

The occasional unusual piece of punctuation, where we would not expect any mark, may suggest the difficulty experienced by readers. It is possible that the scribe did not fully understand the constructions, and hence punctuated in unconventional places. However, there is a clear desire to give guidance, even if that guidance goes astray.

Homily II.6 is particularly useful here, as it is contained in many manuscripts.[71]

> Surdus ille et mutus quem mirabiliter curatum a domino modo cum euangelium legeretur audiuimus genus designat humanum in his qui ab errore diabolicae deceptionis diuina merentur gratia liberari. Obsurduit namque homo ab audiendo uitae uerbo postquam mortifera serpentis uerba contra Deum tumidus audivit; mutus a laude conditoris effectus est ex quo cum seductore conloquium habere praesumpsit.[72]

Again, the punctuation is surprisingly consistent. Either the scribes were very faithful in their copying of punctuation, or the conventions for its use were more stable than hitherto noted. St Gall 433 is unique in punctuating before *quem*, but Engelberg 47, Karlsruhe 19 and Paris lat. 2370 punctuate at the end of that clause (after *domino*). All manuscripts punctuate after *audivimus*, many with the *punctus*

---

[68] Boulogne 75, Zurich C42, Engelberg 47, St Gall, Paris n.a. 1450.
[69] See chapter IV, pp. 95-7.
[70] Boulogne 75, St Gall 433, Munich 18120.
[71] Engelberg 47, Karlsruhe 37, Boulogne 75, St Gall 433, Karlsruhe 19, Paris n.a. 1450, Paris lat. 2370, Munich 18120, Munich 4534.
[72] II.6, p. 220.

elevatus.[73] All but Karlsruhe 37 punctuate after *deceptionis*, indicating the end of the prepositional phrase. All punctuate before *Obsurduit*. Few use the *punctus versus* – a lesser mark and a capital letter is considered sufficient. Engelberg 47 and Paris lat. 2370 punctuate after *homo*, indicating the beginning of a gerundive phrase. All but Engelberg 47, St Gall 433 and Munich 4534 punctuate after *verbo*, indicating the beginning of a new clause. All manuscripts punctuate after *audivit* – most consider *mutus* to begin a new sentence and have capitalised it.[74] Munich 18120 does not capitalise it, but uses a *punctus versus*, recognising the paratactic nature of the construction, even though no conjunction is used. Most punctuate before *ex quo* (only Munich 4534 does not) and before *et*, though Paris lat. 2370 does not, despite capitalising it.

It can be seen from the above three examples that punctuation to mark out subclauses is relatively common and consistent. Paratactic constructions are frequently punctuated, although they are not likely to cause difficulty. On the whole, the punctuation is accurate and appropriate, allowing the reader to construct the sentence with a minimum of effort.

In those manuscripts where we see two-point punctuation, not all share punctuation which looks like Bodley 819. Boulogne 75 and Zurich C42 share many features with the Wearmouth-Jarrow manuscripts; however, Paris lat. 2369 and n.a. 1450 opt for a rather more conservative form of punctuation, punctuating more sparsely. These, along with Boulogne 75 and Munich 18120 have been heavily repunctuated, and the different ink colours are not always as distinct as in Bodley 819. These manuscripts do tend to show the lack of separation of prepositions common to Bodley 819, though as Tunbridge has shown,[75] this declines over time as people redefine what constitutes a word.

In the manuscripts containing sermons by authors other than Bede, the same range of marks is used, and Bede's homilies do not appear to be any more or less punctuated than any of the others. The punctuation of a paratactic construction appears in a homily by St Augustine in Karlsruhe 19: 'ipsum erat granum mortificandum . et multiplicandum'. Seven manuscripts show punctuation of paratactic constructions. These are all early ninth-century manuscripts. Perhaps we

---

[73] Engelberg 47, Boulogne 75, Paris n.a. 1450, Munich 18120.
[74] Engelberg 47, St Gall 433, Karlsruhe 19, Paris n.a. 1450, Paris lat. 2370, Munich 4534.
[75] Tunbridge, *Scribal Practices*, p. 127, p. 157.

are observing the importation of an Anglo-Saxon convention of punctuation which died out during the tenth century on the continent. Engelberg 47 and Munich 18120 preserve the punctuation, but the Engelberg manuscript in particular seems to be a conservative and faithful copy of an earlier exemplar, despite its late date.

Repunctuation tends to be moderately conservative. Rarely are entirely new marks added; existing ones are merely reformed to present a system of punctuation with three marks (excluding the *punctus interrogativus*), not two. The resulting punctuation is consistent with some manuscripts written during and after the eleventh century, although some later manuscripts can be sparing with their punctuation (as is mentioned of Paris lat. 2370).[76] As in Paris lat. 2369, the repunctuation can be selective, suggesting that the punctuator had occasion to consult the manuscript to read a particular homily, and repunctuated it as he went. This is particularly likely for this manuscript, as the repunctuated homily is I.13 (about Benedict Biscop), and, as mentioned in the description, there is a little note stating that the homily was not about the right Benedict. It is notable that later punctuators are reluctant to punctuate paratactic phrases, and when manuscripts are repunctuated, the original punctuation tends to be unaltered.[77]

It can be seen that all the manuscripts punctuate at sentence ends; that much at least is common practice from the ninth century to the twelfth. It is notable that some of the early punctuation shares features with Bodley 819, especially in the punctuation of paratactic clauses or words. The later punctuation is significantly less uniform.

The *diple* is well represented in these manuscripts. It does not appear in Paris lat. 2370 (a late copy of the homilies and one where it seems that the scribe did not fully understand or appreciate the punctuation of his exemplar), or in St Gall 433 and 434, both ninth-century manuscripts of Paul the Deacon's homiliary. Otherwise it appears occasionally in Zurich C42, Boulogne 75, Munich 18120 and Karlsruhe 37, and reasonably consistently in Engelberg 47, Paris lat. 2369, Paris n.a. 1450, Cologne 172, Karlsruhe 19 and Munich 4533 and 4534. As Parkes noted, the *diple* originated as a *nota* symbol,[78] but later it became used to mark out biblical

---

[76] It may be so sparing with punctuation because the scribe did not like the existing punctuation, but was not sufficiently confident to create his own punctuation.

[77] This leaves the paratactic phrases punctuated with a low point, the least important mark in the new system.

[78] Parkes, *Pause and Effect*, p. 19.

quotations.[79] Its use as a marker of biblical quotations arose in seventh-century Spanish manuscripts contemporary with Isidore of Seville.[80] However, in the north of Europe, we have to question whether the practice was acquired from Spanish or English exemplars. The distribution of the use of the *diple* shows that scribes continued to recognise the importance of the mark right up until the twelfth century, even when we account for the conservatism displayed in the copying of manuscript punctuation in some manuscripts.[81] The scribes may have taken varying amounts of care in copying these marks (and some of our earliest manuscripts have distinctly patchy usage of the *diple*), but for the most part they preserve and transmit the symbol, a useful aid to the reader.[82]

Summary

 At least two different Anglo-Saxon exemplars underlie the continental manuscript tradition, one which underlies the Jura manuscripts, another which underlies the rest. Further research may reveal that there is a third manuscript at the head of the English manuscript tradition. It is clear that there was a florilegium of Bede's Gospel commentaries (whether compiled in Anglo-Saxon England or on the continent) circulating before Paul the Deacon made his homiliary. There is no overwhelming evidence to suggest any one point of entry to the continent of Bede's fifty homilies.

The layout of the manuscripts seems primarily governed by Carolingian conventions, which are well-preserved, because of their enduring usefulness, in tenth- and eleventh-century copies. However, some Wearmouth-Jarrow features may have lingered, particularly in punctuation, where some scribes seem to have been

---

[79] Parkes, *Pause and Effect*, p. 181.
[80] Parkes, *Pause and Effect*, p. 22.
[81] See my remarks about Munich 18120, above, pp. 112-3.
[82] It is always possible that a later reader added the *diple* where a biblical quotation was noted, in a process similar to that of the earlier editors, before the existence of concordances or searchable databases.

very conservative. Twelfth- and thirteenth-century readers seem to have been keen to alter the punctuation, which must by then have seemed very outmoded.

The manuscripts attest to a wide range of use, with a broad trend that suggests a potential liturgical use in the ninth century for the manuscripts of the fifty homilies (which is definitely the case for manuscripts of Paul the Deacon). It seems likely that this liturgical use was confined to monastic contexts. This may have been in parallel with private use, which predominated by the twelfth century, as a result of substantial liturgical changes and new preaching practices. The manuscripts may have been used for meditative reading or for inspiration for sermons.

Conclusions

Bede's methodology in writing his Gospel homilies corresponds closely to that found in his other works. However, the homilies are a more personal expression of his theology, as shown in the pericopes he chose and in the allusive references to other theologians. Bede is at his most original here; he carefully conceals his debts to other authors, much as he did in his poetic life of Cuthbert. But Bede is extracting the most important ideas from Gregory and Augustine, forming a tradition and transmission of those ideas that persist in the Roman Church to this day.

There are some notable points about Bede's theology as expressed in the homilies; Bede has a complex, coherent theology, which is only presented to us in glimpses as he discusses a single biblical verse. We have seen that the unity of the Church is very important to Bede; it is important for heavenly unity that the Church on earth can be united. This building of the Church is accomplished through the action of grace, which can be seen throughout history. The framework of the six to eight ages allows Bede a framework for explaining history and the importance of various aspects thereof, through free-ranging connections. These connections demonstrate his acute awareness and understanding of time. This complex yet optimistic theology ensured the popularity of his homilies in Carolingian Europe.

Bede's theology was profoundly influenced by Augustine and Gregory. His homiliary was probably inspired by Gregory's own collection, although the precise audience and intent of the two authors was rather different. Bede was preaching primarily to a monastic audience, and was most concerned with a close understanding of the biblical text, though both men wished their differing congregations to appreciate the moral implications of the biblical text. Gregory's influence on Bede's concept of pastoral care has long been noted; it is equally apparent in the homilies. Augustine's influence is more perceptible in Bede's view of time and history, and in Bede's understanding of the complex theological issues concerning the nature of God.

The homilies were most likely not originally preached in their present form. They were certainly rooted in Bede's own preaching, and may be designed to be read aloud or in private, so that people could derive benefit from them in many contexts. The manuscript evidence bears this out, as it shows that at an early date, Bede's

homilies were used both in a liturgical context and were read in private. The rhetorical artistry used suggests strongly that Bede was keen to insert the kind of aural markers which would help listeners understand his theology. The moral discussions within the homilies surely sprang from his own work within the monastery, even though the homilies were probably composed in private, and carefully arranged.

There are many fruitful areas for further research which arise from this study. There is yet more work to be done on Bede's use of cadences, especially with regard to his use of them in other texts, and on how he compares to other early Anglo-Latin authors. The statistical methods used for such a survey also need further refinement, in order to give a reliable method with sufficient sensitivity. There is also further work to be done on the manuscript transmission of the homilies, examining the English tradition and the remaining continental manuscripts. Such work would also reveal more about how scribes treated the punctuation in Bedan manuscripts, and how readers parsed the text.

Bede commands many registers of style. Augustine and Jerome seem to have influenced different aspects of his style. Augustine's early work may have nurtured Bede's interest in periodic prose. In the homilies, he tends towards a complex, rhetorical style. His style highlights the key words for the less well-educated, and provides food for thought for others. The style of the homilies is used to produce an emotional effect; Bede wants his audience to grow closer to God, and he is prepared to use his rhetoric to induce the appropriate emotions. Statistical analysis suggests that Bede used clausulae, perhaps even the *cursus mixtus*, though this is an area which deserves further research. The clausulae would have been of particular use to listeners, in order to indicate the end of clauses. Their use by Bede suggests that he was aware that people would be listening to his homilies, not just reading them.

At Wearmouth-Jarrow a complex system of punctuation was used. In minuscule text, points at two heights and capital letters were used to facilitate reading. Particular attention is paid to punctuating paratactic clauses. Bodley 819 also shows the response that later readers had to the text. Not only do we have glosses by Aldred, but a twelfth-century scribe or reader felt the need to repunctuate in a more familiar idiom. Similar responses can be seen in manuscripts of the homilies; influenced by their exemplars, most of the early contintental manuscripts use a similar system of punctuation consisting of two points and capital letters.

However, later scribes and readers have again felt the need to repunctuate, showing that the texts were still of interest to readers in the twelfth century and beyond. The manuscripts show evidence of having been used for private reading for all that time; however, some of the early manuscripts show signs of being used in the liturgy, demonstrating a flexibility of use that Bede surely intended. The manuscripts of the homilies show signs of a complicated transmission, and have clearly been disordered and reordered over time. This question of ordering deserves further research, not least because it indicates a far more lively manuscript tradition than the number of manuscripts surviving today would suggest.

The medieval reader of the homilies would have had considerably more help than a reader of the CCSL edition. The very complexity of the Latin becomes a virtue when considered in the context of meditation upon a spiritual text. A reader can feel a very real sense of achievement, having understood Bede's Latin and appreciated the theological message behind it. Bede's homilies also reached a wider audience through the homiliary collected by Paul the Deacon. While some of the finer points may have been lost through hearing the homilies aloud, the stirring rhetorical effects and language used surely inspired the listeners at the night office.

Bede's theology and the undoubted authority of his sources made his homilies popular reading in Carolingian Europe. They provided authoritative sources for preachers and profound content for meditating monks. The precise allocation and ordering of the homilies stayed remarkably stable across four centuries, as did the manuscript punctuation. The twelfth-century reader could see the fingerprints (so to speak) of the eighth-century scribe in the layout and punctuation of the words he was reading; a punctuation set out by Bede to help his readers appreciate his message.

Appendix A: Comparative Tables of Bede's and Gregory's Gospel Homilies

Table 2: The distribution of Gregory's and Bede's homilies through the Church year.

	Gregory the Great	Bede (CCSL edition)	Bede (Appendix E)
Saints' Days	12 30%	8 16%	11 22%
Advent to Epiphany	6 15%	16 32%	13 26%
Lent to Octave of Easter	12 30%	18 36%	17 34%
Other feast days	3 7.5%	4 8%	7 14%
Other	7 17.5%	4 8%	2 4%

Table 3: The pericopes of Gregory's Gospel homilies. Items in **bold** correspond to those items found in Bede's Gospel homilies.

Homily	Day (where known)	Pericope	Story
1	St Felicity	Matt. 12:46-50	Jesus' mother and brothers
2	St Andrew	Matt. 4:18-22	**Calling of the first four Apostles**
3	Advent	Luke 21:25-33	The Son of Man in majesty
4	1st Sunday Advent	John 1:19-27	The Baptist questioned by Pharisees
5	2nd Sunday Advent	Matt. 11:2-10	John sends questioners to Jesus
6	4th Sunday Advent	Luke 3:1-11	**John's preaching**
7	Christmas	**Luke 2:1-14**	**Birth of Christ**
8	Epiphany	Matt. 2:1-12	The visit of the Magi
9	St Agnes?	Matt.13:44-52	Parable on King of heaven
10	A saint	Matt. 25:1-13	Wise and foolish virgins
11	Septuagesima	Matt. 20:1-16	Parable of labourers in vineyard
12	Sexagesima	Luke 8:4-15	Parable of the sower
13	Quinquagesima	Luke 18:31-43	Prophecy and healing of blind man
14	1st Sunday Lent	Matt. 4:1-11	Temptation of Christ
15	Mid-Lent	John 10:11-16	The Good Shepherd
16	Later Lent	John 8:46-59	Jews question Christ
17	Ordination of bishop?	Matt. 10:5-8	Sending of disciples
18	A saint	Matt. 25:14-30	Parable of talents
19	A bishops' synod?	Luke 10:1-7	Sending of disciples
20	St. Felix	Luke 12:35-40	Hour of Christ's coming
21	Easter Sunday	Mark 16:1-7	**The two Marys visit the tomb**
22	Monday after Easter	John 20:1-9	Mary Magdalen and Peter go to the tomb

23	Tuesday after Easter	Luke 24:13-35	The road to Emmaus
24	Wednesday after Easter	John 21:1-14	**Appearance at Galilee**
25	Thursday after Easter	John 20:11-18	Mary Magdalen weeps at the tomb
26	Vigil, or Octave of Easter	John 20:19-29	Appearance for Thomas
27	A martyr	John 15:12-16	'Love one another'
28	A saint?	John 4:46-53	Healing of nobleman's son
29	Ascension	Mark 16: 14-20	**Ascension**
30	Pentecost	John 14:23-27	Foretelling of Pentecost
31	Any day	Luke 13:6-13	Parable of fig tree
32	Saints (uncertain which)	Luke 9:23-27	Take up the cross
33	Any day	Luke 7:36-50	**The anointing of Christ's feet**
34	After Pentecost	Luke 15:1-10	Parable of lost sheep
35	St Marcellinus	Luke 21: 9-19	'Nation against nation'
36	St Lawrence	Luke 14:16-24	Parable of the poor invited to table
37	Timothy or other martyr	Luke 14:26-33	Give up riches to follow Christ
38	Lent?	Matt. 22:2-14	Parable of wedding garment
39	Unknown	Luke 19:41-47	**Cleansing of the Temple**
40	Unknown	Luke 16:19-31	Dives and Lazarus

Table 4: the Pericopes of Bede's Homilies

Homily	Day (where known)	Pericope	Story
I.1	Advent	Mark 1:4-8	**John preaching and baptising**
I.2	Advent	John 1:15-18	John bears witness to Christ
I.3	Advent	Luke 1:26-38	Annunciation
I.4	Advent	Luke 1:39-55	Visitation
I.5	Vigil of Christmas	Matt. 1:18-25	Joseph's dream
I.6	1st Mass of Christmas	**Luke 2:1-14**	**Birth of Christ**
I.7	2nd Mass of Christmas	Luke 2:15-20	The shepherds' visit
I.8	3rd Mass of Christmas	John 1:1-14	'In the beginning…'
I.9	St John the Evangelist	John 21:19-24	Jesus' final appearance: his words to Peter and John
I.10	Holy Innocents	Matt. 2:13-23	The flight to Egypt and slaughter of the Innocents
I.11	Octave of Christmas	Luke 2:21	Jesus' circumcision
I.12	Epiphany	Matt. 3:13-17	Jesus' baptism
I.13	St Benedict Biscop	Matt. 19:27-29	Give away all: receive one hundredfold
I.14	After Epiphany	John 2:1-11	Wedding at Cana
I.15	After Epiphany	John 1:29-34	Jesus' baptism
I.16	After Epiphany	John 1:35-42	John points out Jesus

I.17	After Epiphany	John 1:43-51	The calling of Philip and Nathanael
I.18	Purification of Mary	Luke 2:22-35	Purification of Mary; Simeon
I.19	After Epiphany	Luke 2:42-52	The boy Jesus at the temple
I.20	See of St Peter	Matt. 16:13-19	'Who is the Son of Man?'
I.21	Lent	Matt. 9:9-13	Jesus calls Matthew, the tax-collector
I.22	Lent	Matt. 15:21-28	Healing of the Canaanite woman's daughter
I.23	Lent	John 5:1-18	Healing at pool of Bethzatha
I.24	Lent	Matt. 16:27-17:9	Coming of the Son in glory
I.25	Lent	John 8:1-12	The adulterous woman
II.1	Lent	John 2:12-22	**Cleansing of the Temple**
II.2	Lent	John 6:1-14	Feeding the 5000
II.3	Palm Sunday	Matt. 21:1-9	Jesus enters Jerusalem
II.4	Holy Week	John 11:55-12:11	**Mary anoints Jesus' feet**
II.5	Lord's Supper	John 13:1-17	Washing the disciples' feet
II.6	Holy Saturday	Mark 7:31-37	Healing of the deaf-mute
II.7	Easter Vigil	Matt. 28:1-10	**Two Marys go to the tomb**
II.8	Easter	Matt. 28:16-20	**Jesus appears at Galilee**
II.9	After Easter	Luke 24:36-47	Jesus appears to the Apostles in Jerusalem
II.10	After Easter	Luke 24:1-9	The women go to the tomb
II.11	After Easter	John 16:5-15	Jesus prophesises about the Spirit
II.12	After Easter	John 16:23-30	'Ask anything of the Father...'
II.13	After Easter	John 16:16-22	Jesus prophesises his return to the Father
II.14	Major Litanies	Luke 11:9-13	'Ask and it will be given…'
II.15	Ascension	Luke 24:44-53	Ascension
II.16	After Ascension	John 15:26-16:4	Jesus tells of the coming of the Spirit
II.17	Pentecost	John 14:15-21	'If you love me…'
II.18	Octave of Pentecost	John 3:1-16	The kingdom of heaven
II.19	Vigil of birth of St John the Baptist	Luke 1:5-17	Zechariah's vision
II.20	Birth of St John the Baptist	Luke 1:57-68	John's birth
II.21	Ss John and Paul	Matt. 20:20-23	Sons of Zebedee
II.22	Ss Peter and Paul	John 21:15-19	'Feed my sheep.'
II.23	Beheading of St John the Baptist	Matt. 14:1-12	Beheading of John
II.24	Dedication of a church	John 10:22-30	'My sheep hear my voice…'
II.25	Dedication of a church	Luke 6:43-48	'No good tree bears bad

			fruit…'	

Table 5: The distribution of the pericopes across the Gospels.

	Matthew		Mark		Luke		John	
Bede	13	26%	2	4%	14	28%	21	42%
Gregory	11	27.5%	2	5%	17	42.5%	10	25%

Appendix B: Statistical Analysis of Bede's Use of Clausulae

Table 6: *Cursus mixtus* and metrical forms in Bede

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	total
A					1				1			3	2				14	1		1	85	27	135
B			1	10	8			12	2			36	1	9				1		3	1	1	85
C									1	1					1		11	2				4	20
D									3	1			1			5	2	16	2	12	2	28	72
E	2		1	2	2				9	3	1		5	4		1	2				3		35
F																	1		2		5		8
G											1	1					6			2	2		12
	2	0	2	12	11	0	0	12	13	7	3	40	9	13	1	6	16	38	4	18	90	70	367

A = planus, B = tardus, C = velox, D = trispondaicus, E = medius, F = dispondaicus, G = other

Table 7: Metrical forms in Bede and Oberhelman's control authors[1]

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	total
H	2	0	2	12	11	0	0	12	13	7	3	40	9	13	1	6	16	38	4	18	90	70	367
I	28	4	1	21	47	2	0	12	33	19	7	21	30	54	15	21	95	184	9	32	88	277	1000
J	33	4	4	28	64	2	1	10	66	10	7	40	36	43	8	16	72	171	10	22	104	249	1000
K	15	3	1	21	5	0	3	5	65	4	13	92	14	61	12	105	4	257	30	5	248	37	1000
L	3	0	6	11	9	1	0	4	8	0	1	10	6	1	5	1	26	55	0	2	53	46	248
M	12	0	32	22	12	1	0	10	23	0	2	55	8	21	4	8	36	128	13	17	146	157	707
N	6	0	3	18	9	0	0	5	12	0	2	29	1	2	5	4	21	65	2	2	67	52	305

H = Bede, I = Descartes, J = Polydore, K = Cicero, L = Dante, M = Gilbert, N = John of Salisbury.

---

[1] Data taken from Oberhelman, *Rhetoric and Homiletics*, Table I.

Table 8: *cursus mixtus* forms in Bede and Oberhelman's control authors[2]

	planus	tardus	velox	trispond.	medius	dispond.	other	total
Bede	135	85	20	35	72	8	12	367
Descartes	293	117	130	213	68	144	35	1000
Polydore	296	119	96	203	132	100	54	1000
Cicero	276	136	133	236	99	85	35	1000
Dante	93	50	93	0	2	10	0	248
Gilbert	210	141	142	133	31	27	23	707
John	84	259	356	153	45	37	23	1260

Equation 1

Confidence interval for single proportion:[3]

$$P_L = \frac{(2np + c_{\alpha/2}^2 - 1) - c_{\alpha/2}\sqrt{c_{\alpha/2}^2 - (2 + 1/n) + 4p(nq + 1)}}{2(n + c_{\alpha/2}^2)}$$

$$P_U = \frac{(2np + c_{\alpha/2}^2 + 1) + c_{\alpha/2}\sqrt{c_{\alpha/2}^2 + (2 + 1/n) + 4p(nq + 1)}}{2(n + c_{\alpha/2}^2)}$$

Where *n* is the total (so 367 for Bede), *p* is the proportion of the relevant result (240/367 = 0.653), where $c_{\alpha/2}$ = 2.75,[4] where $q = n - p$. P_L and P_U give us the upper and lower limits of the confidence interval, and we have a 99% confidence that the values lie between these two limits.

Table 9: 99% confidence interval on *planus*, *tardus* and *velox* forms in Descartes, Polydore and Cicero:[*]

. cii 3000 1596, level (99)

```
                -- Binomial Exact --
Variable    Obs     Mean      Std. Err. [99% Conf. Interval]

3000        .532    .00911     .5083315   .5555661
```

---

[2] Data taken from Oberhelman, *Rhetoric and Homiletics*, Table I.
[3] J. L. Fleiss, *Statistical Methods for Rates and Proportions*, 2nd edn (New York, 1981)
[4] This is the cut-off point in the normal distribution.
[*] The values in this table were calculated using the statistical software package Stata 8.0, (©Statacorp, 2003). The output from the program has been copied into this appendix. The first line is the relevant command.

Table 10: 99% confidence interval on *planus*, *tardus* and *velox* forms in Dante, Gilbert and John:[*]
. cii 1260 1002, level (99)

		-- Binomial Exact --			
Variable	Obs	Mean	Std. Err.	[99% Conf. Interval]	
1260	.7952381	.0113681	.7644597	.8237501	

Table 11: 99% confidence interval on *trispondaicus* forms in Descartes, Polydore and Cicero:[*]
. cii 3000 652, level (99)

		-- Binomial Exact --			
Variable	Obs	Mean	Std. Err.	[99% Conf. Interval]	
3000	.2173333	.0075299	.1982337	.2373393	

Table 12: 99% confidence interval on *trispondaicus* forms in Dante and John:[*]
. cii 553 20, level (99)

		-- Binomial Exact --			
Variable	Obs	Mean	Std. Err.	[99% Conf. Interval]	
553	.0361664	.0079395	.0188705	.0618595	

Table 13: 99% confidence interval on *trispondaicus* forms in Gilbert:[*]
. cii 707 133, level (99)

		-- Binomial Exact --			
Variable	Obs	Mean	Std. Err.	[99% Conf. Interval]	
707	.1881188	.0146978	.1517713	.2287556	

Table 14: 99% confidence interval on metrical forms in Descartes and Polydore:[*]
. cii 2000 1379, level (99)

		-- Binomial Exact --			
Variable	Obs	Mean	Std. Err.	[99% Conf. Interval]	
2000	.6895	.0103462	.6621677	.7159203	

---

[*] The values in this table were calculated using the statistical software package Stata 8.0, (©Statacorp, 2003). The first line is the relevant command.

Table 15: 99% confidence interval on metrical forms in Cicero:[*]
. cii 1000 781, level (99)

		-- Binomial Exact --		
Variable	Obs	Mean	Std. Err.	[99% Conf. Interval]
1000	.781	.0130782	.7455039	.8137749

.

Table 16: 99% confidence interval on metrical forms in Dante and John:[*]
 cii 553 429, level (99)

		-- Binomial Exact --		
Variable	Obs	Mean	Std. Err.	[99% Conf. Interval]
553	.7757685	.0177358	.7268847	.819801

Table 17: 99% confidence interval on metrical forms in Gilbert:[*]
. cii 707 552, level (99)

		-- Binomial Exact --		
Variable	Obs	Mean	Std. Err.	[99% Conf. Interval]
707	.7807638	.0155599	.7381366	.8195347

Equation 2

In my analyses, I used the upper value produced by the calculation of the confidence interval to produce the expected frequencies, by multiplying the upper limit by the total number of controls (so $0.555 \times 3000 = 1665$), then used this figure in the test below:

$$\chi^2 \text{ test:}^5 \quad \chi^2_{obt} = \sum \frac{(f_o - f_e)^2}{f_e}$$

where f_o = observed frequency and f_e = expected frequency and χ^2_{obt} = the result obtained.

---

[*] The values in this table were calculated using the statistical software package Stata 8.0, (©Statacorp, 2003). The first line is the relevant command.
[5] Pagano, *Understanding Statistics*, p. 403.

Table 18: χ^2 test on *planus*, *tardus* and *velox* forms in Descartes, Polydore and Cicero against Bede:[*]

. tabi 1665 240 \1335 127, chi2 expec

```
+--------------------+
Key
--------------------
frequency
expected frequency
+--------------------+
```

```
col
row       1       2         Total

1     1,665     240         1,905
      1,697.4   207.6       1,905.0

2     1,335     127         1,462
      1,302.6   159.4       1,462.0

Total   3,000     367     3,367
        3,000.0   367.0   3,367.0
```

Pearson chi2(1) = 13.0325   Pr = 0.000

Table 19: χ^2 test on *planus*, *tardus* and *velox* forms in Dante, Gilbert and John against Bede:[*]

. tabi 1037 240 \223 127, chi2 expec

```
+--------------------+
Key
--------------------
frequency
expected frequency
+--------------------+
```

```
col
row       1       2         Total

1     1,037     240         1,277
      988.9     288.1       1,277.0

2     223       127         350
      271.1     78.9        350.0

Total   1,260     367     1,627
        1,260.0   367.0   1,627.0
```

Pearson chi2(1) = 48.1141   Pr = 0.000

---

[*] The values in this table were calculated using the statistical software package Stata 8.0, (©Statacorp, 2003). The first line is the relevant command.

Table 20: χ^2 test on *trispondaicus* forms in Descartes, Polydore and Cicero against Bede:[*]

. tabi 711 72 \2289 295, chi2 expec

```
+--------------------+
Key
--------------------
frequency
expected frequency
+--------------------+
```

```
col
row     1      2        Total

1     711     72        783
      697.7   85.3      783.0

2    2,289    295       2,584
     2,302.3  281.7     2,584.0

Total   3,000    367    3,367
        3,000.0  367.0  3,367.0
```

Pearson chi2(1) = 3.0522 Pr = 0.081

0.081×5 = 0.405 P>α

Table 21: χ^2 test on *trispondaicus* forms in Dante and John against Bede:[*]
. tabi 34 72 \515 295, chi2 expec

```
+--------------------+
Key
--------------------
frequency
expected frequency
+--------------------+
```

```
col
row      1          2       Total

1      34          72       106
       63.7        42.3     106.0

2      519         295      814
       489.3       324.7    814.0

Total    553       367      920
         553.0     367.0    920.0
```

Pearson chi2(1)   =   39.2645 Pr = 0.000

---

[*] The values in this table were calculated using the statistical software package Stata 8.0, (©Statacorp, 2003). The first line is the relevant command.

Table 22: χ^2 test on *trispondaicus* forms in Gilbert against Bede:[*]
. tabi 161 72 \546 295, chi2 expec

```
+-------------------+
Key
-------------------
frequency
expected frequency
+-------------------+

col
row        1       2        Total

1      161      72        233
       153.4    79.6      233.0

2      546      295       841
       553.6    287.4     841.0

Total    707     367      1,074
         707.0   367.0    1,074.0
```

Pearson chi2(1) = 1.4145 Pr = 0.234

Table 23: χ^2 test on metrical forms in Descartes and Polydore against Bede:[*]
. tabi 1430 276 \570 91, chi2 expec

```
+-------------------+
Key
-------------------
frequency
expected frequency
+-------------------+

col
row        1       2        Total

1    1,430     276       1,706
     1,441.5   264.5     1,706.0

2      570      91        661
       558.5    102.5     661.0

Total    2,000    367     2,367
         2,000.0  367.0   2,367.0
```

Pearson chi2(1) = 2.1142 Pr = 0.146

---

[*] The values in this table were calculated using the statistical software package Stata 8.0, (©Statacorp, 2003). The first line is the relevant command.

Table 24: χ^2 test on metrical forms in Cicero against Bede:[*]
. tabi 813 276 \187 91, chi2 expec

```
+--------------------+
Key
--------------------
frequency
expected frequency
+--------------------+
```

```
col
row       1      2        Total

1      813     276        1,089
      796.6   292.4       1,089.0

2      187      91        278
      203.4    74.6       278.0

Total  1,000    367     1,367
        1,000.0   367.0   1,367.0
```

Pearson chi2(1) =   6.1574 Pr = 0.013

0.013×4=0.052 P>α

Table 25: χ^2 test on metrical forms in Dante and John against Bede:[*]
. tabi 453 276 \100 91, chi2 expec

```
+--------------------+
Key
--------------------
frequency
expected frequency
+--------------------+
```

```
col
row       1      2        Total

1      453     276        729
      438.2   290.8       729.0

2      100      91        191
      114.8    76.2       191.0

Total  553      367      920
        553.0    367.0    920.0
```

Pearson chi2(1) =   6.0420 Pr = 0.014

0.014×4=0.056 P>α

---

[*] The values in this table were calculated using the statistical software package Stata 8.0, (©Statacorp, 2003). The first line is the relevant command.

Table 26: χ² test on metrical forms in Gilbert against Bede:[*]
. tabi 579 276 \128 91, chi2 expec

```
+--------------------+
Key
--------------------
frequency
expected frequency
+--------------------+

col
row       1      2         Total

1     579      276         855
       562.8    292.2       855.0

2     128      91          219
       144.2    74.8        219.0

Total     707      367      1,074
          707.0    367.0     1,074.0
```

Pearson chi2(1) =   6.6628 Pr = 0.010
0.010×4=0.04 P<α

Table 27: forms of final cadence in Bede:

	l	*p*	*p* *p*
6p	0	2	3
5p	0	5	1
5p p	1	2	0
4p	3	39	14
4p p	1	61	11
3p	5	94	31
3p p	3	20	12
2	17	9	24
l	0	9	0

Table 28: expected forms of final cadence for Bede, calculated according to Janson's method:

	l	*p*	*p* *p*
4p	4	37	15
4pp	6	48	19
3p	11	85	34
3pp	3	23	9

---

[*] The values in this table were calculated using the statistical software package Stata 8.0, (©Statacorp, 2003). The first line is the relevant command.

2	4	33	13
othe r	2	15	6

Table 29: χ^2 test on observed and expected cadence forms in Bede, using Janson's method of internal comparison:

forms	o	e	(o-e)^2/e		pvalue		
14p	3	4.577657	0.543728		0.460892		
14pp	1	5.967302	4.134882		0.042008	0.756144	
13p	5	10.6267	2.979267		0.084337	1.518075	
13pp	3	2.861035	0.00675		0.934522		
"12"	17	4.087193	40.79586		1.69E-10	3.04E-09	sig
1 other	1	1.880109	0.411993		0.52096		
p4p	39	36.77384	0.134764		0.713543		
p4pp	61	47.93733	3.559509		0.059205	1.065695	
p3p	94	85.36785	0.872859		0.350165		
p3pp	20	22.98365	0.387326		0.533708		
p2	9	32.83379	17.30076		3.19E-05	0.000574	sig
p other	18	15.10354	0.555464		0.456094		
pp4p	14	14.6485	0.02871		0.865451		
pp4pp	11	19.09537	3.431983		0.063945		
pp3p	31	34.00545	0.265626		0.606281		
pp3pp	12	9.155313	0.883885		0.34714		
pp2	24	13.07902	9.119019		0.00253	0.045534	sig
pp other	4	6.016349	0.675769		0.411047		
total	367	367					

Equation 3

McNemars' test:[6]

$$\chi^2 = \left\{ \frac{\left| |p_2 - p_1| - 1/n \right|}{\text{s.e.}(p_2 - p_1)} \right\}^2 = \frac{(|b - c| - 1)^2}{b + c}$$

$$\text{where } p_1 = \frac{a + c}{n} \text{ and } p_2 = \frac{a + b}{n}$$

from a table:

	Factor Present	Factor Absent	Totals
Factor Present	a	b	a+b
Factor Absent	c	d	c+d
Totals	a+c	b+d	n

---

[6] Fleiss, *Statistical Methods*, pp. 113-114.

Table 30: McNemar's test on the proportion of *14p* cadences in Bede:[*]
. symmi 3 53 \27 284, contrib

col
row   1   2   Total

1   3   53   56
2   27   284   311

Total   30   337   367

Contribution
to symmetry
Cells   chi-squared
----
n1_2 & n2_1   8.4500

	chi2	df	Prob>chi2
Symmetry (asymptotic)	8.45	1	0.0037
Marginal homogeneity (Stuart-Maxwell)	8.45	1	0.0037

Revised probability: 0.0037×18=0.0666 – therefore slightly over the alpha-boundary of 0.05.

Table 31: McNemar's test on *14pp* cadences in Bede:[*]
. symmi 1 72 \29 265, contrib

col
row   1   2   Total

1   1   72   73
2   29   265   294

Total   30   337   367

Contribution
to symmetry
Cells   chi-squared
----
n1_2 & n2_1   18.3069

	chi2	df	Prob>chi2
Symmetry (asymptotic)	18.31	1	0.0000

---

[*] The values in this table were calculated using the statistical software package Stata 8.0, (©Statacorp, 2003). The first line is the relevant command

Marginal homogeneity (Stuart-Maxwell)   18.31   1   0.0000

Table 32: McNemar's test on *13p* cadences in Bede:[*]
. symmi 5 125 \25 212, contrib

col
row   1   2   Total

1   5   125   130
2   25   212   237

Total   30   337   367

Contribution
to symmetry
Cells   chi-squared
----
n1_2 & n2_1   66.6667

	chi2	df	Prob>chi2
Symmetry (asymptotic)	66.67	1	0.0000
Marginal homogeneity (Stuart-Maxwell)	66.67	1	0.0000

Table 33: McNemar's test on *13pp* cadences in Bede:[*]
. symmi 3 32 \27 305, contrib

col
row   1   2   Total

1   3   32   35
2   27   305   332

Total   30   337   367

Contribution
to symmetry
Cells   chi-squared
----
n1_2 & n2_1   0.4237

                                        chi2   df   Prob>chi2

Symmetry (asymptotic)   0.42   1   0.5151
Marginal homogeneity (Stuart-Maxwell)   0.42   1   0.5151
 P>α

Table 34: McNemar's test on *1 2* cadences in Bede:*

. symmi 17 33 \13 304, contrib

col
row   1   2   Total

1   17   33   50
2   13   304   317

Total   30   337   367

Contribution
to symmetry
Cells   chi-squared
----
n1_2 & n2_1   8.6957

	chi2	df	Prob>chi2
Symmetry (asymptotic)	8.70	1	0.0032
Marginal homogeneity (Stuart-Maxwell)	8.70	1	0.0032

0.0032 ×18=0.0576 P>α

Table 35: McNemar's test on *1 other* cadences in Bede:*

. symmi 1 22 \29 315, contrib

col
row   1   2   Total

1   1   22   23
2   29   315   344

Total   30   337   367

Contribution
to symmetry
Cells   chi-squared
----
n1_2 & n2_1   0.9608

	chi2	df	Prob>chi2

---

* The values in this table were calculated using the statistical software package Stata 8.0, (©Statacorp, 2003). The first line is the relevant command

Symmetry (asymptotic)	0.96	1	0.3270
Marginal homogeneity (Stuart-Maxwell)	0.96	1	0.3270

$$P>\alpha$$

Table 36: McNemar's test on *p4p* cadences in Bede:[*]
. symmi 39 17 \202 109, contrib

```
col
row   1    2    Total

1   39   17   56
2  202  109   311

Total  241   126   367
```

```
Contribution
to symmetry
Cells        chi-squared
--------------
n1_2 & n2_1      156.2785
```

	chi2	df	Prob>chi2
Symmetry (asymptotic)	156.28	1	0.0000
Marginal homogeneity (Stuart-Maxwell)	156.28	1	0.0000

Table 37: McNemar's test on *p4pp* cadences in Bede:[*]
. symmi 61 12 \180 114, contrib

```
col
row   1    2    Total

1   61   12   73
2  180  114   294

Total  241   126   367
```

```
Contribution
to symmetry
Cells        chi-squared
--------------
n1_2 & n2_1      147.0000
```

	chi2	df	Prob>chi2

---

[*] The values in this table were calculated using the statistical software package Stata 8.0, (©Statacorp, 2003). The first line is the relevant command.

Symmetry (asymptotic)   147.00 1   0.0000
Marginal homogeneity (Stuart-Maxwell)   147.00 1   0.0000

Table 38: McNemar's test on *p3p* cadences in Bede:[*]
. symmi 94 36 \147 90, contrib

col
row   1   2   Total

1   94   36   130
2   147   90   237

Total 241   126   367

Contribution
to symmetry
Cells   chi-squared
----
n1_2 & n2_1   67.3279

	chi2	df	Prob>chi2
Symmetry (asymptotic)	67.33	1	0.0000
Marginal homogeneity (Stuart-Maxwell)	67.33	1	0.0000

Table 39: McNemar's test on *p3pp* cadences in Bede:[*]
. symmi 20 15 \221 111, contrib

col
row   1   2   Total

1   20   15   35
2   221   111   332

Total 241   126   367

Contribution
to symmetry
Cells   chi-squared
----
n1_2 & n2_1   179.8136

	chi2	df	Prob>chi2
Symmetry (asymptotic)	179.81	1	0.0000
Marginal homogeneity (Stuart-Maxwell)	179.81	1	0.0000

---

[*] The values in this table were calculated using the statistical software package Stata 8.0, (©Statacorp, 2003). The first line is the relevant command.

Table 40: McNemar's test on *p2* cadences in Bede:[*]
. symmi 9 41 \232 85, contrib

col
row   1   2   Total

1   9   41   50
2   232   85   317

Total   241   126   367

Contribution
to symmetry
Cells   chi-squared
----
n1_2 & n2_1   133.6300

	chi2	df	Prob>chi2
Symmetry (asymptotic)	133.63	1	0.0000
Marginal homogeneity (Stuart-Maxwell)	133.63	1	0.0000

Table 41: McNemar's test on *p other* cadences in Bede:[*]
. symmi 18 5 \223 121, contrib

col
row   1   2   Total

1   18   5   23
2   223   121   344

Total   241   126   367

Contribution
to symmetry
Cells   chi-squared
----
n1_2 & n2_1   208.4386

	chi2	df	Prob>chi2

Symmetry (asymptotic)   208.44   1   0.0000
Marginal homogeneity (Stuart-Maxwell)   208.44   1   0.0000

Table 42: McNemar's test on *pp4p* cadences in Bede:[*]
. symmi 14 42 \82 229, contrib

col
row   1   2   Total

1   14   42   56
2   82   229   311

Total   96   271   367

Contribution
to symmetry
Cells   chi-squared
----
n1_2 & n2_1   12.9032

                                                  chi2   df   Prob>chi2

Symmetry (asymptotic)   12.90   1   0.0003
Marginal homogeneity (Stuart-Maxwell)   12.90   1   0.0003
                        0.0003 × 18 = 0.0054   P<α

Table 43: McNemar's test on *pp4pp* cadences in Bede:[*]
. symmi 11 62 \85 269, contrib

col
row   1   2   Total

1   11   62   73
2   85   269   354

Total   96   331   427

Contribution
to symmetry
Cells   chi-squared
----
n1_2 & n2_1   3.5986

                                                  chi2   df   Prob>chi2

---

[*] The values in this table were calculated using the statistical software package Stata 8.0, (©Statacorp, 2003). The first line is the relevant command.

Symmetry (asymptotic)	3.60	1	0.0578
Marginal homogeneity (Stuart-Maxwell)	3.60	1	0.0578

$$0.0478 \times 18 = 0.9 \quad P>\alpha$$

Table 44: McNemar's test on *pp3p* cadences in Bede:[*]
. symmi 31 99 \65 172, contrib

col
row 1   2   Total

1   31   99   130
2   65   172   237

Total   96   271   367

Contribution
to symmetry
Cells   chi-squared
----
n1_2 & n2_1   7.0488

	chi2	df	Prob>chi2
Symmetry (asymptotic)	7.05	1	0.0079
Marginal homogeneity (Stuart-Maxwell)	7.05	1	0.0079

$0.0079 \times 15 = 0.1185,\ P>\alpha$

Table 45: McNemar's test on *pp3pp* cadences in Bede:[*]
. symmi 12 23 \84 248, contrib

col
row   1   2   Total

1   12   23   35
2   84   248   332

Total   96   271   367

Contribution
to symmetry
Cells   chi-squared
----
n1_2 & n2_1   34.7757

	chi2	df	Prob>chi2

Symmetry (asymptotic)   34.78   1   0.0000
Marginal homogeneity (Stuart-Maxwell)   34.78   1   0.0000

Table 46: McNemar's test on *pp2* cadences in Bede:[*]
. symmi 24 26 \72 245, contrib

col
row   1   2   Total

1   24   26   50
2   72   245   317

Total   96   271   367

Contribution
to symmetry
Cells   chi-squared
----
n1_2 & n2_1   21.5918

                                      chi2   df   Prob>chi2

Symmetry (asymptotic)   21.59   1   0.0000
Marginal homogeneity (Stuart-Maxwell)   21.59   1   0.0000

Table 47: McNemar's test on *pp other* cadences in Bede:[*]
. symmi 4 19 \92 252, contrib (pp other)

col
row   1   2   Total

1   4   19   23
2   92   252   344

Total   96   271   367

Contribution
to symmetry
Cells   chi-squared
----
n1_2 & n2_1   48.0090

                                      chi2   df   Prob>chi2

---

[*] The values in this table were calculated using the statistical software package Stata 8.0, (©Statacorp, 2003). The first line is the relevant command.

Symmetry (asymptotic)	48.01	1	0.0000
Marginal homogeneity (Stuart-Maxwell)	48.01	1	0.0000

Appendix C: Description of Manuscripts

Boulogne-sur-Mer, Bibliothèque Municipale MS 75

Date: s.ix   Size: 338×260mm   Provenance: unknown, possibly St. Omer

Folios: 338   Contents: the 50 homilies.[1]

Written in two columns of 21 lines each. Pages are ruled. Titles and first lines of homilies in red uncial, text in black minuscule, with capital initials in black or red. First three folios remade during the twelfth century.[2] A guard leaf at the end is taken from a twelfth-century lectionary. F. 1 and f. 151bis contain an incomplete list of the lections for the homilies. Two or three lines of the Gospel reading are given before each homily. Margins, either top, bottom or side (occasionally all three) have often been cut off. Contractions and ligatures are rare (there is a noticeable difference in the frequency of use of contractions in the ninth- and twelfth-century leaves).

There is a slight ductus at the end of lines, linking words split over two lines, to make word identification easier for the reader; effectively, this is hyphenation of long words at line ends. This is something to which Lupus of Ferrières paid particular attention.[3] As we shall see below, there is evidence for similar levels of scholarship and scribal care in other manuscripts of the homilies.[4] The punctuation has been emended. The earliest punctuation has points at two heights · and . in the same ink as the main hand.[5] These are used in conjunction with capitals to give a fuller range of use, resulting in a hierarchy of low point, high point, point and capital letter.[6] This was subsequently altered, probably during the twelfth century when the first leaves were remade, with a virgule being added to a point to make a *punctus versus*.[7] This is a pattern we will see in later manuscripts, and have already seen in Bodley 819.[8] Γ (*paragraphus* signs) are occasionally used along with an initial to suggest a larger break.[9] The small *diple* is also occasionally used to indicate biblical quotations, as we

---

1 A more complete listing of contents for manuscripts of the fifty homilies can be found on p. 164, appendix D, table 48; contents of the other homiliaries can be found in appendix D, pp. 169-80.
2 These also have two columns, with 37 lines per column.
3 C. H. Beeson, *Lupus of Ferrières as a Scribe and Text Critic: A Study of his Autograph Copy of Cicero's* De Oratore, (Cambridge, Mass., 1930), p. 14.
4 See pp. 110-113 below.
5 As on f. 13r, line 14 and line 6.
6 See pp. 130-6 below for further discussion of punctuation.
7 As at f. 13r, col.1, line 11.
8 For further examples, see p. 110, 112, 118-19; for discussion of Bodley 819 see chapter IV, p. 101.
9 Parkes, *Pause and Effect*, p. 33. See for example f. 77v col. 1, line 16, f. 78r, col. 1 line 4, col. 2, line 5. The first two occurrences (homily I.18.90, p. 130, and line 96, p. 131) are to note the introduction of a new interpretation of the verse, and the third occurrence (I.18.107, p. 131) introduces a new verse.

saw in Bodley 819.[10] The manuscript shows signs either of its use in a public context or its exemplar's use in such a context, as there are marginal numbers on ff. 96v and 97r. These numbers may indicate the division of the text into sections for reading at the divine office.[11] On ff. 8v and 9r, also f. 72v, col. 1, line 4, there are marginal attributions to Bede's sources in a contemporaneous hand. Bede himself instituted this practice of referencing; subsequent scribes did not always observe these marks, and they quite quickly drop out of the manuscript tradition.[12] It is notable that the scriptorium of Corbie, mother-house of the monastery of St Omer (the probable provenance of this manuscript, as some St Omer manuscripts are now preserved in Boulogne)[13] was known to preserve the source-marks in Bede's commentaries.[14] The scribes of this manuscript were inconsistent and only occasionally copied the source marks. This manuscript has marginal 'J's, used to mark out words from John's Gospel (the date of this hand is indeterminate) indicating a reader's interest in the use of this Gospel.[15] This manuscript was probably also used for private reading or teaching: on f. 47v, lines 10-14 there is a marginal note – *de natura columbae* in a ninth- or tenth-century hand. This is next to the passage in homily I.15.81-97, discussing the appearance of the holy spirit in the form of a dove at Christ's baptism. This hand makes other marginal annotations indicating the contents of the main text (a sort of brief summary), for example on f. 73v. col. 1 line 15 *purificatio* appears next to a mention of baptism.[16] Large 'N's (*nota* symbols) appear at times, indicating an area of specific interest.[17] The explicit is: 'explicat omeliae/quas beatae/memoriae/beda presbyter/clare et luci/de exposuit/ numero quinquaginta'.[18]

Zurich, Zentralbibliothek, MS C42 (277)

Date: s.ix   Size: 286×205mm   Provenance: St Gall   Folios: 281

Contents: 50 homilies.

---

10 F. 14 for example. For discussion of the use of the *diple* in Bodley 819, see chapter IV, p. 91.

11 For evidence of the homilies being part of the divine office, see Introduction, p. 20.

12 See Laistner, 'The Library', p. 240 and Parkes, *The Scriptorium*, p. 17.

13 See p. 124 below.

14 D. Ganz, *Corbie in the Carolingian Renaissance* (Sigmaringen, 1990), p. 44.

15 See for example, f. 101v, 102r.

16 Other examples have a paragraphus symbol Γ in the text, with a few words in the margin, as at f. 16v, *de templo*, and *epilogus*, marking out the exhortation at the end of the homily (II.1). F. 238r, col. 2, lines 2-5, (II.19) next to the text *inde etiam cantores statuit* we have 'psalm cui metodia de cantare clera'.

17 See for example f. 92r, col. 1, lines 7-8; I.24.112-3, where Bede states that the condemned cannot see Christ in his glory.

18 'End of the 50 homilies which Bede the priest of blessed memory clearly and lucidly explained.' A description can be found in *Catalogue Général des manuscrits des bibliothèques publiques des départements de France IV* (Paris, 1872), pp. 620-21.

23 lines to the page. Rubrics in red capitals, text in minuscule.[19] The Gospel reading is given before the homily, with the first few words in black capitals, the rest in minuscule. Initials in red and silver. Insular features.[20] Several hands. F.1 contains an index of the homilies in book I, though the first part is missing. F. 129 contains a list of the homilies in book II. F.1 also has a stamp of the Zurich library and the St Gall library. Punctuation: points at two heights, the *punctus interrogativus*, with the points later altered to *puncti versi* and *puncti elevati*. The small *diple* is occasionally seen, marking out Gospel quotations.[21] The ink of the alterations is very close in colour to that of the main text, but a finer pen has been used.[22]

The biblical text has not been repunctuated and was punctuated only with points at one height, the *punctus interrogativus* and *litterae notabiliores*.[23] The text has been frequently corrected; it is possible that some of the corrections resulted from a comparison of texts or speculative editing, rather than simple error correction, as we have words corrected which make sense in context. In homily I.5.80, the manuscript omits *agnoscerent*, and a later hand has added in the margin *meminissent*, knowing that a verb was missing[24] In line 90 of the same homily, the spelling of *adsumens* is corrected to *assumens*. Words have frequently been missed out, and have been added in the margin under a *signe de renvoi* in a contemporary hand.[25] I am unable to hazard a date for the other correcting hands. Such correcting work recalls the activity of Lupus of Ferrières. Beeson has noted Lupus' techniques as a textual critic. Lupus would actively seek out texts against which to compare copies already in his possession, and would correct the manuscripts, even engaging in conjectural editing.[26] While this manuscript is not associated with Lupus, it has certainly been subjected to some conjectural editing, as the addition of *meminissent* shows. This word is not present as a reading in any other surviving manuscript, and therefore we may reasonably assume that it is a conjectural addition by a ninth-century editor. This reminds us that the practice was not confined to Lupus, but was practised by other

---

19 See A. Bruckner, ed., *Scriptoria Medii Aevi Helvetica: III Schreibschulen der Diözese Konstanz: St Gallen II* (Geneva, 1938), p. 124.
20 See Hurst, CCSL 122, p. xvii.
21 F. 83v, line 9.
22 See f. 2r.
23 F. 36r, for example.
24 See for example f. 13r and v, homily I.5.80 and I.5.90. Ff. 135r, 142r, 181v and 237v all have insertions of omitted words.
25 For example, f. 30r.
26 Beeson, *Lupus of Ferrières*, p. 4, p. 34.

scholars.[27] At the bottom of the final leaf of most quires is a number enclosed in a small decorative feature. Occasionally the quire number within has been erased. This is a feature reminiscent of Bodley 819. Marginal ÷ appear. These are occasionally used as *signes de renvoi* for corrections, but may also function as marks for liturgical use, indicating sections of the homily to be used as a reading, as they are often regularly spaced, and have no text associated with them in the margins. However, some homilies have marginal numbers indicating lections, which perhaps makes it more likely that the ÷ function as signs to draw the attention of the reader.[28] Lines 2-5 of the Gospel reading on f. 53v are neumed. F. 242v is marked up for reading, with ´ over the syllable marking things to be stressed, and dots over short vowels, thus: *cėlėbrámus*.[29] The punctuation of such sections seems more frequent than elsewhere. These marks are quite different from neumes. The presence of both these features suggests strongly that it was a manuscript used in the liturgy, to be sung and spoken.

St Gall, Klosterbibliothek, Codex 85 (Bede's commentary on Luke) contains layout features similar to those used in Wearmouth-Jarrow manuscripts – long line layout, uncial lemmata, local minuscule for text, source mark for quotations. Zurich C42 shows a few, but not all, of these features, and also some other features of Wearmouth-Jarrow manuscripts. It is therefore likely that the St Gall scriptorium was influenced by the layout of Wearmouth-Jarrow manuscripts and that they adopted those conventions for their own use.[30] Zurich C42 is slightly older than St Gall 85 (which dates from the late eighth century), and therefore some of the Wearmouth-Jarrow-like features may have been subsumed in the Carolingian norms of presentation.

Engelberg, Stiftsbibliothek, Codex 47

Date: s.xii   Size: 250×205mm   Provenance: unknown   Folios: 135

Contents: 50 homilies.[31]

This is the only manuscript to contain an illuminated frontispiece, of a scribe, facing right, eyes turned heavenwards with a pen in his left hand (with a maniple over his wrist) and a book stand in front of him. His robe is red, and at the corner are four

---

27 See the editorial intervention in Munich 18120 and Munich 4533 and 4534. See pp. 112-3 and pp. 118-9.

28 For example, f. 249v, 250r.

29 Boyle, *"Vox paginae"*, p. 24. See also ff. 243r. This marking appears sporadically thereafter.

30 See Parkes, *The Scriptorium*, p. 17.

31 Description in E. G. Vogel, *Serapeum* X (1849), p. 122.

winged evangelist symbols. F. 2 has a list of homilies in book I; f. 65v-66r has a list of those in book II. Titles in red capitals, text in black minuscule. Initials in red, blue and gold. Small *diple* used to mark out Gospel quotations.[32] Punctuation: low point, *punctus elevatus*, *punctus interrogativus*. Marginal comments exist, which tend to consider the nature and sacrifice of Christ.[33] *Maria* is capitalised throughout the manuscript. A later hand has left marginal symbols, Ø sometimes with a direction to genuflect.[34] Correspondences to Migne's edition in PL have been pencilled in.[35]

Munich, Staatsbibliothek, Clm 18120

Date: s.xi   Size: quarto   Provenance: Tegernsee   Folios: 187

Contents: 50 homilies.[36]

Titles red capitals, text black minuscule. Initials in red, green and blue. The first line of the lection is given, in minuscule. F. 1r contains a note stating that the manuscript belonged to the monastery at Tegernsee. F. 2r list of lections for book I, f. 85r has a list of lections for book II. 30 lines per page. Punctuation: points at two heights, *punctus elevatus*, *punctus versus*, *punctus interrogativus*. Later repunctuated, with *punctus elevatus* being changed to *punctus versus*, and points being changed to *punctus versus*.[37] The small *diple* marking Gospel quotation appears at times.[38] Some words are corrected in a thirteenth-century hand, presumably against the homiliary of Paul the Deacon contained in Munich 4533 and 4534 (both manuscripts from Benediktbeuren), which also shows corrections in the same hand to homilies by Bede.[39] Some homilies are marked for reading.[40] At the first occurrence in homily I.13 the name *Benedicto* is capitalised, and there is a marginal note saying: 'Non loquitur hic de sancto benedicto ordinis nostri legislatore, sed de alio quodam huius nominis abbate.'[41] There are occasional marginal comments, in hands of various

---

32 F. 2r, lines 11-12.
33 F. 13v, line 16: opposite *coheredem christi posse fieri*, 'dat exemplum evangelista R et ipse filius dei hominem fieri', f. 24v.
34 F. 89r, 90r.
35 Bede, *Homiliae*, PL 90.
36 C. Halm, *et al*., ed., Catalogus *Codicum Manuscriptorum Bibliothecae Regiae Monacensis III.ii Codices Latini* (Munich, 1844), p. 134.
37 See f. 6r.
38 See f. 125v for example.
39 F. 6v of this manuscript.
40 F. 8r, ff. 16v-17v, amongst others.
41 F. 38v. 'This passage is not talking about St Benedict, who wrote the rule for our order, but of some other abbot of that name.' This homily is, of course, about Benedict Biscop. See Introduction p. 9 and

dates.[42]

Paris, B.n.F, MS lat. 2369

Date: s.x   Size: 275×255mm   Provenance: Jura, later owned by J. A. Thou

Folios: 221[43]   Contents: most of the 50 homilies, plus a homily by Gregory

the Great on f. 106v-110v.

Incipits in red capitals, rubric in uncial. First lines of the Gospel reading are in black

capitals, thereafter, two or three more lines of the reading in Caroline minuscule.

Written in one column of 26 lines.

F. 1r has a donation formula of uncertain date. Lower down on the same page

there is a thirteenth-century note from a reader: 'ego non peto librum expositionis

bede super evangelia/sed peto librum expositionis bede super psalmos perscribet'.[44]

We see here that Bede was a sought-after author in this time and also that the

cataloguing at the reader's library left something to be desired. It is unclear to what

work the reader is referring; Bede never wrote a commentary on Psalms. He wrote an

abbreviated psalter, but this comment would suggest something more extensive.[45] It is

probably therefore by some other author, and has become attributed to Bede by the

thirteenth century. F. 1v contains a formula to be used on Maundy Thursday for the

reconciliation of penitents. Insular abbreviations are used.[46] Marginal and interlinear

corrections are common.[47] Punctuation: points at two heights and the *punctus elevatus*

and the *punctus interrogativus* are found. The punctuation has subsequently been

emended, with some of the lower points being converted into *puncti elevati* and some

of the higher points being turned into *puncti versi*.[48] *Litterae notabiliores* are used in

conjunction with these to provide a pausal hierarchy. Word separation of prefixes is

erratic. The smaller form of the *diple* is used to indicate a quotation from the Gospel

---

p. 121 below for more discussion.

42 See for example, ff. 80r, line 29; 132r, line 25, where the comment is in a thirteenth-century hand.

43 P. Lauer, ed., *Bibliothèque Nationale catalogue général des manuscrits latins II* (Paris, 1940), p. 428.

44 'I do not seek Bede's book of exposition of the Gospels, but I seek the book of exposition Bede wrote on the psalms.'

45 Bede, 'Collectio Psalterii Bedae', in *Liber hymnorum*, ed. J. Fraipont, CCSL 122, pp. 452-70. For a discussion of this work, see B. Ward, *Bede and the Psalter*, Jarrow Lecture (Jarrow, 1991). However, M. Gorman doubts the authenticity of this work, 'The Canon of Bede's Work', p. 416.

46 See Hurst, CCSL 122, p. xviii.

47 See for example f. 2v, line 4, f. 3r, line 18.

48 This occurs on ff. 108-111. It seems to be confined to these leaves. On these leaves in the same coloured ink as the punctuation alterations is a marginal note: *Angelus cuius nostros* (f. 110v, line 11, on homily II.10). See discussion below, pp. 135-6.

reading, but this is not done systematically.[49] Lections are indicated in the margin, in groups of twelve.[50] These groups may run across from homily to homily. Occasionally these marginal numbers have been erased.[51] Ff. 147-8 have only 20 lines per page. F. 149 returns to 21 lines per page. The last leaves are badly faded and barely visible. The evidence strongly suggests that this book had a liturgical function – especially given the formula for reconciliation included at the beginning of the manuscript.

Paris, B.n.F., MS lat. 2370

Date: s.xi-xii Size: 335×260mm Provenance: Jura Folios: 112

Contents: most of the 50 homilies.[52]

F. 112 contains three documents concerning security given on the goods of a monastery in the Jura, witnessed by Aymery de Sevin, Guillaume de Chalmiac and Guibert de Vin. These date from the twelfth century.[53] Written in two columns of 39 lines. Coloured initials, decorated with pen at the beginning of each homily. Incipits in capital. Rubrics in uncial and rustic capitals, for both reading and homily. Text in minuscule. Contains insular contractions. Punctuation: points at two heights, *punctus versus* and *punctus elevatus*.[54] F. 1 contains a list of lections for book I of the homilies, f. 53 for book II. Several scribes worked on this manuscript, with changes of hand perceptible at folios 5, 12, 25, and 49. The initials have features reminiscent of Insular art, they are formed of animals. This may suggest closeness to an insular original. There are no marginal numerals or other indications of liturgical use, nor are there marginal notes indicating private reading.

Paris, B.n.F., MS Nou. acq. lat. 1450

Date: s.xi Size: 334×245mm Provenance: Cluny Folios: 129ff

Contents: Most of the 50 homilies.

Written in two columns of 39-45 lines (the number varies throughout the manuscript). Insular abbreviations used.[55] F. 1 lists the Gospel readings for book I, f. 58 for book

---

49 The first example can be found on f. 3v.
50 As at ff. 27-36.
51 Ff. 42v-43r.
52 See list in table 48, p. 165.
53 Lauer, *Bibliothèque Nationale catalogue général II*, p. 429.
54 F. 25r.
55 L. Delisle, *Inventaire des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Nationale, Fonds de Cluny* (Paris, 1884), pp. 86-90.

2. Lemma and incipits in red capitals. Text in black minuscule, in two hands, changing at f. 49r. The first three to four lines of each Gospel reading are given. Homilies have decorated initials, some of which are historiated initials, as at the beginning of homily I.22, where the initial 'I' is formed as a woman next to a banner on which is written *mulier cananea*. The homily is indeed about the Canaanite woman.[56] Historiated initials probably originated in insular manuscripts.[57] Smaller initials are used at the beginnings of sentences. Abbreviations are frequently used. Three punctuation marks are used: low point, *punctus elevatus*, *punctus interrogativus*.[58] The small version of the *diple* is used to indicate quotation from the Gospels.[59] An 'N', for *nota*, is often found in the margin (see f. 3r-v), possibly indicating private reading. Other marginal comments include *angeli* (f. 17v) and a more extensive discussion on f. 65v. This latter is very difficult to read, and is severely truncated by the trimming of the vellum leaf. There are frequent marginal corrections.[60] On ff. 68v and 69r ł (vel) appears in the margin, next to the word *autem*. This symbol also appears opposite *ergo* in margins.[61] A marginal 'F' appears on 69r, col. 2, line 28, opposite the words *tristabantur discipuli* and on f. 71r, col. 1, line 38 next to *Pater autem nec*. Ff. 94-6 have marginal numerals, usually used to mark out lections, though in this case they may have been transferred from the exemplar, as they are infrequently used. The manuscript, therefore, may have been used in the liturgy, but is more likely to have been used for private study, particularly if it were produced at Cluny, a foundation in which the Benedictine practice of private devotional reading was of great importance. However, there may well not be a sharp distinction between private and liturgical use since the former might well inform the mindset of the monk undertaking private reading.

Karlsruhe, Hof- und Landesbibliothek, MS Aug. 19

Date: s.ix   Size: 402×314mm   Provenance: Reichenau   Folios: 147

Contents: Paul the Deacon's homiliary, summer season.[62]

---

56 F. 38.
57 J. J. G. Alexander, *The Decorated Letter* (London, 1978), p. 9 and p. 11.
58 See f. 1, col. 2, line 2.
59 F. 2v, col 2, line 2.
60 F. 21v, for example, where *ad discenda* is added in the margin.
61 F. 118r-v.
62 A. Holder, *Die Handschriften der Grossherzoglich Badischen Hof- und Landesbibliothek in Karlsruhe V: Die Reichenauer Handschriften I* (Leipzig, 1906), pp. 69-78. See appendix D, pp. 169-74 for list of contents.

Uses red and gold capitals for the rubric, capitals for the beginning of the homily and decorated initial letters. Thirty-four lines per column, two columns. Punctuation: low point, point with up-right pointing arrow, and *punctus interrogativus*. Smaller form of the *diple* used to indicate quotation from lection. Manuscript has marginal numbers indicating lections.[63] It lacks marginal comments and may perhaps have been primarily used as a liturgical book, as indeed it was intended to be.

Karlsruhe, Hof- und Landesbibliothek, MS Aug. 37

Date: s.x[ex]   Size: 370×279mm   Provenance: Reichenau   Folios: 194

Contents: Homiliary for Sundays and feast days.[64]

F. 39r was rewritten in s.xiv. 2 columns of 28 lines. Large round Caroline hand. Initials at beginnings of homilies in red, blue and green. Initials at beginning of sentences. Rubrics in red capitals. Punctuation: low point, *punctus elevatus*, *punctus interrogativus*, *punctus versus* (rarer). Occasional abbreviations. Marginal numbers indicate lection divisions. Bede's homilies are much abridged (to approximately one-third of their length), making them comparable in length to the other homilies included in this collection. At least two scribes. F. 22r has marginal comments (most of which have been cut off when the leaves were trimmed, possibly for rebinding) which may suggest that the manuscript was read and studied privately.[65] From f. 74 onwards, the outer margins are badly damaged and difficult to read. The small *diple* makes occasional appearances, marking out biblical quotations.[66]

St Gall, Stiftsbibliothek, MS 433

Date: s.ix   Size: 300×425mm   Provenance: St Gall   Pages: 708

Contents: Paul the Deacon's homiliary – Sundays and saints' days.[67]

Paul the Deacon's homiliary contains many of Bede's Gospel homilies, as well as homilies by other fathers of the Church.[68] Titles in red rustic capitals or uncial, fine initials in silver or gold. Text in black minuscule. Two columns, 27 lines. Pages 1-6

---

63 F. 36v, for example.
64 Holder, *Die Handschriften V*, pp. 140-55; see appendix D, pp. 174-6.
65 The few words still visible suggest that they were not liturgical directions.
66 F. 186r, col.1 lines 14-17.
67 See Bruckner, *Scriptorium medii aevi Helvetica III*, p. 105; appendix D, pp. 176-9.
68 For a discussion of the connections between Paul the Deacon's homiliary and Bede's homilies, see Introduction, pp. 19-20.

contains a list of the homilies in this manuscript, though another leaf at the beginning has been lost. Punctuation: points at two heights and the *punctus interrogativus*, more rarely the *punctus elevatus*. Initials occur at the beginning of sentences.[69] Frequent use of abbreviation. Corrections are infrequent – the manuscript is very accurate.[70] On page 12 begins a life of St Gall. It has numbered sections for reading, each beginning with a red initial. Page 18 has 'IN OCTAVA SANCTI GALLI' and a new set of numbers begins midway through the life. A marginal cross marks the end of the last section of reading. This practice of numbering is often followed in the manuscript. There are occasional marginal comments, indicating private reading, in several different hands, dating from the tenth, thirteenth and fifteenth centuries.[71] On page 447, Bede's homily for the feast of Benedict Biscop (I.13) has been converted to be an encomium for St Gall, simply by changing the relevant names.[72] This manuscript was originally intended for liturgical use, and later became used for private study – as will be discussed further below.

St Gall Stiftsbibliothek, MS 434

Date: s.ix   Size: 305×415mm   Provenance: St Gall   Pages: 342

Contents: Paul the Deacon's homiliary – octave of Pentecost to beginning of Advent.[73] Two columns of 27 lines. Titles in red rustic capitals. Text in a minuscule hand.[74] Pages 1-5 contains an index. Pages 6-7 are blank, though ruled. Punctuation: low point, *punctus elevatus*, high point, *punctus interrogativus*. Ductus at the end of hyphenated words to indicate run-over to next line (this is also seen in the Boulogne 75 manuscript). Occasional marginal comment. 'R/' in the margin indicates certain phrases may have been used as a responsory.[75]

---

69 See page 62 for examples.
70 See page 141 for a rare example.
71 See for example pages 298, 452 and 486.
72 This is a not-uncommon practice with saints' lives, where on occasions the only difference between two lives is the name of the saint. H. Delehaye, *The Legends of the Saints*, trans. D. Attwater (Dublin, 1998), p. 76.
73 See pp. 179-80.
74 Bruckner, *Scriptorium medii aevi Helvetica III*, p. 105.
75 See page 294.

Munich, Staatsbibliothek, Clm 4533

Date: s.xi[in] [76]   Size: quarto   Provenance: Benediktbeuren   Folios: 243

Contents: Homiliary of Paul the Deacon, Advent to Holy Saturday.[77]

Titles in capitals, text in minuscule. Two columns of twenty-five lines. f. 1-3v contains a list of contents. At the beginning of f. 1r, there is a general statement of content, written in red, blue and yellow capitals. On f. 3v, after the capitulae, we have a smaller hand, in different ink.[78] Punctuation: low point, *punctus elevatus*, *punctus interrogativus*. Later, the *punctus versus* was added, and some points, a very few, were changed to *puncti elevati*.[79] There are some marginal comments, though most are illegible.[80] The manuscript itself is hard to read; many abbreviations are used, minims are very unclear and words are often run together. The small *diple* is used for biblical quotation.   There are indications of liturgical use beyond the usual marginal numbers:[81] there are symbols in the margin, often crosses or struck-through circles Ø, with accompanying text which was probably used as a response.[82]

Munich, Staatsbibliothek, Clm 4534

Date: s.xi[in]   Size: quarto   Provenance: Benediktbeuren   Folios: 285

Contents: Homiliary of Paul the Deacon, Easter to Advent.

Titles in capitals, text in minuscule. Two columns of 25 lines. F. 1r contains a list of feasts, written badly using many abbreviations; ff. 1v-4r contain a list of contents. Punctuation: low point, *punctus elevatus*, *punctus interrogativus*, occasional *punctus versus*. Some points are changed to *puncti versi*. Small *diple* is used. Some homilies are marked for reading.

Cologne, Dombibliothek, Codex 172

Date: *c*.800   Size: 288×176mm   Provenance: Mondsee   Folios: 132

---

76 F. Wiegand dates this manuscript and Clm 4534 to s.x-xi. 'Das Homiliarium Karls des Grossen', *Studien zur Geschichte der Theologie und der Kirche* I.II (Leipzig, 1897), p. 7.
77 See appendix E, p. 180.
78 At the bottom of this leaf are some words noting a connection to the great Benedictine scholar, Mabillon. The entire preface to Paul the Deacon's collection, as published in PL is written here.
79 See f. 30v, for example.
80 F. 34v.
81 Which can be seen on ff. 72-3 for example.
82 F. 69v, 'Tu autem domine lumen de lumine tu dignatus es hodie nasci miserere nostri.'; see also f. 73v.

Contents: homilies by various authors for Christmas to Ascension.[83]

In a good Carolingian hand. Index at the front of 65 homilies. Format: lection of the day, then relevant homilies and sermons. 20 lines to the page. Small form of *diple* marks quotation from the lection. Two hands. Punctuated with low point, *punctus elevatus* and *punctus versus*. The manuscript contains frequent extracts from Bede's commentaries on Acts and the Seven Catholic Epistles, as well as homilies by Gregory, Augustine and Leo. This collection contains homilies on books of the Bible, but does not include Gospel homilies. I examined this manuscript to ascertain whether copies of Paul the Deacon's homiliary typically had a layout differing from other contemporary homiliaries.[84] As this homiliary originates from Mondsee, an area strong in Insular connections (which many of the manuscripts of the Gospel homilies have), its presentation habits may be compared with those of the manuscripts of Bede's Gospel homilies. It thus allows us to determine to what extent the scribes are copying the features of their exemplars, and to what extent the Wearmouth-Jarrow layout innovations had permeated Carolingian scribal practice. This manuscript demonstrates that both are the case, to a certain extent. The abbreviations (and in some cases the numerals denoting lections) have clearly been copied from the exemplar, but other features are Carolingian in origin. Punctuation in ninth-century manuscripts seems to be copied from the exemplar, but for collections such as that of Paul the Deacon, where either there is a Carolingian exemplar, or the collection is compiled from several exemplars, the three-mark system of punctuation (point, *punctus versus* and *punctus elevatus*) is used from the start.[85] More generally, it seems that there was a Carolingian convention for homiliary layout, including a table of contents, and careful rubrication of the individual homilies.

This manuscript also illustrates the importance of biblical commentaries as a source for homiliary compilers. Paul the Deacon and the compilers of the two Karlsruhe manuscripts used extracts from commentaries to fill out their volumes. Sometimes the extracts are marked as such: *sermo ex commentario*; at other times they are not: extracts from Bede's commentaries are often just described as *sermo Bedae*. Some of these Bedan examples are part of what J. Leclercq has described as

---

83 http://www.ceec.uni-koeln.de/ceec.cgi/kleioc/0010/exec/katk/%22kn28%2D0172%22 last accessed August 2005.
84 See pp. 127-8 below for discussion of layout.
85 As mentioned above in chapter IV, the three-mark system of punctuation arose in the late eighth century, and was first used in liturgical manuscripts, which accurately matches the intended use of Paul the Deacon's homiliary. Parkes, *Pause and Effect*, p. 36.

the 'third book' of Bede's homilies:[86] a collection of genuine Bedan material, extracted from his commentaries.[87] It is clear that such a collection enters circulation early (if not exactly this collection, which J. Leclercq assembles from Giles' edition); in the early manuscripts of Paul the Deacon's homiliary, they are already labelled as *sermo* with no hint that they originate from a commentary.[88] Paul was clearly aware that he was making extracts from commentaries, as noted above. He also clearly distinguished between Bede's fifty homilies, which he describes in terms matching those found in *HE* V.21, and these *sermones* of Bede's, which suggests that by the year 800, a separate volume of Bedan florilegia was circulating. It could perhaps have originated in his monastery in the years following his death, or be associated with the school at York and circulated by Alcuin. However, as J. Leclercq points out, no manuscript of the entire collection he lists in his article has ever existed (or at least survived),[89] nor is any such manuscript of commentary extracts known to survive, though perhaps a search of florilegia would be fruitful. J. Leclercq suggests searching in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries for the constitution of the collection; I suggest that the nucleus of the collection should be sought in the Carolingian period, as there seems to have been a specific source for Paul the Deacon to use.

The layout of the manuscripts of Paul the Deacon's homiliary and of the Cologne homiliary demonstrates the importance of layout to the Carolingian scribes, and the unity of style across the empire. Direct influence from Wearmouth-Jarrow is difficult to demonstrate, but clarity was important to scribes on both sides of the sea and the Carolingian scribes could not fail to be impressed by the layout of any Wearmouth-Jarrow manuscripts they happened to see.

---

86 See appendix D.
87 J. Leclercq, 'Le iiie livre', pp. 211-18.
88 Munich 4533, from the beginning of the eleventh century and St Gall 433, 434, both s.ix.
89 J. Leclercq, 'Le iiie livre', p. 218.

Appendix D: Manuscript Assignations of the Homilies

Table 48: relative orders of homilies

Hurst	Morin	Engel-berg 47	Munich 18120	Zurich C42	Paris n.a. 1450	Paris 2370	Paris 2369	Boul-ogne 75	PL
I.1	I.1	I.1	I.1	I.1	I.1	I.3	I.3	I.1	I.3
I.2	I.2	I.2	I.2	I.2	I.2	I.4	I.4	I.2	I.4
I.3	I.5	I.5	I.5	I.5	I.5	I.1	I.1	I.5	I.1
I.4	I.6	I.7	I.7	I.7	I.6	I.2	I.5	I.7	I.2
I.5	I.7	I.8	I.8	I.8	I.7	I.5	I.8	I.8	I.5
I.6	I.8	I.9	I.9	I.9	I.8	I.7	I.9	I.9	I.7
I.7	I.9	I.10	I.10	I.10	I.9	I.8	I.10	I.10	I.8
I.8	I.10	I.11	I.11	I.11	I.10	I.9	I.11	I.11	I.9
I.9	I.11	I.12	I.12	I.12	I.11	I.10	I.12	I.12	I.10
I.10	I.12	I.14	I.14	I.14	I.12	I.11	I.19	I.14	I.11
I.11	I.14	I.19	I.19	I.19	I.14	I.12	I.14	I.19	I.12
I.12	I.19	I.13	I.13	I.13	I.19	I.19	I.15	I.13	I.19
I.13	I.15	I.15	I.15	I.15	I.15	I.15	I.18	I.15	I.14
I.14	I.18	I.18	I.18	I.18	I.18	I.14	I.17	I.18	I.15
I.15	I.17	I.17	I.17	I.17	I.17	I.18	I.24	I.17	I.18
I.16	I.24	I.24	I.24	I.24	I.24	I.23	I.25	I.24	I.23
I.17	I.22	I.22	I.22	I.22	I.22	I.24	II.2	I.22	I.17
I.18	I.25	I.25	I.25	I.25	I.25	I.22	II.1	I.25	I.24
I.19	II.6	II.6	II.6	II.6	II.6	I.25	II.3	II.6	I.22
I.20	II.1	II.1	II.1	II.1	II.1	II.2	II.5	II.1	I.25
I.21	I.23	I.23	I.23	I.23	I.23	II.1	II.7	I.23	II.2
I.22	II.2	II.2	II.2	II.2	II.2	II.3	GREG	II.2	II.1
I.23	II.4	II.4	II.4	II.4	II.4	II.4	II.9	II.4	II.3
I.24	II.3	II.3	II.3	II.3	II.3	II.5	II.8	II.3	II.4
I.25	II.5	II.5	II.5	II.5	II.5	II.7	II.13	II.5	II.5
II.1	II.7	II.7	II.7	II.7	II.7	II.9	II.11	II.7	II.7
II.2	II.10	II.10	II.10	II.10	II.10	II.8	II.14	II.10	II.9
II.3	II.9	II.9	II.9	II.9	II.9	II.10	II.15	II.9	II.8
II.4	II.8	II.8	II.8	II.8	II.8	II.13	II.16	II.8	II.10
II.5	II.13	II.13	II.13	II.13	II.13	II.11	II.17	II.13	II.11
II.6	II.11	II.11	II.11	II.11	II.11	II.12	II.18	II.11	II.12
II.7	II.12	II.12	II.12	II.12	II.12	II.14	II.19	II.12	II.13
II.8	II.14	II.14	II.14	II.14	II.14	II.15	II.20	II.14	II.14
II.9	II.15	II.15	II.15	II.15	II.15	II.16	II.22	II.15	II.15
II.10	II.16	II.16	II.16	II.16	II.16	II.17	I.20	II.16	II.16
II.11	II.17	II.17	II.17	II.17	II.17	II.18	II.21	II.17	II.17
II.12	II.18	II.18	II.18	II.18	II.18	II.19	II.24	II.18	II.18
II.13	II.19	II.19	II.19	II.19	II.19	II.20	I.21	II.19	II.19
II.14	II.20	II.20	II.20	II.20	II.20	II.22	I.16	II.20	II.20
II.15	I.20	I.20	II.22	I.20	I.20	I.20		I.20	II.22
II.16	II.22	II.22	I.20	II.22	II.22	I.13		II.22	I.20
II.17	II.21	II.21	II.21	II.21	II.21	II.21		II.21	I.13
II.18	II.23	II.23	II.23	II.23	II.23	II.6		II.23	II.21
II.19	II.24	II.24	II.24	II.24	II.24	II.23		II.24	II.6
II.20	II.25	II.25	II.25	II.25	II.25	I.21		II.25	II.23
II.21	I.21	I.21	I.21	I.21	I.21	II.24		I.21	II.24
II.22	I.16	I.16	I.16	I.16	I.16	I.16		I.16	I.21
II.23	I.3	I.3	I.3	I.3	I.3	I.17		I.3	I.16
II.24	I.4	I.4	I.4	I.4	I.4			I.4	I.6
II.25	I.13	I.6	I.6	I.6	I.13			I.6	II.25

Table 49: The assignment of Homilies to Feast Days

I.1: **Advent**: Hurst, Engelberg 47, Zurich C42, Paris n.a. 1450, Paris 2369. **Not told**: Paris 2370, Boulogne 75, Munich 18120.[1]

I.2: **Advent**: Hurst, Zurich C42, Paris n.a. 1450. **Not told**: Engelberg 47, Paris 2370, Boulogne 75, Munich 18120.

I.3: **Advent**: Hurst, Boulogne 75, Zurich C42, Engelberg 47. **Feria iv before Christmas**: Munich 4533. **Not told**: Munich 18120, Paris 2369, Paris 2370, Paris n.a. 1450.

I.4: **Advent**: Hurst, Engelberg 47, Zurich C42, Boulogne 75. **Feria vi before Christmas**: Munich 4533. **Not told**: Paris n.a. 1450, Paris 2370, Paris 2369, Munich 18120.

I.5: **Vigil of Christmas**: Hurst, Munich 18120, Boulogne 75, Paris 2369, Zurich C42, Engelberg 47. **Not told**: Paris 2370, Paris n.a. 1450.

I.6: **First mass of Christmas**: Hurst. **Christmas**: Engelberg 47, Zurich C42, Boulogne 75. **Not told**: Paris n.a. 1450, Munich 18120.

I.7: **Second mass of Christmas**: Hurst. **Christmas**: Munich 4533, Munich 18120, Zurich C42, Engelberg 47. **Not told**: Boulogne 75, Paris 2370, Paris n.a. 1450.

I.8: **Third mass of Christmas**: Hurst. **Christmas**: Engelberg 47, Zurich C42, Paris 2370, Boulogne 75, Munich 18120, Munich 4533. **Not told**: Paris n.a. 1450, Paris 2369.

I.9: **Feast of John the Evangelist**: Hurst, Munich 4533, Boulogne 75, Paris 2369, Paris 2370, Zurich C42, Engelberg 47. **Not told**: Munich 18120, Paris n.a. 1450.

I.10: **Holy Innocents**: Hurst, Engelberg 47, Zurich C42, Paris 2370, Paris 2369, Boulogne 75, Munich 18120, Munich 4533. **Not told**: Paris n.a. 1450.

I.11: **Octave of Christmas**: Hurst, Munich 4533, Boulogne 75, Paris 2369, Paris 2370, Zurich C42, Engelberg 47. **Not told**: Paris n.a. 1450, Munich 18120.

I.12: **Epiphany**: Hurst, Zurich C42, Paris 2369, Munich 18120. **Octave of Epiphany**: Engelberg 47, Boulogne 75, Munich 4533. **Vigil of Epiphany**: Paris 2370. **Not told**: Paris n.a. 1450.

---

[1] If a manuscript is not mentioned in this list, it means the homily is not contained in that manuscript.

I.13: **St Benedict Biscop**: Hurst, Boulogne 75. **Vigil of St Benedict**: Zurich C42. **St Gall**: St Gall 433. **St Benedict (founder of the Benedictines)**: Paris 2370.[2] **Not told**: Munich 18120, Paris n.a. 1450, Engelberg 47.

I.14: **After Epiphany**: Hurst, Zurich C42, Boulogne 75, Munich 4533. **First Sunday after the Octave of Epiphany**: Engelberg 47, Paris 2369, Karlsruhe 37. **Not told**: Paris 2370, Paris n.a. 1450, Munich 18120.

I.15: **After Epiphany**: Hurst, Munich 4533, Boulogne 75, Zurich C42. **Third Sunday after Epiphany**: Paris 2369. **Not told**: Paris 2370, Paris n.a. 1450, Munich 18120.

I.16: **After Epiphany**: Hurst. **Vigil of St Andrew**: Engelberg 47, Karlsruhe 19, St Gall 433. **St Andrew**: Zurich C42, Paris 2370, Paris 2369, Boulogne 75, Munich 4534. **Not told**: Munich 18120, Paris n.a. 1450.

I.17: **After Epiphany**: Hurst, Paris 2369. **Sunday after the Purification of Mary**:[3] Munich 18120, Boulogne 75 75, Zurich C42. **Not told**: Paris 2370, Paris n.a. 1450, Engelberg 47.

I.18: **Purification of Mary**: Hurst, Engelberg 47, Zurich C42, Paris 2370, Paris 2369, Boulogne 75, Munich 4533. **Not told**: Munich 18120, Paris n.a. 1450.

I.19: **After Epiphany**: Hurst, Munich 18120, Boulogne 75, Zurich C42, Engelberg 47. **First Sunday after Epiphany**: Karlsruhe 37, Munich 4533. **Octave of Epiphany**: Paris 2369. **Not told**: Paris 2370, Paris n.a. 1450.

I.20: **Cathedra of St Peter**: Hurst. **Feast of Ss Peter and Paul**: Engelberg 47, Zurich C42, Paris 2370, Paris 2369, Munich 4534, Boulogne 75, St Gall 433. **Not told**: Munich 18120, Paris n.a. 1450. The attribution in Karlsruhe 37 is illegible.

I.21: **In Lent**: Hurst. **St Matthew**: Munich 4534, St Gall 433, Karlsruhe 19, Boulogne 75, Paris 2369, Paris 2370, Zurich C42, Engelberg 47. **Not told**: Munich 18120, Paris n.a. 1450.

I.22: **In Lent**: Hurst, Zurich C42, Boulogne 75**. Not told**: Engelberg 47, Paris 2370, Paris n.a. 1450, Munich 18120.

I.23: **In Lent**: Hurst, Zurich C42, Boulogne 75. **Not told**: Munich 18120, Paris n.a. 1450, Paris 2370, Engelberg 47.

I.24: **In Lent**: Hurst, Zurich C42, Boulogne 75. **Second Sunday in Lent**: Paris 2369. **In septuagesima**: Munich 4533. **Not told**: Paris n.a. 1450, Engelberg 47, Paris 2370, Munich 18120.

---

[2] In none of these manuscripts is the distinction between the various Benedicts made by name – the distinction here arises from where they place the homily in the liturgical year.

[3] The Feast of the Purification of Mary is described in these manuscripts as 'the day of Mary' and one has to infer from the ordering which day of Mary is meant. Since all these references occur close to Epiphany, it is clear that we are dealing with the Purification.

I.25: **In Lent**: Hurst, Boulogne 75, Zurich C42. **Third Sunday in Lent**: Paris 2369. **Not told**: Engelberg 47, Paris n.a. 1450, Munich 18120, Paris 2370.

II.1: **In Lent**: Hurst, Zurich C42, Boulogne 75, Munich 18120. **Feria ii in Lent**: Paris 2369. **Not told**: Engelberg 47, Paris n.a. 1450, Paris 2370.

II.2: **In Lent**: Hurst, Boulogne 75, Paris 2369, Zurich C42. **First Sunday in Lent**: Munich 4533. **Third Sunday in Lent**: Karlsruhe 37. **Not told**: Munich 18120, Paris n.a. 1450, Paris 2370, Engelberg 47.

II.3: **Palm Sunday**: Hurst, Engelberg 47, Zurich C42, Karlsruhe 37, Paris 2369, Munich 18120. **Second Sunday of Lent**: Munich 4533. **In Lent**: Boulogne 75. **Not told**: Paris 2370, Paris n.a. 1450.

II.4: **Maioris Hebdomadae**: Hurst. **Palm Sunday**: Munich 4533. **Lent**: Boulogne 75, Zurich C42. **Not told**: Munich 18120, Paris n.a. 1450, Paris 2370, Engelberg 47.

II.5: **Last Supper**: Hurst, Engelberg 47, Zurich C42, Paris 2369, Boulogne 75, Munich 4533, Karlsruhe 37. **Not told**: Paris 2370, Paris n.a. 1450, Munich 18120.

II.6: **Holy Saturday**: Hurst. **Lent**: Boulogne 75, Zurich C42. **Sunday after St Lawrence**: Karlsruhe 19. **After St Lawrence**: Munich 4534. **Twelfth Sunday after Pentecost**: Karlsruhe 37. **Thirteenth Sunday after Pentecost**: St Gall 434. **Not told**: Munich 18120, Paris n.a. 1450, Engelberg 47.

II.7: **Holy Saturday**: Hurst, Engelberg 47, Munich 18120. **Easter vigil**: Zurich C42, Paris 2369, Munich 4534. **Not told**: Paris 2370, Paris n.a. 1450, Boulogne 75.

II.8: **Easter Sunday**: Hurst. **Feria vi of Holy Week**: Munich 4534, Boulogne 75,[4] Engelberg 47, Paris 2369, Zurich C42. **Not told**: Munich 18120, Paris 2370, Paris n.a. 1450.

II.9: **After Easter**: Hurst. **Feria iii of Holy Week**: Engelberg 47, Zurich C42,[5] Paris 2369, Boulogne 75, Munich 4534. **Not told**: Paris n.a. 1450, Paris 2370, Munich 18120.

II.10: **After Easter**: Hurst. **Easter**: Boulogne 75, Zurich C42. **Not told**: Munich 18120, Paris n.a. 1450, Paris 2370, Engelberg 47.

II.11: **After Easter**: Hurst, Munich 4534. **Third Sunday after the Octave of Easter**: Zurich C42, Paris 2369, Boulogne 75, Karlsruhe 37. **Not told**: Munich 18120, Paris n.a. 1450, Paris 2370.

---

[4] Also labelled *albas paschae*.
[5] The number is erased, but it seems likely that as in many other instances, the Zurich C42 and Boulogne 75 manuscripts would refer to the same day.

II.12: **After Easter**: Hurst, Munich 4534. **Fourth Sunday after the Octave of Easter**: Karlsruhe 37, Boulogne 75, Engelberg 47, Zurich C42. **Not told**: Munich 18120, Paris n.a. 1450, Paris 2370.

II.13: **After Easter**: Hurst, Munich 4534. **In albas Paschae**: Zurich C42. **Second Sunday after the Octave of Easter**: Engelberg 47, Paris 2369, Boulogne 75, Karlsruhe 37. **Not told**: Paris 2370, Paris n.a. 1450, Munich 18120.

II.14: **Litaniis maioribus**: Hurst, Paris 2369. **Rogation Sunday**: Boulogne 75, Engelberg 47. **Not told**: Paris 2370, Paris n.a. 1450, Zurich C42, Munich 18120.

II.15: **Ascension**: Hurst, Zurich C42, Paris 2369, Boulogne 75. **Not told**: Paris n.a. 1450, Engelberg 47, Paris 2370, Munich 18120.

II.16: **After Ascension**: Hurst, Munich 4534. **Sunday after Ascension**: Karlsruhe 37, Boulogne 75, Paris 2369, Paris 2370, Zurich C42, Engelberg 47. **Not told**: Munich 18120, Paris n.a. 1450.

II.17: **Pentecost**: Hurst, Zurich C42, Boulogne 75. **Vigil of Pentecost**: Paris 2370, Engelberg 47, Paris 2369. **After Pentecost**: Munich 4534. **Not told**: Munich 18120, Paris n.a. 1450.

II.18: **Octave of Pentecost**: Hurst, Boulogne 75, Paris 2369, Zurich C42, Engelberg 47. **Finding of the Cross**: Karlsruhe 37. **Not told**: Munich 18120, Paris n.a. 1450, Paris 2370.

II.19: **Vigil of the Birth of John the Baptist**: Hurst, Engelberg 47, Zurich C42, Paris 2370, Paris 2369, Boulogne 75, Munich 4534, St Gall 433. **Not told**: Munich 18120, Paris n.a. 1450.

II.20: **Birth of John the Baptist**: Hurst, St Gall 433, Munich 4534, Boulogne 75, Paris 2369, Paris 2370, Zurich C42, Engelberg 47. **Not told**: Munich 18120, Paris n.a. 1450.

II.21: **Ss John and Paul**: Hurst. **St James**: Engelberg 47, Zurich C42, Paris 2370, Paris 2369, Boulogne 75. **Not told**: Munich 18120, Paris n.a. 1450, St Gall 433.

II.22: **Ss Peter and Paul**: Hurst, Zurich C42. **Vigil of Ss Peter and Paul**: St Gall 433, Munich 4534, Boulogne 75, Paris 2369, Paris 2370, Engelberg 47. **Not told**: Munich 18120, Paris n.a. 1450.

II.23: **Beheading of John the Baptist**: Hurst, Engelberg 47, Zurich C42, Paris 2370, Boulogne 75, Karlsruhe 19, St Gall 433. **Not told**: Paris n.a. 1450, Munich 18120.

II.24: **Dedication of a church**: Hurst. St Gall 433, Munich 4534, Boulogne 75, Paris 2370, Engelberg 47. **Dedication of a basilica**: Karlsruhe 19. **Encaenia**: Paris 2369, Zurich C42. **Not told**: Munich 18120, Paris n.a. 1450.

II.25: **Dedication of a church**: Engelberg 47, Boulogne 75, Karlsruhe 19, Karlsruhe 37, St Gall 433. **Perennia**: Zurich C42. **Not told**: Munich 18120, Paris n.a. 1450.

Appendix E: A Summary of Manuscript Contents

Karlsruhe Aug. 19:

F.1r: Feast of St Laurence.[1] Sermon by Bishop Maximus:[2] *Sanctam est fratres ac conplacitum ut natalem beati laurentii*.[3]

F.1v: Feast of St Laurence. Sermon by Bishop Maximus: *Sicut patrum nostrorum fratres carissimi non incerta.*

F.2v: Feast of St Laurence. Sermon by Bishop Maximus: *Beatissimi laurentii fratres carissimi annua semperque nova festivitas.*

F.3v: Feast of St Laurence: Reading from the Gospel of John:[4] *Dixit Jesus discipulis suis, Amen Amen.*

F.3v: Feast of St Laurence: Homily on this reading by Augustine:[5] *Amen Amen dico vobis. Nisi granum frumenti cadens.*

F.5r: Sunday after Feast of St Laurence. Reading from the Gospel of Mark: *Exiens Jesus de finibus tyri. Venit per sidonem ad mare galilaea inter medios fines.*

F.5r: Sunday after Feast of St Laurence. Homily on this reading by Bede: *Surdus ille et mutus quem mirabiliter curatum a domino.*[6]

F.7v: Assumption of Mary.[7] Reading from the Gospel of Luke: *Intravit Jesus in quoddam castellum et mulier quedam martha nomine.*

F.7v: Assumption of Mary. Homily on this reading by Bede: *Haec lectio fratres carissimi pulcherrima ratione dilectionem dei et proximi rebus et verbis designat.*[8]

F.9r: Beheading of John the Baptist.[9] Sermon by Bishop John: *Hodie nobis iohannis virtus herodis …confusa sunt viscera corda tremuerunt.*

F.10v: Beheading of John the Baptist. Sermon by Bishop John: *Heu me quid agam unde sermonis exordium faciam.*

F.11r: Beheading of John the Baptist. Reading from the Gospel of Matthew: *Audivit herodes tetrarcha famam Jesu.*

F.11r: Beheading of John the Baptist. Homily on this reading by Bede:[10] *Natalem fratres carissimi beatis iohannis diem caelebrantes.*[11]

F.15v: Second Sunday after St Laurence. Reading from the Gospel of Luke: *Et factum est dum iret Jesus in hierusalem transiebat.*

F.15v: Second Sunday after St Laurence. Sermon on this reading by Bede: *Leprosi non absurde intellegi possunt qui scientiam verae fidei non habentes.*[12]

F.17v: Third Sunday after St Laurence. Reading from the Gospel of Matthew: *Dixit Jesus discipulis suis Nemo potest duobus dominis servire.*

---

[1] August 10th.

[2] St Maximus of Turin, b. *c*.380, d. *c*.465.

[3] Include reference to text.

[4] All readings are introduced by the words *in illo tempore*. I have omitted them to save space.

[5] Augustine, Bishop of Hippo.

[6] CCSL 122, II.6.

[7] August 15th.

[8] Extract from Bede's commentary on Luke 10:38-42.

[9] August 29th.

[10] Bede is titled as *venerabilis bedae presbyteri*.

[11] CCSL 122, II.23.

[12] Extract from Bede's commentary on Luke 17:11-19.

F.17v: Third Sunday after St Laurence. Sermon on this reading [attributed to Bede]: *Nemo potest duobus dominis servire quia non valet simul transitoria et aeterna diligere.*

F.19r: Fourth Sunday after St Laurence. Reading from the Gospel of Luke: *Et factum est deinceps ibat Jesus in civitatem quae vocatur Naim.*

F.19r: Fourth Sunday after St Laurence. Sermon on this reading by Bede: *Naim civitas est galileae in secundo miliario thabor montis.*[13]

F.20r: Birth of Mary. Reading from the Gospel of Luke: *Exsurgens Maria abiit in montana cum festinatione in civitatem iudaeae.*

F.20r: Birth of Mary. Sermon on this reading by Ambrose:[14] *Exsurgens autem maria in diebus illis abiit in montana cum festinatione.*

F.22r: Feast of St Cyprian. Sermon by Bishop Maximus: *Sancti Cypriani festivitatem sicut omnibus notum est hodie celebramus.*

F.22v: Feast of St Cyprian. Sermon by Bishop Maximus: *In martyrio beatissimi cypriani fratres carissimi.*

F.23r: Fifth Sunday after St Laurence. Reading from the Gospel of Luke: *Et factum est cum intraret Jesus in domum cuiusdam principis phariseorum.*

F.23r-v: Fifth Sunday after St Laurence. Sermon on this reading by Bede: *Ydropis morbus ab aquoso humore vocabulum trahit. Grece enim aqua ydor vocatur.*[15]

F.25r: In the seventh month, feria 4. Sermon by Pope Leo:[16] *Devotionem fidelium dilectissimi nihil est in quo providentia divina non adiuvet.*

F.25v: In the seventh month, feria 4. Reading from the Gospel of Mark: *Respondens unus de turba dixit: Magister attuli filium meum ad te.*

F.25v: In the seventh month, feria 4. Sermon by Bede: *Notandum autem quod semper loca rebus congruunt.*[17]

F.27v: In the seventh month, feria 6. Sermon by Pope Leo: *Apostolica institutio dilectissimi quae dominum Jesum Christum ad hoc venisse in hunc mundum noverat.*

F.29r: In the seventh month, feria 6: Reading from the Gospel of Luke: *Factum est in una dierum et ipse sedebat docens et erant pharisaei sedentes.*

F.29r: In the seventh month, feria 6: Sermon on this reading [attributed to Bede]: *Ubi dominus sedens docuerit quando scribis et phariseis consedentibus.*

F.30v: Sunday in the seventh month. Sermon by Pope Leo: *Scio quidem dilectissimi plurimos vestrum.*

F.31v: Sunday in the seventh month. Reading from the Gospel of Luke: *Dicebat Jesus turbis similitudinem hanc.*

F.31v: Sunday in the seventh month. Homily by Pope Gregory: *Dominus et redemptor noster per evangelium suum.*

F.34v: The following Sunday. Reading from the Gospel of Matthew: *Accesserunt ad Jesum sadducaei qui dicerunt non esse resurrectionem.*

F.34v: The following Sunday. Sermon on this reading [attributed to Bede]: *Accesserunt quidam sadduceorum qui negant esse resurrectionem quae erat hereses in indeis.*

---

[13] Extract from Bede's commentary on Luke 7:11-16.

[14] Ambrose of Milan.

[15] Extract from Bede's commentary on Luke 14:1-15.

[16] Pope Leo the Great.

[17] Extract from Bede's commentary on Mark 9:16-49.

F.36r: The Holy Angels.[18] Reading from the Gospel of Matthew: *Accesserunt discipuli ad Jesum dicentes: quid putas maior est in regno caelorum?*

F.36v: The Holy Angels. Sermon by Bishop Maximus: *Si diligentis audistis evangelium.*

F.38r: First Sunday after Holy Angels. Reading from the Gospel of Matthew: *Ascendens Jesus in naviculam.*

F.38r: First Sunday after Holy Angels. Sermon on this reading by Bishop John: *Christum in humanis actibus divina gessiess mysteria et in rebus visibilibus invisibilia.*

F.39v: Second Sunday after Holy Angels. Reading from the Gospel of Mark: *Interrogavit unus de scribis quia videbat illos.*

F.39v: Second Sunday after Holy Angels. Sermon by Bishop John: *Et interrogavit eum unus legis doctor?*

F.42r: Third Sunday after Holy Angels. Sermon by Bishop John: *Tria sunt quae in misericordiae opere optanda sunt Christiano.*

F.44r: Third Sunday after Holy Angels. Reading from the Gospel of Matthew: *Dixit Jesus discipulis suis parabolam hanc. Simile factum est regnum caelorum.*

F.44r: Third Sunday after Holy Angels. Sermon from the Commentary of Jerome on this reading: *Aliam parabolam proposuit illis dicens.*

F.45r: Fourth Sunday after Holy Angels. Sermon by Augustine: *Ammonet nos dominus deus noster non neglegere invicem nostra peccata.*

F.50v: Fourth Sunday after Holy Angels. Reading from the Gospel of Matthew: *Dixit Jesus discipulis suis parabolam hanc. Simile est regnum caelorum homini regi.*

F.50v: Fourth Sunday after Holy Angels. Sermon by Jerome from his commentary on this reading: *Ideo ad similatum est regnum caeorum homini regi.*

F.51r: Fourth Sunday after Holy Angels. Sermon by Pope Gregory: *Sed inter haec sciendum est quia ille reste delicti sui.*

F.51v: Fifth Sunday after Holy Angels. Reading from the Gospel of Matthew: *Abeuntes pharisaei consilium inierunt.*

F.51v: Fifth Sunday after Holy Angels. Sermon on this reading [attributed to Bede]: *Et observantes miserunt insidiatore qui se instros similarent ut caperent eum in sermone et traderet eum.*

F.52v: Sixth Sunday after Holy Angels. Reading from the Gospel of Matthew: *Loquente Jesus ad turbas. Ecce princeps unus accessit et adorabat.*

F.52v: Sixth Sunday after Holy Angels. Sermon on the Gospel of Luke [attributed to Bede]: *Ecce vir venit cui nomen erat iairus et ipse princeps sinagoge erat.*

F.56r: Vigil of the Feast of St Andrew.[19] Reading from the Gospel of John: *Stabant Iohannes et ex discipulis eius duo et respiciens Jesum ambulantem dicit.*

F.56r: Vigil of the Feast of St Andrew. Homily on this reading by Bede: *Tanta ac talis est scripturae.*[20]

F.60r: Feast of St Andrew. Reading from the Gospel of Matthew: *Ambulans Jesus iuxta mare galileae vidit duos frates.*

F.60r: Feast of St Andrew. Homily on this reading by Pope Gregory: *Audistis fratres carissimi quia ad unius iussionis vocem petrus et andreas relictis retibus.*

---

[18] October 2nd.

[19] The Feast of St Andrew falls on November 30th.

[20] CCSL 122, I.16.

F.61v: Feast of St Matthew.[21] Reading from the Gospel of Matthew: *Vidit Jesus hominem sedentem in theloneo.*

F.61v: Feast of St Matthew. Homily by Bede: *Legimus apostolo dicente quia omnes peccaverunt.*[22]

F.64v: Vigil for one of the Apostles. Reading from the Gospel of John: *Dixit Jesus discipulis suis, Ego sum vitis vera.*

F.64v: Vigil for one of the Apostles. Homily by Augustine: *Iste locus evangelius fratres ubi se dicit dominus.*

F.67r: Feast of one of the Apostles. Reading from the Gospel of John: *Dixit Jesus discipulis suis Hoc est praeceptum meum.*

F.67r: Feast of one of the Apostles. Homily by Pope Gregory: *Cum cuncta sacra eloquia dominicis plena sint.*

F.70v: Feast of one of the Apostles. Sermon on the reading by Augustine: *Hoc est praeceptum meum ut diligetis invicem sicut dilexi vos. Sive dicatur preceptum sive mandatum.*

F.74v: Feast of one of the Apostles. Reading from the Gospel of John: *Dixit Jesus discipulis suis Haec mando vobis ut diligatis in vicem.*

F.74v: Feast of one of the Apostles. Sermon on this reading by Augustine: *Haec mando vobis ut diligatis in vicem. Ac per hoc intellegere debeums hunc esse fructum nostrum de quo ait.*

F.77v: For the death of a priest. Reading from the Gospel of Matthew: *Dixit Jesus discipulis suis parabolam hanc Homo quidem peregere proficiscens.*

F.77v: For the death of a priest. Homily on this reading by Pope Gregory: *Lectio sancti evangelii fratres carissimi sollicite considerare nos admonet.*

F.79v: For the death of a priest. Sermon by Bishop Maximus which is also appropriate for the Feast of St Hilary, or Paulinus Treverensis or Bishop Eusebius:[23] *Sanctorum patrum memorias religiosis conventibus honoratus.*

F.81r: For the death of a Confessor. Homily by Bishop Maximus: *Ad sancti et beatissimi istius patris nostri cuius hodie festa celebramus.*

F.82v: For the deposition of a Confessor. Reading from the Gospel of Luke: *Dixit Jesus discipulis suis Nemo lucernam ascendit.*

F.82v: For the deposition of a Confessor. Commentary on this reading [attributed to Bede]: *De se ipso dominus haec loquitur ostendens etsi supra diserit nullam generationi.*

F.83v: For the deposition of a Confessor. Sermon by Blessed Fulgentius to be read on the Feast of St Martin or another Confessor: *Dominicus sermo quem debemus omnes non solum.*

F.86v: For the deposition of a Confessor. Reading from the Gospel of Luke: *Dixit Jesus discipulis suis Sint lumbi vestri praecincti.*

F.86v: For the deposition of a Confessor. Homily by Pope Gregory on the same reading: *Sancti evangelii fratres carissimi aperta est lectio recitate.*

F.89r: For the Vigil of a Martyr. Reading from the Gospel of Matthew: *Dixit Jesus discipulis suis Nolite arbitrari quia veni.*

F.89r: For the Vigil of Martyr. Sermon on this reading from a commentary by Jerome.

F.90r: For the Feast of a Martyr. Reading from the Gospel of Matthew: *Dixit Jesus discipulis suis Nihil opertum quod non revelabitur.*

---

[21] September 21st.

[22] CCSL 122, I.21.

[23] St Hilary: January 14th.

F.90r: For the Feast of a Martyr. Sermon on this reading from the commentary by Jerome.

F.91r: For the Feast of a Martyr. Reading from the Gospel of Luke: *Dixit Jesus turbis Si quis venit ad me et non odit patrem suum.*

F.91v: For the Feast of a Martyr. Homily on this reading by Pope Gregory: *Si consideremus fratres carissimi quae et quanta sunt quae nobis.*

F.95v: For the Feast of several Martyrs. Sermon by Augustine.

F.98r: For the Feast of several Martyrs. Reading from the Gospel of Luke: *Descendens Jesus de monte stabit in loco.*

F.98r: For the Feast of several Martyrs. Sermon on the same reading [attributed to Bede]: *Et ipse elevatis oculis in discipulos suous dicebat Beati pauperes quie vestrum est regnum dei.*

F.100r: For the Feast of several Martyrs. Reading from the Gospel of Matthew: *Dixit Jesus discipulis suis Ecce ego mitto vos.*

F.100r: For the Feast of several Martyrs. Sermon by Ambrose following the story in Luke's Gospel: *Ecce ego mitto vos sicut agnos inter lupos Contraria sunt ista sibi animalia.*

F.103r: For the Feast of several Martyrs. Reading from the Gospel of Luke: *Dixit Jesus discipulis suis Cum audieritis proelia.*

F.103r: For the Feast of several Martyrs. Homily on this reading by Pope Gregory: *Quia longius ab urbe digressimus ne ad revertendum nos.*

F.106r: For the Feast of several Martyrs. Sermon by Bishop Maximus: *Sufficere nobis deberant ad profectum salutis nostrae.*

F.109r: For the Feast of several Martyrs. Reading from the Gospel of Matthew: *Dixit Jesus discipulis suis Si quis vult post me venire.*

F.109r: For the Feast of several Martyrs. Homily on this reading by Pope Gregory: *Quia dominus ac redemptor noster novus homo venit in mundum.*

F.113r: For the Feast of several Martyrs. Sermon by Pope Leo on the eight Beatitudes: *Predicante dilectissimi domino Jesu Christi evangelium regni et diversos per totam galileam curate languos.*

F.115v: For the Feast of several Martyrs. Sermon by Bishop John: *Quis coram merita religiosa caritate.*

F.117v: For the Feast of a Virgin. Reading from the Gospel of Matthew: *Dixit dominus discipulis suis Simile est regnum caelorum decem virginibus.*

F.117v: For the Feast of a Virgin. Sermon by Augustine: *Inter parabolas a domino dictas solet quaerentes multum exercere ista quae de decem virginibus posita est.*

F.120r: For the Feast of a Virgin. Homily on this reading by Gregory: *Saepe vos fratres carissimi admoneo prava opere fugere.*

F.123r: For the Feast of a Virgin. Reading from the Gospel of Matthew: *Dixit dominus discipulis suis Simile est regnum caelorum thesauro absconditi.*

F.123r: For the Feast of a Virgin. Homily on this reading by Gregory: *Caelorum regnum fratres carissimi id circo terrenis rebus.*

F.125r: For the Feast of St Felicity or another saint.[24] Reading from the Gospel of Matthew: *Loquente Jesus ad turbas Ecce mater eius et fratres stabant foris.*

F.125r: For the Feast of St Felicity or another saint. Homily on this reading by Pope Gregory: *Sancti evangelii fratres carissimi brevis est lectio recitata.*

F.127r: For the dedication of a church. Reading from the Gospel of Luke: *Non est arbor bona.*

---

[24] March 6th.

F.127r: For the dedication of a church. Homily on this reading by Bede: *Quia propitia divinitate fratres carissimi sollemnia dedicationis ecclesiae celebramus*.[25]

F.132v: For the dedication of a basilica. Reading from the Gospel of John: *Facta sunt encaenia*.

F.123v: For the dedication of a basilica. Homily on this reading by Bede: *Audivimus ex lectione evangelica fratres*.[26]

F.137v: For the dedication of a basilica. Sermon by Augustine: *Quotiens cumque fratres carissimi altaris vel templi festinatem colimus*.

F.138v: For the dedication of a basilica. Sermon by Augustine: *Recte festa ecclesiae colunt qui re ecclesia filior esse cognoscent*.

F.140r: For the dedication of a church. Reading from the Gospel of Luke: *Egressibus per ambulat hierico et ecce vir nomine Zacheus*.

F.140r: For the dedication of a church. Homily on this reading [attributed to Bede]: *Et ingressus per ambulabat hiericho et ecce vir nomine Zacheus*.

F.142r: For a Feast (laetania), whenever appropriate. Sermon by Bishop John on the fast of the Ninevites: *Clementissimus deus pietate misericordia semper*.

F.144r: Anniversary of the day of deposition of any of the faithful departed. Sermon by Augustine: *Tempus quod inter hominis mortem et ultimam resurrectionem interpositum est*.

F.144v: Anniversary of the day of deposition of any of the faithful departed. Sermon by Augustine: *Iam vero de resurrectionis carnis*.

F.146-7: A list of the readings for the homiliary. Two items mentioned which are no longer contained in the manuscript.[27]

Karlsruhe Aug. 37:

F.1r: Feast of Philip and James.[28] Reading from John: *Dixit Jesus discipulis suis Non turbetur cor vestrum*.
    Sermon by Blessed [illeg.]: *Erigenda est nobis fratres ad deum maior intentio ut verba sancti evangelii*.

F.3r: For one Martyr. Reading from John: *Dixit Jesus discipulis suis. Ego sum vitis vera*.
    Sermon by St Augustine: *Iste locus evangelicus fratres ubi se dicit dominus*.

F.5r: For the dedication of a church. Reading from Luke: *Dixit Jesus discipulis suis Non est arbor bona*.
    Homily by Bede:[29] *Quia propitia divinitate fratres carissimi*.

F.8r: Life of Pope Gregory: *Gregorius genere romanus aste philosophus*.

F.12r: Life of St Benedict: *Fuit vitae venerabilis gratiae benedictus et nomine*.

F.16r: Reading from Mark. *Leprosus deprecores eum et*.
    Homily [attributed to Bede]: *De hoc leproso mendato matheus commemorat dicens cum autem descendisset de monte secutae sunt eum*.

F.17r: 3rd night of the Feast of several Martyrs. Reading from Luke: *Dixit Jesus discipulis suis. Cum audieritis proelia et sediti*.

---

[25] CCSL 122, II.25.
[26] CCSL 122, II.24.
[27] The inclusion of the contents at the end of the manuscript, and the loss of the final two items may suggest that the manuscript has been rebound at some stage. See chapter V.
[28] May 11th.
[29] II.25.

Homily by Pope Gregory: *Quia longius ab urbe digressi sumus ne ad reveteri.*

F.18r: Hebdom. v before the birth of the Lord. Reading from John: *Cum sublevasset oculos Jesus.*

Homily by Augustine: *Miracula quae fecit dominus noster Jesus Christ sunt quidem divina opera.*

F.20v: Hebdom. iv before the birth of the Lord. Reading from Matthew: *Cum adpropinquasset hierosolymis et venisset bethfage.*

Homily by Bishop John: *Puto res ipsa exigit ut queramus. Frequenter quidem.*

F.22v: Third Sunday before Christmas. Reading from Luke: *Dixit Jesus discipulis suis. Erunt signa in sole et luna.*

Homily by Pope Gregory: *Dominus ac redemptor noster paratos nos invenire desiderans senescentem mundum.*

F.24v: Second Sunday before Christmas. Reading from Matthew: *Cum audisset iohannes in vinculis opera Christi.*

Homily by Pope Gregory: *Quaerendum nobis est frates carissimi iohannes propheta et plusquam propheta.*

F.26v: Last Sunday before Christmas. Reading from John: *Miserunt iudaei ab hierosolymis sacerdotes et levitas ad iohannem.*

Homily by Pope Gregory: *Ex huius nobis lectionis verbis fratres carissimi iohannis humilitas commendatur.*

F.28v: Sunday after Christmas. Reading from Luke: *Erat pater Jesu et mater mirantes super his.*

Homily by Origen: *Congregemus in unum ea quae in ostii Jesu dicta scriptaque.*

F.31r: First Sunday after Epiphany. Reading from Luke: *Cum esset Jesus annorum duodecim.*

Homily by Bede:[30] *Aperta est.*

F.33r: Second Sunday after Epiphany. Reading from John: *Nuptiae factae sunt in chana galilaeae.*

Homily by Bede.[31]

F.35r: Third Sunday after Epiphany. Reading from Matthew: *Cum descendisset Jesus de monte secutae est.*

Homily by Origen: *Docente domino in monte discipuli venerint ad eum sicut alacres sicut domesticii.*

F.37r: Fourth Sunday after Epiphany. Reading from Matthew: *Ascendente Jesu in naviculum secuti sunt eum.*

Homily by Origen: *Ingrediente domino in naviculam secuti.*

F.50r: Second Sunday in Lent. Reading from Luke: *Erat dominus Jesus eiciens daemonium.*

Homily attributed to Bede: *Daemonia eus iste apud matheum. Non solum mutus sed et caecus fuisse.*

F.52r: Third Sunday in Lent. Reading from John: *Abiit Jesus trans mare galileae quod est.*

Homily by Bede.[32]

F.54r: Gregory.

---

[30] I.19.

[31] I.14.

[32] II.2.

F.56v: Palm Sunday. Reading from Matthew: *Cum adpropinquasset hierosolymis et venisset*.
  Bede:II.3
F.58r: The last supper. Reading from John: *Ante diem festum paschae*.
  Bede:II.5
  Leo.
  Gregory.
F.64r: Second Sunday after the Octave of Easter. Reading from John: *Dixit Jesus discipulis suis Modicum et iam non videbitis me*.
  Bede:II.13
F.66r: The finding of the Cross. Reading from John: *Erat homo ex phariseis nicodemus*.
  Bede:II.18
F.68r: Third Sunday after the Octave of Easter. Reading from John: *Dixit jesus discipulis suis Vado ad eium qui me misit*.
  Bede:II.11
F.70r: Fourth Sunday after the Octave of Easter. Reading from John: *Dixit Jesus discipulis suis. Amen Amen*.
  Bede:II.12
F.72r: Sunday after Ascension. Reading from John: *Dixit Jesus discipulis suis Cum venerit paraclytus*.
  Bede:II.16
F.74r: Gregory.

St Gall 433:[33]

Feast of the Apostles Philip and James.[34] Gospel reading: *Ego sum vitis vero*. Sermon by St Augustine: *Iste locus evangelicus*.
  Gospel reading: *Si manseritas in me et uobis*. Sermon by St Augustine: *Manentes in Christo quid velle possunt*.
The finding of the Holy Cross.[35] Gospel reading: *Dixit Jesus ad nicodemum*. See end of book.
Vigil of the birth of John the Baptist.[36] Gospel reading: *Fuit in diebus herodis*. Homily by Bede: *Venturus in carne dominus et redemptor noster*.[37]
Birth of John the Baptist. Sermon by Bishop Maximus: *Solemnitates nobis diversorum*.
  Sermon by Bishop Maximus: *Cunctorum quidem prophetarum*.
  Sermon by Bishop Maximus: *Festivitatem praesentes diei fratres carissimi*.
  Gospel reading: *Elizabeth impletum est*.
  Homily by Bede: *Praecursoris domini nativitas sicut sacratissima*.[38]
  Sermon by Bede: *Hodie dilectissimi fratres quie domini praecurrit*.

---

[33] This manuscript, together with the later manuscript St Gall, Klosterbibliothek, Cod. 432 and St Gall 434, contains the homiliary of Paul the Deacon.
[34] May 11th. Contents list is found on f. 1r-3v.
[35] May 3rd.
[36] June 21st.
[37] II.19.
[38] CCSL 122, II.20.

Vigil of Ss Peter and Paul. Gospel reading: *Dixit Jesus Simoni petro*. Homily by
Bede: *Virtutem nobis perfectae dilectionis*.[39]
Sermon by Maximus: *Beatissimorum apostolorum petri et pauli*.
Feast of Ss Peter and Paul. Sermon by Maximus: *Gloriosissimos Christianae fidei*.
Sermon by Maximus: *Apostolici natalis gaudio fratres*.
Gospel reading: *Venit Jesus in partes caesereae*.
Homily by Bede: *Lectio sancti evangelii quam modo fratres*.[40]
Sermon by Leo: *Omnium quidem sanctarum solet*.
Sermon by Bishop Maximus: *Beatissimorum apostolorum*.
Sermon by Maximus: *Cum omnes beati apostoli panem gratiam*.
Feast of St Paul: Sermon by Bishop John: *Beatus Paulus quie tantam vim*.
Gospel reading: *Respondens petrus dixit ad Jesum*.
Sermon by Jerome: *Grandis fiducia petrus piscatur*.
Feast of St James. Gospel reading: *Accessit ad Jesum mater filiorum Zebedei*.
Homily by Bede: *Dominus conditor ac redemptor nostrum*.[41]
Feast of St Laurence. Sermon by Bishop Maximus: *Sanctam est fratres ac deo
placitum*.
Sermon by Bishop Maximus: *Sicut patrum nostrorum fratres carissimi*.
Sermon by Bishop Maximus: *Beatissimi laurentii fratres karissimi*.
Gospel reading: *Amen amen dico vobis*.
Homily by Augustine: *Se ipsum dominus significat dicens nisi granum*.
Sermon by Leo: *Cum omnium dilectissimi summa*.
Sermon by Bishop Maximus: *Dicit dominus in evangelio Cui*.
Sermon by Bishop Maximus: *Multa fratres perstruximus quibus*.
Assumption of Mary. Sermon by Augustine: *Celebritas hodierna diei admonet ut in
laude*.
Sermon by Augustine: *Adest nobis dilectissimi*.
Gospel reading: *Intravit Jesum quoddam castellum*.
Homily by Bede: *Haec lecio fratres*.
Sermon [attributed to Bede]: *Scientes fratres dilectissimi auctori*.
St Bartholomew.[42] Gospel reading: *Hoc est praeceptum*.
Homily by Gregory: *Cum cuncta sana*.
Sermon by Augustine: *Psalmus qui cantatur domino*.
Beheading of John the Baptist. Sermon by Bishop John: *Hodie nobis iohannis*.
Gospel reading: *Audivit herodes tetrarcha*.
Homily by Bede: *Natalem fratres carissimi*.[43]
Sermon by John: *Heu me quid agam unde*.
Birth of Mary. Gospel reading: *Exsurgens maria ab*.
Homily by Ambrose: *Mortale est omnibus ut qui*.
Ss Protus, Hyacinth, Felix and Regulus.[44] Sermon by Leo: *Praedicante dilectissimi
domino Jesu Christi evangelii*.
St Matthew, Apostle. Gospel reading: *Vidit Jesus hominem*.
Homily by Bede: *Legimus apostolo dicente*.[45]
Ss Maurice and companions. Gospel reading: *Cum audieritis proelia et*.

---

[39] CCSL 122, II.22.
[40] CCSL 122 I.20.
[41] CCSL 122 II.21.
[42] August 24th.
[43] CCSL 122, II.23.
[44] September 11th.
[45] I.21.

Homily by Gregory: *Quia longius ab.*

St Michael. 'Relatio' [attributed to Bede]: *Memoriam beati archangeli.*

    Gospel reading: *Accesserunt discipuli ad Jesum.*

    Sermon by Bishop Maximus: *Si diligenter audistis evangelium.*

    Sermon by Gregory: *Angelorum et hominum naturam.*

Vigil of St Gall. Gospel reading: *Nihil opertus quod.*

    Sermon by Jerome: *Et quomodo in praesenti saeculo.*

St Gall. Sermon by Bishop Maximus: *Ad sancti beatissimi istius patris.*

    Gospel reading: *Nemo lucernam accendit.*

    Sermon [attributed to Bede]: *De se ipso dominus haec loquitur ostendens.*

    Gospel reading: *Dixit simon petrus.*

    Homily by Bede: *Audiens a domino petrus quia dives difficile.*[46]

    Gospel reading: *Sint lumbi vestri praecincti.*

    Homily by Gregory: *Sancti evangelii fratres.*

Dedication of a church. Sermon by Augustine: *Quotiens cumque fratres.*

    Gospel reading: *Facta sunt encenia in hierosolem.*

    Homily by Bede: *Audivimus.*[47]

Ss Simon and Jude. Gospel reading: *Haec mundo vobis ut diligetis.*

    Homily by Augustine: *Haec mundo vobis.*

All saints. Sermon by Bishop John: *Qui sanctorum merita religiosa.*

    Gospel reading: *Jesus elevatis oculis in discipulos.*

    Homily [attributed to Bede]: *Et si generaliter omnibus loquitur.*

    Homily by Augustine: *Iste locus evangeli.* See under Easter.

    Sermon by Gregory: *Angelorum et hominem.* See the Feast of St Michael. See also the sermons of Rabanus and Walafrid at the end of the book.

St Martin. Sermon by Maximus: *Sanctorum patrum memorias.*

St Cecilia. Gospel reading: *Simile est regnum caelorum.*

    Homily by Augustine: *Inter parabolas.*

Ss Clement and Columbanus. Gospel reading: *Dixit Jesus a domes Si quis vult.*

    Homily by Gregory: *Quia dominus ac redemptor.*

For the Feast of any Apostle. Gospel reading: *Misit Jesus duodecim discipulos.*

    Homily by Gregory: *Cum constet omnibus fratres.*

For the Feast of a priest. Gospel reading: *Designavit dominus Jesus.*

    Homily by Gregory: *Dominus et salvator noster.*

    Sermon by Fulgentius: *Dominicus sermo quem debemus.*

Feast of holy Martyrs. Sermon by Bishop Maximus: *Sufficere nobis deberent ad.*

    Gospel reading: *Qui vos audit me audit.*

    Sermon [attributed to Bede]: *Ut in audiendo quinque vel spernendo.*

    Sermon by John: *Quotienscumque fratres carissimi.*

St Felicity and her sons. Gospel reading: *Loquente Jesus ad turbas.*

    Homily by Gregory: *Sancti evangelii fratres.*

Dedication of a church. Sermon by Augustine: *Recte festa ecclesiae colunt.*

    Gospel reading: *Ingressus Jesus perambulabat.*

    Sermon [attributed to Bede]: *Quae impossibilia sunt apud.*

    Gospel reading: *Non est arbor bona quae facit.*

    Homily by Bede: *Quia propitia divinitate.*[48]

Feast of the Holy Cross. Gospel reading: *Dixit Jesus ad nicodemum.*

---

[46] I.13.

[47] II.24.

[48] II.25.

Homily [attributed to Bede]: *Terrena illis dixit.*
The Feast of any Saint. Gospel reading: *Misit Jesus discipulos suos dicens*
      Sermon by Ambrose: *Contraria sunt ista sibi.*
Feast of a Virgin. Gospel reading: *Simile erit regnum caelorum decem virginibus.*
      Homily by Caesarius: *In lectione quae nobis recitata est.*
      Sermon by Bishop Rabanus: *Legimus in ecclesiasticus bis toriis.*
      Sermon by Walafrid: *hodie dilectissimi omniam sanctorum.*
In laetania: Sermon by Bishop John: *Clementissimus.*
      Aileranus Scottus *Oportum videtur de monibus.*

St Gall 434:

Second Sunday after Pentecost. Reading from Luke: *Dixit Jesus discipulis suis Homo quidem.*
      Homily by Pope Gregory: *In verbis sari eloquii fratres carissimi.*
Third Sunday after Pentecost. Reading from Luke: *Dixi Jesus similitudeinem hanc.*
      Homily by Pope Gregory: *Hoc distare fratres carissimi.*
Fourth Sunday after Pentecost. Reading from Luke: *Accesserunt ad Jesum publicani et peccatores.*
      Homily by Pope Gregory: *Estivum tempus quod corpore.*
      Sermon by Bishop John about David: *Dominus deus cum david regem populo.*
Fifth Sunday after Pentecost. Reading from Luke: *Dixit Jesus discipulis suis Estote misericordes.*
      Homily [attributed to Bede]: *Hoc loco nobis nihil aliud praecipi.*
      Sermon by Bishop John: *Pictores imitantur ante naturam.*
Sixth Sunday after Pentecost. Reading from Luke: *cum turbae irruerent ad Jesum.*
      Sermon [attributed to Bede]: *Stagnum gennesarteh idem dicunt.*
      Sermon by Bishop John: *Reliquias pristinae mensae.*
Seventh Sunday [after Pentecost]. Reading from Matthew: *Dixit Jesus discipulis suis Amen dico vobis quia.*
      Homily by Augustine: *Dico autem vobis quia nisi abundaverit.*
      Sermon by Bishop John on David and Absalom: *Perdidit absalon scelestissimus mentem.*
Eighth Sunday. Reading from Mark: *cum multa turba esse cum Jesu.*
      Homily [attributed to Bede]: *In hac lectione consideranda est.*
      Sermon by Bishop John: *Apud quosdam veteres reges moris.*
Ninth Sunday. Reading from Matthew: *Dixit Jesus discipulis suis: Alter dite a falsis prophetis.*
      Homily by Origen: *Quod paulo superius spatioseam et letam.*
Tenth Sunday after Pentecost. Reading from Luke: *Dixit Dominus discipulis suis Homo quidam erat dives.*
      Sermon by Jerome: *Quaeris qui scit vilicus iniquitatis.*
Eleventh Sunday after Pentecost. Reading from Luke: *Cum appropinquasset Jesus hierusalem.*
      Homily by Pope Gregory: *Lecionem brevem sancti evangelii.*
Twelfth Sunday. Reading from Luke: *Dixit Jesus ad quosdam qui is se confidebant.*
      Sermon [attributed to Bede]: *Quia parabolam dominus qua semper orare.*
Thirteenth Sunday. Reading from Mark: *Exiens Jesus de finibus tyri.*

Homily by Bede:[49] *Surdus ille et mutus*.

Fourteenth Sunday. Reading from Luke: *Dixit Jesus discipulis suis Beati oculi qui vidit*.

    Sermon [attributed to Bede]: *Non oculi scribarum et phariseorum*.

    Sermon by Bishop John: *Intendat fratres carissimi caritas vestra*.

Fifteenth Sunday after Pentecost. Reading from Luke: *Dum iret Jesus in hierusalem*.

    Sermon by Bede: *Leprosi non absurde intellegi possunt*.[50]

Sixteenth Sunday. Reading from Matthew: *Dixit Jesus discipulis suis Nemo potest duobus dominis servire*.

    Sermon [attributed to Bede]: *Nemo potest duobus dominis servire*.

Seventeenth Sunday. Reading from Luke: *Ibat Jesus in civitatem quae vocatur Naim*.

    Sermon by Bede: *Naim civitas est galilee*.[51]

Eighteenth Sunday. Reading from Luke: *Cum intraret Jesus in domum cuiusdam princis*.

    Sermon by Bede: *Ydropis morbus ab aquoso humore*.[52]

Feria iv. Sermon by Pope Leo: *Devotionem fidelium dilectissimi*.

    Reading from Mark: *Respondens unus de turba dixit ad jesum Magister*.

    Sermon [attributed to Bede]: *Notandum quod semper loca rebus negunt*.

Feria vi. Sermon by Pope Leo: *Apostolica institutio dilectissimi*.

    Reading from Luke: *Rogabat Hesum quidam phariseus*.

    Homily by Pope Gregory: *Cogitendi mihi de marie preztenta*.

Sabbato. Sermon by Pope Leo: *Scio quidem*.

Twenty-Fourth Sunday. Reading from Matthew: *Abeuntes phariseis*.

    Sermon [attributed to Bede]: *Et obeservates miser' insidiatores*.

Twenty-Fifth Sunday. Reading from Matthew: *Loquentes Jesum ad turbas Ecce princeps*.

    Sermon [attributed to Bede]: *Ecce vir cui nomen iairus*.

    Homily by [erasure]: *Due era hereses in iudeis*.

Munich Clm 4533 and 4534: a complete listing of the contents of these manuscripts can be found in 'Das Homiliarum Karls des Grossen', F. Weigand, *Studien zur Geschichte der Theologie und der Kirche* I.ii (Leipzig, 1897), pp. 14-65.

---

[49] CCSL 122, II.6.

[50] Extract from his commentary.

[51] Extract from his commentary.

[52] Extract from his commentary.

Appendix F: A Proposed Order for the Homilies

Morin, in his seminal article, arrives at an order which closely follows Paris n.a. 1450, which restores I.6 to its rightful place, but relegates I.13 to the end.[1] Hurst seems somewhat bewildered by what he sees as the confused and random ordering of the Advent and Christmas homilies, along with the attribution of a post-Epiphany homily to the feast of St Andrew and a Lenten homily to the feast of St Matthew.[2] He attempts to restore them to what he considers a more natural order.

Hurst's ordering is greatly influenced by liturgical manuscripts, and in the places where his ordering differs from that of the main manuscripts it is because he prefers to follow the evidence of liturgy. It is, however, notable that across manuscripts produced hundreds of miles and hundreds of years apart, there is for the most part a close agreement about the place in the liturgical year of a particular homily. Part of this is connected to the Gospel readings, which are, if nowhere else, quoted in the homily, or are the first words given in the contents page of the manuscripts. A narrative of Christ's birth is not likely to be used outside the Christmas season; similarly, when Bede discusses the story of Pentecost, the homily is less likely to be given at another time and season.[3] It is in the case of the more flexible homilies that Hurst uses the liturgical evidence to fix their rightful place.

No matter where their manuscript placing, whenever the liturgical date of homilies I.1-I.4 is mentioned, it is given as during Advent. Some manuscripts may give a more specific date.[4] All manuscripts agree, including those of Paul the Deacon's homiliary, in the days given for homilies I.5-I.11. There is a little more confusion over the Epiphany homilies (I.12, I.14, I.15, I.19), but they are all associated with that feast. I.13, is, as Hurst noted, subject to more difficulty. It is included in only seven manuscripts; in only four of those is it assigned a day: Zurich to the vigil of St Benedict, Boulogne 75 and Paris 2370 to the feast of St Benedict (but this latter manuscript assigns it to later in the year – to the feast of St Benedict, founder of the Benedictine order).[5] I.16 is one of the examples of Hurst going against the manuscript evidence, as all the manuscripts assign it to either the vigil or the feast of St Andrew, and place it later in the year.[6] The same is true of I.20

---

[1] Morin, 'Le recueil primitif', pp. 325-6.
[2] Hurst, CCSL 122, p. vii.
[3] See p. 47.
[4] See appendix C.
[5] See p. 121 for the importance of I.13 in the categorising of manuscripts of the homilies.
[6] See table 50, pp. 187-8.

(assigned by Hurst to the Cathedra of St Peter, rather than the feast or vigil of Ss Peter and Paul) and I.21 (assigned by Hurst to Lent, rather than the feast or vigil of St Matthew). For I.16, Hurst follows the evidence of the Burchard Gospels (Würzburg, Universitätsbibliothek, MS Mp.Th.F.68) in categorising the homily as a post-Epiphany one; for I.21 he follows the Lindisfarne Gospels in placing it as a Lenten homily. Both these manuscripts contain evidence of the Roman-Neapolitan liturgy, which form was probably followed to a large extent of Wearmouth-Jarrow, with an admixture of the Roman and Gallican usages.[7] It is the Gallican usage (as given in the Luxeuil lectionary (Paris, BnF, MS Lat. 9427) and the Bobbio Missal, (Paris, BnF, MS Lat. 13246) which Hurst follows in his assignation of I.20 to the Cathedra S. Petri – the manuscripts all follow the Roman-Neapolitan usage in assigning it to the feast of Ss Peter and Paul.

I propose a general ordering of the homilies based upon the order of the two oldest manuscripts, Boulogne 75 and Zurich C42, taking account of the disorder of the Advent and Christmas homilies. For fine-tuning the dates to which the homilies may have been assigned, both the manuscript and the liturgical evidence will be used, giving due regard to the Neapolitan usage which seems to have been predominant in Northumbria at that time.[8]

Homilies I.1 and I.2: there is no evidence for placing them anywhere else or in any other order, in manuscript or liturgy. Liturgical and manuscript evidence place I.3 and I.4 next, with Munich 4533 confirming this order. I.5 is equally clearly for the Christmas vigil. Some of the liturgical evidence suggests that I.6 comes first, and the manuscripts are all consistent in placing I.7 before I.8. The sequencing of I.9, I.10, I.11 and I.12 is not in any doubt, nor are the dates given for I.9-I.11. I.12 is, in the manuscripts, given for both Epiphany and the Octave of Epiphany, with a serious divergence between the Zurich and the Boulogne manuscripts. However, let us tentatively assign it to the Epiphany, as both the Luxeuil Lectionary and Bobbio Missal assign the pericope to that date. Four of our manuscripts assign I.14 immediately after I.12, and some manuscripts (though not the oldest) assign it to the first Sunday after the Octave of Epiphany. In any case, this is before the feast of Benedict Biscop. I.19 is in some manuscripts assigned to the first Sunday after

---

[7] Hurst, CCSL 122, pp. vii-viii.
[8] M. P. Brown, *The Lindisfarne Gospels*, pp. 155-8.

Epiphany, though this is incidental. Hurst places it as late as he does purely on the liturgical evidence.[9] Hurst notes that I.13 is celebrated on the day before the Ides of January.[10] This is of course a fixed date around which the Epiphany homilies are arranged. Unlike Hurst, I prefer to take the manuscript evidence, unless that is manifestly faulty, rather than the liturgical evidence. Though Wearmouth-Jarrow was partly involved in the production of the Lindisfarne Gospels, we cannot rule out some variation in liturgical practice, and if we are to override the manuscript evidence, we must presume a very early manuscript at the head of most of the continental transmission in which the homilies were reordered for local liturgy. It is clear that this can happen, as is witnessed by the Jura manuscripts. However, these are later manuscripts, during which time a good deal of liturgical change may be posited. I am reluctant to assume large-scale reordering so early in the tradition, though the textual divergence between Zurich C42 and Boulogne 75 is already considerable, but several minor textual variants are very different from reordering the entire manuscript.

All manuscripts and liturgical sources agree in placing I.15 after Epiphany. Some sources assign it to the first Sunday after Epiphany, but there is a degree of flexibility here.[11] Hurst and the manuscripts agree about I.18 being assigned to the Purification (though this is one homily which is strongly affixed to that date by virtue of its Gospel story). Three of the manuscripts (including the two oldest) assign I.17 to the Sunday after this feast; the only evidence against it is contained in Paris 2369 (one of the manuscripts from the Jura region, which was somewhat reordered) and in the Lindisfarne Gospels. Both of these assign I.17 to a date after Epiphany. However, the manuscripts consistently place I.17 after I.18, and it seems likely therefore, that the first assigned date is the correct one. Homilies I.22-I.25, II.1 and II.2 are firmly set in Lent by both Hurst and the manuscript evidence; the only question is about the order in which they occur. The ordering of these homilies is remarkably stable, as can be seen in table 48. The major divergences with Hurst's scheme for Lent arise with homilies II.6 and II.4, which he assigns to Holy Saturday and Maioris Hebdomadae respectively. These two homilies are attributed to many

---

[9] The Lindisfarne Gospels and the Burchard Gospels both assign the reading for I.19 to the fourth Sunday after Epiphany.

[10] CCSL 122, p. 88.

[11] Engelberg 47, Paris 2369, Karlsruhe 37 and the Lindisfarne and Burchard Gospels assign it to this date.

dates in the manuscripts, though all are consistent in placing II.6 much earlier in the ordering of homilies than Hurst does. None of the manuscript dates given match Hurst's reading. Here, II.6 and II.4 are placed in the order in which the manuscripts suggest, with the date as given in Zurich C42 and Boulogne 75.   The other manuscripts assign it to a date much later in the year, despite the fact that it is included in the midst of the Lenten homilies. This may suggest that, if the readings were not considered suitable for the time of year, it was the rubrics that were changed, and not the ordering of the homilies.

The ordering of the homilies for Holy week and the week leading to the Octave of Easter is highly consistent in the manuscripts. If the manuscript ordering is followed, the relation between the assigned date and the Gospel reading makes more sense. Hurst correctly assigned II.3 to Palm Sunday and II.5 to Maundy Thursday. Hurst, following the evidence of the Burchard and Lindisfarne Gospels, assigned II.7 to Holy Saturday, as does Engelberg 47 and Munich 18120. However, Zurich C42, Paris 2369 and Munich 4534 assign it to the Easter Vigil, as does the Luxeuil Lectionary and the Bobbio Missal. Given the importance of Zurich C42 and Munich 4534, I would tentatively prefer to assign this homily to the Easter Vigil, though it may also have been designed for the day mass on Holy Saturday. The Gospel reading is that of the two Marys visiting the tomb, which may incline one to assign it to the Easter Vigil mass.

The evidence for II.10 is scant, but the two oldest manuscripts are united in assigning this homily to Easter day. This is again an account of the women visiting the tomb, and it would seem logical that this would be the reading given on Easter Sunday. Hurst assigns II.8 to Easter day, though the pericope given is that of Jesus appearing in Galilee. This homily is assigned by five manuscripts to the Saturday in holy week, and II.9 is assigned by the same five manuscripts to the third day of holy week. The liturgical evidence for II.9 suggests a similar date for this reading. The Burchard Gospels support assigning II.8 to the later date also.

Hurst's ordering of II.11-II.13 follows the ordering of the readings assigned in the Lindisfarne Gospels. Mine follows that of the manuscript ordering, with the number of Sunday after Easter taken from Engelberg 47, Boulogne 75 and Karlsruhe 37 manuscripts.   My ordering for homilies II.14-II.20 accords with Hurst's. The dates to which they are assigned in substantially the same, though Hurst assigns II.14 to Litaniis maioribus, rather than the minor Rogation Sunday

before Ascension. (Here I follow Boulogne 75 and Engelberg 47). II.16 Hurst assigns generally to 'After Ascension', whereas I follow the majority of manuscripts in assigning this homily to the Sunday after Ascension. II.17 Hurst and I assign to Pentecost; a few manuscripts (Paris 2370, Paris 2369 and Engelberg 47) assign it to the Vigil of Pentecost and Munich 4534 assigns it to 'After Pentecost'. However, the Luxeuil Lectionary and Lindisfarne Gospels and Zurich C42 and Boulogne 75 assign it to Pentecost, so this would seem the preferable attribution. Karlsruhe 37 assigns II.18 to the feast of the Finding of the Cross, though this would appear to be a local peculiarity.

At this point, most of the manuscripts place I.20, followed by II.22. Munich 18120, Paris 2370 and Paris 2369 have II.22 followed by I.20. These two homilies are assigned by the manuscripts to the vigil of Ss Peter and Paul (II.22) and to the feast of Ss Peter and Paul (I.20). The Lindisfarne and Burchard Gospels also assign I.20 to this feast The Zurich manuscript simply assigns both homilies to the feast of Ss Peter and Paul. The evidence is clear that I.20 is strongly associated with that feast day, whether for the vigil or the day itself. I prefer to follow the ordering of Munich 18120, and can only assume that some confusion with the rubrics or the ordering arose at an early stage.

II.21 follows, which Hurst, following the Lindisfarne and Burchard Gospels, assigns to the feast of Ss John and Paul. The manuscripts which mention a day are united in assigning this homily to the feast of St James, and this is the date I have preferred. II.23-II.25 occur in the order given in Hurst, assigned to the same occasions.

Finally, the manuscripts indicate that I.21 and I.16 (in that order) are to be assigned to the feasts of St Matthew and St Andrew respectively, and not to the period between Christmas and Easter.

There are still some areas of uncertainty in this ordering (particularly with regard to I.20 and II.22), though the general outline seems clear. The assignation of a homily to particular occasions may still be negotiated, as it is unclear to what extent the Wearmouth-Jarrow liturgy differed from that at Lindisfarne, and to what extent the homilies were reordered or rerubricated on the continent.

Table 50

Order	Day (where known)	Pericope	Story
I.1	Advent	Mark 1:4-8	John preaching and baptising
I.2	Advent	John 1:15-18	John bears witness to Christ
I.3	Advent	Luke 1:26-38	Annunciation
I.4	Advent	Luke 1:39-55	Visitation
I.5	Vigil of Christmas	Matt. 1:18-25	Joseph's dream
I.6	Christmas	Luke 2:1-14	Birth of Christ
I.7	Christmas	Luke 2:15-20	The shepherds' visit
I.8	Christmas	John 1:1-14	'In the beginning…'
I.9	John the Evangelist	John 21:19-24	Jesus' final appearance: his words to Peter and John
I.10	Holy Innocents	Matt. 2:13-23	The flight to Egypt and the slaughter of the Innocents
I.11	Octave of Christmas	Luke 2:21	Jesus' circumcision
I.12	Epiphany	Matt. 3:13-17	Jesus' baptism
I.14	After Epiphany	John 2:1-11	Wedding at Cana
I.19	After Epiphany	Luke 2:42-52	The boy Jesus at the temple
I.13	Benedict Biscop	Matt. 19:27-29	Give away all: receive one-hundredfold
I.15	After Epiphany	John 1:29-34	Jesus' baptism
I.18	Purification of Mary	Luke 2:22-35	Purification of Mary; Simeon
I.17	Sunday after Purification of Mary	John 1:43-51	The calling of Philip and Nathanael
I.24	Lent	Matt. 16:27-17:9	Coming of the Son in glory
I.22	Lent	Matt. 15:21-28	Healing of the Canaanite woman's daughter
I.25	Lent	John 8:1-12	The adulterous woman
II.6	Lent	Mark 7:31-37	Healing of the deaf-mute
II.1	Lent	John 2:12-22	The cleansing of the Temple
I.23	Lent	John 5:1-18	Healing at the pool of Bethzatha
II.2	Lent	John 6:1-14	Feeding the 5000
II.4	Lent	John 11:55-12:11	Mary anoints Jesus' feet
II.3	Palm Sunday	Matt. 21:1-9	Jesus enters Jerusalem
II.5	Maundy Thursday	John 13:1-17	Washing the disciples' feet
II.7	Easter Vigil	Matt. 28:16-20	Two Marys go to the tomb
II.10	Easter	Luke 24:1-9	The women go to the tomb
II.9	Feria ii of Easter	Luke 24:36-47	Jesus appears to the Apostles in Jerusalem
II.8	Feria vi of Easter	Matt. 28:16-20	Jesus appears at Galilee
II.13	2nd Sunday after Octave of Easter	John 16:16-22	Jesus prophesises his return to the Father
II.11	3rd Sunday after Octave of Easter	John 16:5-15	Jesus prophesises about the Spirit
II.12	4th Sunday after Octave of Easter	John 16:23-30	'Ask anything of the Father…'
II.14	Rogation Sunday	Luke 11:9-13	'Ask and it will be given…'

II.15	Ascension	Luke 24:44-53	Ascension
II.16	Sunday after Ascension	John 15:26-16:4	Jesus tells of the coming of the Spirit
II.17	Pentecost	John 14:15-21	'If you love me…'
II.18	Octave of Pentecost	John 3:1-16	The kingdom of heaven
II.19	Vigil of Birth of John the Baptist	Luke 1:5-17	Zechariah's vision
II.20	Birth of John the Baptist	Luke 1:57-68	John's birth
II.22	Vigil of Ss Peter and Paul	John 21:15-19	'Feed my sheep'
I.20	Ss Peter and Paul	Matt. 16:13-19	'Who is the Son of Man?'
II.21	St James	Matt. 20:20-23	Sons of Zebedee
II.23	Beheading of John the Baptist	Matt. 14:1-12	Beheading of John
II.24	Church Dedication	John 10:22-30	'My sheep hear my voice…'
II.25	Church Dedication	Luke 6:43-48	'No good tree bears bad fruit…'
I.21	St Matthew	Matt. 9:9-13	Jesus calls Matthew, the tax-collector
I.16	St Andrew	John 1:35-42	John the Baptist points out Jesus

Bibliography

This bibliography is arranged into five sections: primary sources (manuscripts); primary sources (texts and translations), listed in alphabetical order by author, then alphabetical order within author, with texts given priority over translations; secondary sources (manuscript catalogues), listed according to place; secondary sources (books and articles); URLs.

Primary Sources: Manuscripts mentioned

(An * indicates that I have seen the manuscript, a + indicates I have seen a complete facsimile or microfilm.)

Berlin: Staatsbibliothek, MS Görres 86
Boulogne-sur-Mer: *Bibliothèque Municipale, MS 75
Bückeburg: Niedersächsisches Staatsarchiv, dep. 3, Bedafragment III-VI B
Cambrai: Bibliothèque Cathedrale, MS 365
Cambridge: Trinity College, MS 126
                +University Library, MS Kk.v.16 (Moore Bede)
                 University Library, MS Ff.v.27
Charleville: Bibliothèque Publique, MS 162
Cologne: +Dombibliothek, Codex 92
                *Dombibliothek, Codex 172
Darmstadt: Hessische Landes- und Hochschulbibliothek, MS 4262
Durham: +Cathedral Library, MS A.IV.19 (Durham Ritual)
                 Cathedral Library, MS A.II.17
Engelberg: *Stiftsbibliothek, Codex 47
Florence: +Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, MS Amiatino 1 (Codex Amiatinus)
Karlsruhe: *Hof- und Landesbibliothek, MS Aug. 19
                  *Hof- und Landesbibliothek, MS Aug. 37
Laon: Bibliothèque Municipale, MS Laudunensis 55
Lincoln: Cathedral Library, MS 182
London: British Library, MS Harley 4688
              British Library, MS Cotton Tiberius A.XIV
             +British Library, MS Cotton Nero D.IV (Lindisfarne Gospels)
              British Library, Additional MS 37777
              British Library, Additional MS 45025
             +British Library, MS Loan 74 (Stonyhurst Gospel)
              British Library, MS Loan 81 (Bankes Leaf / Kingston Lacy fragment)
Montpellier: École de Médecine, MS 66
Munich: *Staatsbibliothek, Clm 4533
              *Staatsbibliothek, Clm 4534
              *Staatsbibliothek, Clm 18120
Münster-in-Westfalen: Staatsarchiv, MSC I 324
New Haven: Yale, Beinecke Library, MS 516
Oxford: *Bodleian Library, MS Bodley 819
              Bodleian Library, MS Laud Graec. 35 (Laudian Acts)
              Lincoln College, MS Lat. 30
              Merton College, MS 175
              Merton College, MS 176

Merton College, MS 177

Paris: BnF, MS Arsenal 319
        *BnF, MS Lat. 2369
        *BnF, MS Lat. 2370
         BnF, MS Lat. 2371
         BnF, MS Lat. 9472 (Luxeuil Lectionary)
         BnF, MS Lat. 13246 (Bobbio Missal)
        *BnF, MS nov. acq. Lat. 1450

Shrewsbury: Shrewsbury School, MS 39

St Gall: Klosterbibliothek, Codex 85
         Klosterbibliothek, Codex 432
       *Klosterbibliothek, Codex 433
       *Klosterbibliothek, Codex 434

St Petersburg: +M. E. Saltykov-Schedrin Public Library, MS Lat. Q.v.1.18
      (Leningrad Bede)

Tours: Bibliothèque Publique, MS 336

Utrecht: University Library, MS 32 (Utrecht Psalter)

Vatican: B. A. V., MS Pal. Lat. 284
        B. A. V., MS Reg. Lat. 38

Vitry-Le-François: Bibliothèque Publique, MS 37

Würzburg: Universitätsbibliothek, MS Mp.Th.F.62
         Universitätsbibliothek, MS Mp.Th.F.68 (Burchard Gospels)

Zurich: *Zentralbibliothek, MS C42 (277)

Primary Sources: Texts and Translations

Texts and translations are listed under the name of their original author. Unknown authors are listed under Anonymous. If an edition or translation contains a number of texts by different authors, I list it at the end under the name of the editor or translator. If I refer to the introduction or commentary, the text will also be listed under the name of the editor or translator in the main bibliography.

ÆLFRIC, *Ælfric's Catholic Homilies: The First Series: Text*, ed. P. Clemoes, Early English Texts Series (EETS), Second Series 17 (Oxford, 1997)

-----, *Ælfric's Catholic Homilies: Introduction, Commentary and Glossary*, M. Godden, EETS, Second Series 18 (Oxford, 2000)

AENEAS SILVIUS PICCOLOMINI, *Der Briefwechsel des Eneas Silvius Piccolomini*, ed. R. Wolkan, Fontes rerum Austriacanum 61 (1909)

ALCUIN, *Alcuin of York: His Life and Letters*, trans. S. Allott (York, 1974)

ALDHELM, *Aldhelm: The Prose Works*, trans. M. Lapidge and M. Herren (Cambridge, 1979)

AMBROSE, *In Lucam*, ed. M. Adriaen, Corpus Christianorum Series Latina (CCSL) 14 (Turnholt, 1957)

ANON., *The Saga of Hacon and a Fragment of the Saga of Magnus With Appendices*, trans. G. W. Dasent, 2 vols. (repr. Felin Fach, 1997)

-----, *Simeon's History of the Church of Durham*, trans. J. Stevenson (repr. Lampeter, 1993)

AUGUSTINE, *Acta contra Fortunatum Manichaeum*, ed. J. Zycha, Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum (CSEL) 25 (Vienna, 1891)

-----, *Contra Faustum Manichaeum*, ed. J. Zycha, CSEL 25 (Vienna, 1891)

-----, *Contra Julianum*, ed. E. Kalinka and M. Zelzer, CSEL 85 (Vienna, 1978)

-----, *De diversis quaestionibus 83*, ed. A. Mutzenbecher, CCSL 44A (Turnholt, 1975)

-----, *De doctrina christiana*, ed. J. Martin, CCSL 32 (Turnholt, 1967)

-----, *De Genesi contra Manichaeos*, Patrologia Latina (PL) 93

-----, *Sermones*, PL 38

-----, *Tractatus in Iohannem*, ed. A. Mayer, CCSL 36 (Turnholt, 1954)

-----, *Saint Augustine: On Christian Doctrine*, trans. D. W. Robertson Jr (Indianapolis, 1958)

-----, *Tractates on the Gospel of John*, trans. J. W. Rettig (Washington, 1988)

BEDE, *De arte metrica*, ed. C. W. Jones, CCSL 123A (Turnholt, 1975)

-----, *De orthographia*, ed. C. W. Jones, CCSL 123A (Turnholt, 1975)

-----, *De natura rerum*, ed. C. W. Jones, CCSL 123A (Turnholt, 1975)

-----, *De schematibus et tropis*, ed. C. W. Jones, CCSL 123A (Turnholt, 1975)

-----, *De tabernaculo*, ed. D. Hurst, CCSL 119A (Turnholt, 1969)

-----, *De templo*, ed. D. Hurst, CCSL 119A (Turnholt, 1969)

-----, *De temporibus*, ed. C. W. Jones, CCSL 123C (Turnholt, 1980)

-----, *De temporum ratione*, ed. C. W. Jones, CCSL 123B (Turnholt, 1997)

-----, *Epistulae*, ed. C. W. Jones, CCSL 123C (Turnholt, 1980)

-----, *Expositio Actuum*, *Bedae Venerabilis Expositio Actuum Apostolorum et Retractatio*, ed. M. L. W. Laistner (Cambridge, Mass., 1939)

-----, *Historia Abbatum*, *Venerabilis Baedae Opera Historica*, ed. C. Plummer, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1896)

-----, *Historia ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum*, ed. and trans. B. Colgrave and R. A. B. Mynors, *Bede's Ecclesiastical History of the English Church and People* (Oxford, 1969)

-----, *Homiliae*, ed. D. Hurst, CCSL 122 (Turnholt, 1955)

-----, *Homiliae*, PL 90

-----, *In Apocalypsin*, ed. R. Gryson, CCSL 121A (Turnholt, 2001)

-----, *In Cantica Canticorum*, ed. D. Hurst, CCSL 119B (Turnholt, 1983)

-----, *In Canticum Habakuk*, ed. D. Hurst, CCSL 119B (Turnholt, 1983)

-----, *In epistolas septem catholicas*, ed. D. Hurst, CCSL 121 (Turnholt, 1983)

-----, *In Ezram et Neemiam*, ed. D. Hurst, CCSL 119A (Turnholt, 1969)

-----, *In Genesim*, ed. D. Hurst, CCSL 118A (Turnholt, 1967)

-----, *In Lucam*, ed. D. Hurst, CCSL 120 (Turnholt, 1960)

-----, *In Marcum*, ed. D. Hurst, CCSL 120 (Turnholt, 1960)

-----, *In Proverbia Salomonis*, ed. D. Hurst, CCSL 119B (Turnholt, 1983)

-----, *In Regum Librum XXX Quaestiones*, ed. D. Hurst, CCSL 119 (Turnholt, 1962)

-----, *In Samuhelis*, ed. D. Hurst, CCSL 119 (Turnholt, 1962)

-----, *In Tobiam*, ed. D. Hurst, CCSL 119B (Turnholt, 1983)

-----, *Liber hymnorum*, ed. J. Fraipont, CCSL 122 (Turnholt, 1955)

-----, *Retractatio Actuum, Bedae Venerabilis Expositio Actuum Apostolorum et Retractatio*, ed. M. L. W. Laistner (Cambridge, Mass., 1939)

-----, *Vita Metrica S. Cuthberti, Bedas metrische Vita sancti Cuthberti*, ed. W. Jaeger, Palaestra 198 (Leipzig, 1935).

-----, *Opera Omnia*, ed. J. A. Giles (London, 1843-4)

-----, *Venerabilis Baedae Opera Historica*, ed. C. Plummer (Oxford, 1896)

-----, *Two Lives of Cuthbert: A Life by an Anonymous Monk of Lindisfarne and Bede's Prose Life*, ed. and trans. B. Colgrave (Cambridge, 1940)

-----, *Bede: On the Temple*, trans. S. Connolly (Liverpool, 1995)

-----, *Bede: On Tobit and On the Canticle of Habakkuk*, trans. S. Connolly (Dublin, 1997)

-----, *Bede: A Biblical Miscellany*, trans. W. Trent Foley and A. G. Holder (Liverpool 1999).

-----, *Bede the Venerable: Commentary on the Seven Catholic Epistles*, trans. D. Hurst, Cistercian Studies Series (CSS) 82 (Kalamazoo, 1985)

-----, *Bede the Venerable: Homilies on the Gospels*, trans. L. T. Martin, CSS 110 and 111 (Kalamazoo, 1991)

-----, *The Venerable Bede: Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles*, trans. L. T. Martin, CSS 117 (Kalamazoo, 1989)

-----, *Bede: The Reckoning of Time*, trans. F. Wallis (Liverpool, 1999)

BENEDICT OF NURSIA, *The Rule of St Benedict*, trans. J. McCann, 2nd edn (London, 1976)

Biblia Sacra: Iuxta Vulgatam versionem, ed. R. Gryson *et al.*, 4th edn (Stuttgart, 1994)

BONIFACE, *S. Bonifatii et S. Lulli Epistulae*, ed. M. Tangl, Monumenta Germaniae Historica, *Epistulae Selectae 1* (Berlin, 1916)

-----, *The Letters of Saint Boniface*, trans. E. Emerton (New York, 1940)

CAESARIUS OF ARLES, *Sermones*, ed. G. Morin, CCSL 103 and 104 (Turnholt, 1953)

CICERO, *The Verrine Orations*, ed. and trans. L. H. G. Greenwood, 2 vols. (London, 1928-35)

CONSTANTIUS OF LYON, *Constance de Lyon: Vie de Saint Germain d'Auxerre*, ed. and trans. R. Borius, Sources Chrétiennes 112 (Paris, 1965)

CUTHBERT, abbot of Wearmouth-Jarrow, 'Epistola de obitu Bedae', in *Bede's Ecclesiastical History of the English Church and People*, ed. B. Colgrave and R. A. B. Mynors (Oxford, 1969)

GREGORY THE GREAT, *Dialogi*; *Dialogues*, ed. A. de Vogue (Paris, 1978)

-----, *Gregorius Magnus: Homiliae in Evangelia*, ed. R. Étaix, CCSL 141 (Turnholt, 1999)

-----, *Homiliae in Ezechielis*, ed. M. Adriaen, CCSL 142 (Turnholt, 1977)

-----, *Grégoire le Grand: Homélies sur Ézéchiel*, ed. and trans. C. Morel, 2 vols (Paris, 1986)

-----, *Le omelie di Gregorio Magno zu Ezechiele (1-5)*, ed. and trans. V. Recchia (Bari, 1974)

-----, *S. Gregorii Magni: Moralia in Iob Libri I-X*, ed. M. Adriaen, CCSL 143 (Turnholt, 1979)

-----, *Règle pastorale: Gregoire le Grand*, ed. and trans. F. Rommel and C. Morel, Sources Chrétiennes 381 and 382 (Paris, 1992)

-----, *Gregory the Great: Forty Gospel Homilies*, trans. D. Hurst, CSS 123 (Kalamazoo, 1990)

-----, *Gregory the Great: Morals on the Book of Job*, vol. II (Oxford, 1845)

-----, *Gregoire le Grand: Morales sur Job I et II*, trans. R. Gillet and A. de Gaudemaris, Sources Chrétiennes 32 bis (Paris, 1975)

GREGORY OF TOURS, *Gregory of Tours: Life of the Fathers*, trans. E. James, 2nd edn (Liverpool, 1991)

ISIDORE OF SEVILLE, *Isidori Hispalensis episcopi etymologiarum sive originum libri xx*, ed. W. M. Lindsay (Oxford, 1911)

-----, *Quaestiones in Vetus Testamentum*, PL 83

JACOBO da VORAGINE, *Iacopo da Varazze: Legenda Aurea*, ed. G. P. Maggiori, 2nd edn, 2 vols. (Florence, 1998)

JEROME, *Liber interpretationis Herbraicorum nominum*, ed. P. Antin, CCSL 72 (Turnholt, 1959)

NOTKER BALBULUS, 'Notkers des Stammlers *Notatio de illustribus viris*: Teil 1: Kritische Edition', ed. E. Rauner, *Mittellateinisches Jahrbuch* 21 (1986), 34-69

-----, *Notker der Dichter und seine geistige Welt*, ed. W. von den Steinen, 2 vols. (Berne, 1948)

PAUL THE DEACON, *Homiliary*, PL 95

The Age of Bede, trans. D. H. Farmer and J. F. Webb, rev. edn (Harmondsworth, 1998)

Ancient Literary Criticism: The Principal Texts in New Translations, trans. D. A. Russell and M. Winterbottom (Oxford, 1972)

The Apostolic Fathers, ed. and trans. K. Lake, 2 vols. (London, 1912-13)

Early Christian Lives, trans. C. White (Harmondsworth, 1998)

Secondary Sources: Manuscript Catalogues

France:
Catalogue Général des manuscrits des bibliothèques publiques de France
    Vols. I (1849); IV (1872); V (1879); XIII, (1891); XVII, ed. A. Molinier
    (1891); XXXVII, ed. M. Collon (1900)
Paris: *Inventaire des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Nationale, Fonds de Cluny*, ed.
    L. Delisle (Paris, 1884)
    Bibliothèque Nationale, catalogue général des manuscrits Latins,   ed. P.
    Lauer (Paris, 1940)
    Catalogue des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal I, ed. H. Martin
    (Paris, 1885)

Germany:
Berlin: *Die Handschriften der Königlichen Bibliothek zu Berlin. III Die Görres
    Handschriften*, ed. S. X. F. Schillmann (Berlin, 1919)
Karlsruhe: *Die Handschriften der Grossherzoglich Badischen Hof- und
    Landesbibliothek in Karlsruhe V: Die Reichenauer Handschriften
    I*, ed. A. Holder (Leipzig, 1906)
Munich: *Catalogus Codicum Manuscriptorum Bibliothecae Regia Monacensis: III.II
    Codices Latini*, ed. C. Halm (Munich, 1844)

Switzerland:
Engelberg: article by E. G. Vogel in *Serapeum* X (1849), 122-3
St Gall: *Verzeichniss der Handschriften der Stiftsbibliothek von St
    Gallen*, ed. G. Scherner (Halle, 1875)
    Scriptorium medii aevi Helvetica III: St Gallen II, ed. A.
    Bruckner (Geneva, 1938)
Zurich: *Katalog der Handschriftes der Zentralbibliothek Zürich: I Mittelalterliche
    Handschriftes*, ed. K. Mohlberg (Zurich, 1932)

U.K.:
Bibliotheca Patrum Latinorum Britannica, ed. H. Schenkl (Vienna, 1891), vol. I
Cambridge: *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Western Manuscripts in the Library of
    Trinity College Cambridge I*, ed. M. R. James (Cambridge, 1900)
London: *A Catalogue of the Harleian Manuscripts in the British Museum* (London,
    1806), vol. III
Oxford: *The Medieval Books of Merton College* ed. F. M. Powicke (Oxford, 1931)
    *Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Oxford Colleges: Catalogus codicum
    manu scriptorum qui in collegiis aulisque Oxoniensibus hodie adservantur*,
    ed. H. O. Coxe (Oxford, 1852), vol. I
    A Summary Catalogue of Western Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library at
    Oxford II, ed. F. Madan and H. H. E. Craster (Oxford, 1935)

Vatican: *Codices Reginenses Latini*, ed. A. Wilmart (Vatican, 1937), vol. I

Secondary Sources: Books and Articles

ADAMS, B., *et al.*, *Atlas of the World in the Middle Ages* (London, 1980)

ALEXANDER, J. J. G., *The Decorated Letter* (London, 1978)

ALLAN, V. L., *Bede's Commentary on the Six Days of Creation and the Six Ages of the World in* In Genesim *I.1093-1224: Sources and Analogues*, (unpublished B.A. thesis, Cambridge, 2000). Also available at http://tartarus.org/verity/Bede_ug.html

-----, 'Bede: Educating the Educators of Barbarians', *Quaestio: Selected Papers from the Cambridge Colloquium in Anglo-Saxon, Norse and Celtic* 3 (2003), 1-21

ALLEN, M. I., 'Bede and Frechulf at Medieval St Gallen', in *Beda Venerabilis: Historian, Monk and Northumbrian*, ed. L. A. J. R. Houwen and A. A. MacDonald (Groningen, 1996), pp. 61-80

ALLEN, P. S., 'Charles Plummer 1851-1927', *Proceedings of the British Academy* 15 (1929), 463-76

ALLEN, W. S., *Accent and Rhythm* (Cambridge, 1973)

AMOS, T. L, 'Monks and Pastoral Care in the Early Middle Ages', in *Religion, Culture and Society in the Early Middle Ages: Studies in Honor of Richard E. Sullivan*, ed. T. F. X. Noble and J. J. Contreni (Kalamazoo, 1987), pp.165-180

ANDREW, S. O., *Syntax and Style in Old English* (Cambridge, 1940)

ARAKELIAN, P. G., 'Punctuation in a Late Middle English Manuscript', *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen* 76 (1975), 614-24

ARNGART, O., ed., *The Leningrad Bede: An Eighth Century Manuscript of the Venerable Bede's Historia Ecclesiastica Gentis Anglorum in the Public Library, Leningrad*, Early English Manuscripts in Facsimile 2 (Copenhagen, 1952)

ASTRUC-MORIZE, G., and A. le Boulluec, 'Le sens caché des Écritures selon Jean Chrysostome et Origène', *Studia Patristica* 25 (1993), 1-26

AUERBACH, E., *Literary Language and Its Public in Late Latin Antiquity and in the Middle Ages*, trans. R. Manheim (London, 1965)

AUMONT, J., *Métrique et stylistique des clausules dans la prose latine: De Cicéron à Pline le Jeune et de César à Florus*, Travaux de Linguistique Quantative 56 (Paris, 1996)

d'AVRAY, D. L., *The Preaching of the Friars: Sermons Diffused from Paris before 1300* (Oxford, 1985)

BAILEY, R. N., 'Bede's Bones' in *New Offerings Ancient Treasures: Essays in Medieval Art for George Henderson*, ed. P. Binski and W. Noel (Stroud, 2001), pp. 165-86.

-----, *The Durham Cassiodorus*, Jarrow Lecture (Jarrow, 1978)

BANNIARD, M., *Viva Voce: communication orale et communication écrite en occident latin (IVᵉ – IXᵉ siècle)* (Paris, 1992)

BAREILLE, G., 'Angélologie d'apres les Pères' in *Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique*, ed. A. Vacant, (Paris, 1901), vol. I, col. 1192-1222.

-----., 'Le culte des anges a l'époque des pères de l'église', *Revue Thomiste* 8 (1900), 41-9

BARRÉ, H., *Les homéliaires Carolingiens de l'école d'Auxerre: Authenticité – Inventaire – Tableaux comparatifs – Initia*, Studi e Testi 225 (Vatican, 1962)

-----, 'Marie et l'Eglise du Vénérable Bède à Saint Albert le Grand', *Études Mariales* 9 (1951), 59-143

BATTISCOMBE, C. F., ed., *The Relics of St Cuthbert* (Oxford, 1965)

BECK, G. J., *The Pastoral Care of Souls in South-East France* (Rome, 1950)

BEDINGFIELD, M. Bradford, *The Dramatic Liturgy of Anglo-Saxon England*, Anglo-Saxon Studies 1 (Woodbridge, 2002)

BEESON, C. H., 'The Manuscripts of Bede', *Classical Philology* 42 (1947), 73-87

-----, *Lupus of Ferrieres as a Scribe and Text Critic: A Study of his Autograph Copy of Cicero's* De Oratore (Cambridge, Mass., 1930)

BERROUARD, M.-F., 'Deux peuples, un seul tropeau, un unique Pasteur: Ecclésiologie de Saint Augustin et citations de Jean 10:16' in *Collectanea Augustininana: Augustine: 'Second Founder of the Faith'*, ed. J. C. Schnaubelt and F. Van Fleteren (New York, 1990), pp. 275-301

BERSCHIN, W., 'Bede's *Opus deliberatum ac perfectum*' in *Saint Cuthbert, His Cult and His Community*, ed. G. Bonner *et al*. (Woodbridge 1989), pp. 95-102

BEVENOT, M., 'Towards dating the Leningrad Bede', *Scriptorium* 16 (1962), 365-9

BINSKI, P., and W. Noel, ed., *New Offerings, Ancient Treasures: Essays in Medieval Art for George Henderson* (Stroud, 2001)

BISCHOFF, B., *Manuscripts and Libraries in the Age of Charlemagne*, ed. and trans. M. Gorman (Cambridge, 1994)

-----, *Latin Palaeography: Antiquity and the Middle Ages*, trans. D. Ó Croinin and D. Ganz (Cambridge, 1990)

-----, 'Die europäische Verbreitung der Werke Isidors von Sevilla', in *Isidoriana: colección de estudios sobre Isidoro de Sevilla*, ed. M. C. Díaz y Díaz (Leon, 1961), pp. 317-44

BISHOP. E., *Liturgica Historica: Papers on the Liturgy and Religious Life of the Western Church* (Oxford, 1918)

BLAIR, P. Hunter, *The World of Bede*, rev. edn (Cambridge, 1990)

-----, 'From Bede to Alcuin', in *Famulus Christi*, ed. G. Bonner (London, 1976), pp. 239-60

-----, *Bede's* Ecclesiastical History of the English Nation *and its Importance Today*, Jarrow Lecture (Jarrow, 1959)

BLAND, J. M., and D. G. Altman, 'Multiple Significance Tests: The Bonferroni Method' *British Medical Journal* 310 (1995), 170. Available at http://bmj.bmjjournals.com/cgi/content/full/31069730/170 , last accessed May 2005

BOLTON, W. F., 'A Bede Bibliography, 1935-1960', *Traditio* 18 (1962), 436-45

BONNER, G., 'Bede: Scholar and Spiritual Teacher', in *Northumbria's Golden Age*, ed. J. Hawkes and S. Mills (Stroud, 1999), pp. 365-70

-----, ed., *Famulus Christi: Essays in Commemoration of the Thirteenth Centenary of the Birth of the Venerable Bede* (London, 1976)

-----, 'Bede and Medieval Civilisation', *Anglo-Saxon England* (*ASE*) 2 (1973), 71-90

-----, 'The Christian Life in the Thought of the Venerable Bede', *Durham University Journal* 63 (1971), 39-55

BONNER, G., *et al.*, ed., *Saint Cuthbert, His Cult and His Community To AD 1200* (Woodbridge, 1989)

BOYD, W. J. P., *Aldred's Marginalia: Explanatory Comments in the Lindisfarne Gospels* (Exeter, 1975)

BOYLE, L., *"Vox paginae": An Oral Dimension of Texts* (Rome, 1999)

-----., *Medieval Latin Palaeography* (Toronto, 1984)

BROWN, G. Hardin, 'The Church as a Non-symbol in the Age of Bede', in *Northumbria's Golden Age*, ed. J. Hawkes and S. Mills (Stroud, 1999), pp. 359-64

-----, *Bede the Educator*, Jarrow Lecture (Jarrow, 1996)

-----, *Bede the Venerable* (Boston, 1987)

BROWN, G. Hardin and C. Karkov*, ed., *Anglo-Saxon Styles* (New York, 2003)

BROWN, M. P., *The Lindisfarne Gospels: Society, Spirituality and the Scribe* (London, 2003)

-----, 'House Style in the Scriptorium: Scribal Reality and Scholarly Myth' in *Anglo-Saxon Styles*, ed. G. H. Brown and C. Karkov (New York, 2003), pp. 131-50

-----, *"In the Beginning was the Word": Books and Faith in the Age of Bede*, Jarrow Lecture (Jarrow, 2000)

-----, *A Guide to Western Historical Scripts from Antiquity to 1600*, (London, 1993)

-----, 'The Lindisfarne Scriptorium from the Late Seventh to the Early Ninth Century', in *St Cuthbert, His Cult and His Community*, ed. G. Bonner, pp. 151-164

BROWN, T. J., *A Palaeographer's View: Selected Writings of Julian Brown*, ed. J. Bately *et al*. (London, 1993)

----, 'Late Antique and Early Anglo-Saxon Books' in *Manuscripts at Oxford: R. W. Hunt Memorial Exhibition*, ed. A. C. de la Mare and B. C. Barker-Benfield (Oxford, 1980), p.11-14

-----, ed., *The Stonyhurst Gospel of St. John* (Oxford, 1969)

BROWN, T. J., *et al.*, ed., *The Durham Ritual: A Southern English Collectar of the Tenth Century with Northumbrian Additions. Durham Cathedral Library A.IV.19*, Early English Manuscripts in Facsimile 16 (Copenhagen, 1969)

de BRUYNE, A., *Études d'esthétique mediévale 1-3* (Bruges, 1946)

de BRUYNE, D., 'Note sur les manuscrits et les éditions du commentaire de Bède sur les proverbes', *Journal of Theological Studies* 28 (1926-7), pp. 182-4.

-----, *Sommaire, Divisions et Rubriques de la Bible Latine* (Namur, 1914)

BULLOUGH, D. A., *Carolingian Renewal, Sources and Heritage* (Manchester, 1991)

-----, 'Alcuino e la Tradizione Culturale Insulare', in *I problemi dell'Occidente nel secolo VIII*, Settimane 20 (Spoleto, 1973), 571-600

BULLOUGH, D. A., and A. L. H. Corrêa, 'Texts, Chant and the Chapel of Louis the Pious' in *Charlemagne's Heir: New Perspectives on the Reign of Louis the Pious (814-840)*, ed. P. Godman and R. Collins (Oxford, 1990), pp.489-508

BURTON-CHRISTIE, D., 'Scripture, Self-Knowledge and Contemplation in Cassian's *Conferences*', *Studia Patristica* 25 (1993), 339-45

CAMPBELL, J., 'Elements in the Background to the Life of St Cuthbert and his Early Cult', in *St Cuthbert, His Cult and His Community*, ed. G. Bonner, pp. 3-20

-----, 'Bede I' in his *Essays in Anglo-Saxon History* (London, 1986), pp. 1-27

-----, 'Bede', in *Latin Historians*, ed. T. A. Dorey (London, 1966), pp. 159-90

CAPELLE, B., 'Le rôle théologique de Bède le Vénérable', in *Sancta Beda Venerabilis*, Studia Anselmiana 6 (Rome, 1936), pp. 1-40

CAPUTA, G., *Il sacerdozio dei fedeli secondo San Beda: Un itinerario di maturità cristiana*, Monumenta Studi Instrumenta Liturgica 16 (Vatican, 2002)

-----, 'Lineamenti di teologica liturgica nelle omelie di San Beda il Venerabile', *Ephemerides Liturgicae* 111 (1997), 116-31

-----, 'Il ministero della "Madre Chiesa" a servizio del sacerdozio comune, secondo san Beda il Venerabile', *Ephemerides Liturgicae* 108 (1994), 128-45

CARROLL, M. T. A., *The Venerable Bede: His Spiritual Teachings* (Washington, 1946)

CAVADINI, J., ed., *Gregory the Great: A Symposium* (Notre Dame, 1995)

CHADWICK, H., *Augustine* (Oxford, 1986)

CHADWICK, O., *John Cassian*, 2nd edn (Cambridge, 1968)

CHAVASSE, A., *Le sacramentaire Gélasien (Vaticanus Reginensis 316). Sacramentaire presbytéral en usage dans les titre romaine au viie siècle* (Tournai, 1957)

CHEVALIER, C., 'Les trilogies homilétiques dans l'élaboration des fêtes mariales 650-850', *Gregorianum* 19 (1937), 361-78

CLARK, A. C., *The Cursus in Mediaeval and Vulgar Latin* (Oxford, 1910)

CLARK, J. M., *The Abbey of St Gall as a Centre of Literature and Art* (Cambridge, 1926)

CLAYTON, M., *The Apocryphal Gospels of Mary in Anglo-Saxon England* (Cambridge, 1998)

-----, *The Cult of the Virgin Mary in Anglo-Saxon England* (Cambridge, 1990)

COATES, S. J., 'Bishop as Pastor and Solitary: Bede and the Spiritual Authority of the Monk-Bishop', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* (*JEH*) 47 (1996), 601-19

COLGRAVE, B., *The Venerable Bede and his Times*, Jarrow Lecture (Jarrow, 1958)

COMEAU, M., *Saint Augustin, exégète du IVe Évangile* (Paris, 1930)

CONNOLLY, S., trans., *Bede: On Tobit and On the Canticle of Habakkuk* (Dublin, 1997)

CONTRENI, J. J., 'Chapter 27: The Carolingian Renaissance: Education and Literary Culture' in *The New Cambridge Medieval History*, ed. R. McKitterick (Cambridge, 1995), pp. 709-57

CRAMP, R., 'The Position of the Otley Crosses in English Sculpture', in her *Studies in Anglo-Saxon Sculpture* (London, 1992), pp. 55-63

-----, *Early Northumbrian Sculpture*, Jarrow Lecture (Jarrow, 1965)

CRÉPIN, A., 'Bede and the Vernacular', in *Famulus Christi: Essays in Commemoration of the Thirteenth Centenary of the Birth of the Venerable Bede*, ed. G. Bonner (London, 1976), pp. 170-192

CROSS, F. L., and E. A. Livingstone, ed., *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, 3rd edn (Oxford, 1997)

CROSS, J. E., 'Bede's Influence at Home and Abroad: An Introduction', in *Beda Venerabilis: Historian, Monk and Northumbrian*, ed. L. A. J. R. Houwen and A. A. MacDonald (Groningen, 1996), pp. 17-30

CUBITT, C., 'Unity and Diversity in the Early Anglo-Saxon Liturgy' in *Unity and Diversity in the Church*, ed. R. N. Swanson (Oxford, 1996), pp. 45-58

CUPICCIA, M., 'Clausole quantitive e clausole ritmiche nella prosa latina della Spagna Visigotica', *Filologia Mediolatina* 8 (2001), 25-100

DALBY, M. G., 'Themes and Techniques in the Blicking Lenten Homilies', in *The Old English Homily and its Backgrounds*, ed. P. Szarmach and B. Huppé (Manchester, 1978), pp. 221-39

DALES, D., *Light to the Isles: A Study of Missionary Theology in Celtic and Anglo-Saxon Britain* (Cambridge, 1997)

DANIELOU, J., *Les anges et leur mission d'après les Pères de l'Église* (Paris, 1951)

DANIELOU, R. P., *Bible et Liturgie* (Paris, 1951)

DAVIDSE, J., 'The Sense of History in the Works of the Venerable Bede', *Studi Medievali* 23.2, series 3A (1982) 647-695

DEFERRARI, R. J., 'St Augustine's Method of Composing and Delivering Sermons', *American Journal of Philology* 43 (1922), 97-123 and 193-219

DELEHAYE, H., *The Legends of the Saints*, trans. D. Attwater (Dublin, 1998)

DIONISOTTI, A. C., 'On Bede, Grammars and Greek', *Revue Bénédictine* (*RB*) 92 (1982), 111-41

DOYLE, A. I., 'The Original and Later Structure of Durham University Library, MS Cosin V.II.6' in *Symeon of Durham: Historian of Durham and the North*, ed. D. Rollason (Stamford, 1998), pp. 120-7

ECHLIN, T., 'Bede and the Church', *Irish Theological Quarterly* 40 (1973), 351-62

ECKENRODE, T. R., 'The Venerable Bede: A Bibliographical Essay, 1970-1981' *American Benedictine Review* 36 (1985), 172-94

-----, 'The Venerable Bede and the Pastoral Affirmation of the Christian Message in Anglo-Saxon England', *The Downside Review* 99 (1981), 258-78

ETAIX, R., 'Un homiliaire ancien', *RB* 73 (1963), 288-308

FARR, C. A., 'The Shape of Learning at Wearmouth-Jarrow: The Diagram Pages in the *Codex Amiatinus*' in *Northumbria's Golden Age*, ed. J. Hawkes and S. Mills (Stroud, 1999), pp. 336-44

FARRELL, R. T., ed., *Bede and Anglo-Saxon England: Papers in Honour of the 1300th Anniversary of the Birth of Bede, Given at Cornell University in 1973 and 1974*, British Archaeological Reports 46 (Oxford, 1978)

FISCHER, B., 'Bibelauslegungen des frühen Mittelalters', *Settimane di Studio* 10 (Spoleto, 1963), 586-97

FLEISS, J. L., *Statistical Methods for Rates and Proportions*, 2nd edn (New York, 1981)

FLETCHER, E., *Benedict Biscop*, Jarrow Lecture (Jarrow, 1981)

FLINT, V., 'The Commentaries of Honorius Augustodunsis', in her *Ideas in the Medieval West: Texts and their Contexts* (Variorum, 1988), pp. 196-211, originally published in *RB* 84 (1974)

FOLLIET, G., 'La typologie du *sabbat* chez saint Augustin: son interprétation millénariste entre 388 et 400', *Revue des études augustiniennes* 2 (1956), 371-90

FRENAUD, G., 'Marie et l'Eglise d'après les liturgies latines du VIIe au XIe siècle', *Études Mariales* 9 (1951) 39-58

GANZ, D., 'Chapter 29: Book Production in the Carolingian Empire and the Spread of Caroline Minuscule', in *The New Cambridge Medieval History Volume II: c.700 – c.900*, ed. R. McKitterick (Cambridge, 1995), pp. 786-808

-----, *Corbie in the Carolingian Renaissance* (Sigmarignen, 1990)

GATCH, M. McC., *Preaching and Theology in Anglo-Saxon England: Ælfric and Wulfstan* (Toronto, 1977)

GNEUSS, H., *A Handlist of Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts: A List of Manuscripts and Manuscript Fragments Written or Owned in England up to 1100*, Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies 241 (Tempe, 2001)

-----, 'Liturgical Books in Anglo Saxon England and Their Old English Terminology', in *Learning and Literature: Studies Presented to Peter Clemoes on the Occasion of his Sixty-Fifth Birthday* (Cambridge, 1985), pp. 91-141

-----, 'A Preliminary List of Manuscripts Written or Owned in England Up to 1100', *ASE* 9 (1981), 1-59

GODMAN, P, and R. COLLINS, ed., *Charlemagne's Heir: New Perspectives on the Reign of Louis the Pious (814-840)* (Oxford, 1990)

le GOFF, J., *The Birth of Purgatory*, trans. A. Goldhammer (London, 1984)

GOFFART, W., *The Narrators of Barbarian History* (Princeton, 1998)

GORMAN, M., 'The Canon of Bede's Work and the World of Pseudo-Bede', *RB* 111 (2001), 399-445

-----, 'The Commentary on the Pentateuch Attributed to Bede in PL 91.189-394', *RB* 106 (1996), 61-108

GREGOIRE, R., *Homéliaires liturgiques médiévaux: Analyse des manuscrits* (Spoleto, 1980)

-----, *Les homéliaires du moyen âge: Inventaire et analyse des manuscrits*, Rerum Ecclesiasticarum documenta series maior: Fontes VI (Rome, 1966)

GROCOCK, C., 'Bede and the Golden Age of Latin Prose in Northumbria', in *Northumbria's Golden Age*, ed. J. Hawkes and S. Mills (Stroud, 1999), pp. 371-82

HART-HASLER, J. N., *Vestigia patrum sequens: The Venerable Bede's use of patristic sources in his commentary on the Gospel of Luke* (unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Cambridge, 1999)

-----, 'Bede's Use of Patristic Sources', *Studia Patristica* 28 (1993), 197-204

HAWKES, J., and S. Mills, ed., *Northumbria's Golden Age* (Stroud, 1999)

HILL, J., *Bede and the Benedictine Reform*, Jarrow Lecture, (Jarrow, 1998)

HILL, R., 'Christianity and Geography in Early Northumbria', in *Studies in Church History*, ed. G. J. Cuming, 3rd edn (London, 1966), pp. 126-39

HILL, R. C., 'Psalm 45: A *locus classicus* for Patristic Thinking on Biblical Inspiration', *Studia Patristica* 25 (1993), 95-100

HILLGARTH, J. N., 'L'influence de "La Cité de Dieu" de Saint Augustin au Haut Moyen Age', *Sacris Erudiri* 28 (1985), 5-34

HOLDER, A., '(Un)Dating Bede's *De Arte Metrica'* in *Northumbria's Golden Age*, ed. J. Hawkes and S. Mills (Stroud, 1999), pp. 390-5

-----, 'The Venerable Bede on the Mysteries of Our Salvation', *American Benedictine Review* 42 (1991), 140-62

HOLTZ, L., 'A l'école de Donat, de saint Augustin à Bède', *Latomus* 36 (1977), 522-38

HOPE, D. M., *The Leonine Sacramentary: A Reassessment of its Nature and Purpose* (Oxford, 1971)

HOUWEN, L. A. and A. A. MacDonald, ed., *Beda Venerabilis* (Groningen, 1996)

HOWLETT, D., *British Books in Biblical Style* (Dublin, 1997)

-----, 'Biblical Style in Early Insular Latin', in *Sources of Anglo-Saxon Culture*, Studies in Medieval Culture 20, ed. P. E. Szarmach and V. D. Oggins (Kalamazoo, 1986), pp. 127-47

HURST, D., *Gregory the Great: 40 Gospel Homilies*, Cistercian Studies Series 123 (Kalamazoo, 1990)

-----, *Opera Homiletica*, CCSL 122 (Turnholt, 1955)

IGUANEZ, M., 'Il Venerabile Beda nei codici e negli scrittori cassinesi medievali', in *S. Beda Venerabilis*, Studia Anselmiana 6 (Rome, 1936), pp. 41-50

IRVINE, M., 'Bede the Grammarian and the Scope of Grammatical Studies in Eighth-Century Northumbria', *ASE* 15 (1986), 15-44

ISOLA, A., 'Il *De schematibus et tropis* di Beda in rapporto al *De doctrina christiana* di Agostino', *Romanobarbarica* 1 (1976), 71-82

JAMES, M. R., 'The Manuscripts of Bede' in *Bede: His Life, Times and Writings*, ed. A. Hamilton Thompson (Oxford, 1935), pp. 230-6

JANSON, T., *Prose Rhythm in Medieval Latin from the 9th to the 13th Century*, Acta Universitatis Stockholmiensis, Studia Latina Stockholmiensis XX (Stockholm, 1975)

JENKINS, C., 'Bede as Exegete and Theologian', in *Bede: His Life, Times and Writings*, ed. A. Hamilton Thompson (Oxford, 1935), pp. 152-200

JONES, C. W., 'Some Introductory Remarks on Bede's Commentary on Genesis', *Sacris Erudiri* 19 (1970), 119-98

-----, 'Bede as Early Medieval Historian', *Medievalia et Humanistica* 4 (1946), 26-36

-----, ed., *Bedae Opera de Temporibus*, (Cambridge, Mass., 1943)

de JONG, M., 'Chapter 23: Carolingian Monasticism: The Power of Prayer' in *The New Cambridge Medieval History*, ed. R. McKitterick, pp. 622-53

KARKOV, C. E., 'Whitby, Jarrow and the Commemoration of Death in Northumbria' in *Northumbria's Golden Age*, ed. S. Hawkes and J. Mills (Stroud, 1999), pp. 126-35

KELLY, J. F., '1996 NAPS Presidential Address: "On the Brink: Bede"', *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 5 (1997), 85-103

-----, 'Bede's Exegesis of Luke's Infancy Narrative', *Medievalia* 15 (1993), 59-70

-----, 'The Venerable Bede and Hiberno-Latin Exegesis', in *Sources of Anglo-Saxon Culture*, ed. P. Szarmach (Kalamazoo, 1986), pp. 65-76

KENDRICK, T. J. , *et al.*, ed., *Evangeliorum quattuor codex Lindisfarnensis: MS BM Cotton Nero D.IV*, 2 vols. (Lausanne, 1956, 1960)

KER, N. R., *Medieval Libraries of Great Britain: A List of Surviving Books*, 2nd edn (London, 1964)

KITZINGER, E., 'The Coffin-Reliquary', in *The Relics of St Cuthbert*, ed. C. F. Battiscombe (Oxford, 1965), pp. 202-304

KLAUSER, T., *A Short History of the Western Liturgy: An Account of Some Reflections*, trans. J. Halliburton, (London, 1969)

KNAPPE, G., *Traditionen der Klassischen Rhetorik* (Heidelberg, 1996)

KNOWLES, D., *The Monastic Order in England* (Cambridge, 1940)

KUHN, S. M., 'Cursus in Old English: Rhetorical Ornament or Linguistic Phenomenon?' *Speculum* 47 (1972), 188-206

LADNER, G. B., *The Idea of Reform: Its Impact on Christian Thought and Action in the Age of the Fathers* (Cambridge, Mass., 1959)

LAISTNER, M. L. W., *Thought and Letters in Western Europe, A.D. 500 to 900*, 2nd edn (London, 1957)

-----, 'The Library of the Venerable Bede', in *Bede: His Life, Times and Writings*, ed. A. Hamilton Thompson, (Oxford, 1935), pp. 237-66

LAISTNER, M. L. W., and H. H. King, *A Hand-list of Bede Manuscripts*, (Ithaca, 1943)

LAMBOT, C., 'La tradition manuscrite anglo-saxonne des sermons de S. Augustin', *RB* 64 (1954), 3-8

LANG, J., 'The Imagery of the Frank's Casket: Another Approach' in *Northumbria's Golden Age*, ed. J. Hawkes and S. Mills (Stroud, 1999), pp. 247-55

-----, *The Anglian Sculpture of Deira: The Classical Tradition*, Jarrow Lecture (Jarrow, 1990)

LAPIDGE, M., 'Aldhelm's Latin Poetry and Old English Verse', in his *Anglo-Latin Literature 600–899* (London, 1996), pp. 247-70.

-----, 'Autographs of Insular Latin Authors of the Early Middle Ages' in *Gli autografi medievali. Problemi palaeografici e filologici*, ed. P. Chiesa and L. Pinelli (Spoleto, 1994), pp.103-44

-----, *Bede the Poet*, Jarrow Lecture (Jarrow, 1993)

-----, ed., *Anglo-Saxon Litanies of the Saints*, Henry Bradshaw Society 106 (London, 1991)

-----, 'Bede's Metrical *Vita S. Cuthberti*' in *Saint Cuthbert, His Cult and His Community to AD1200*, ed. G. Bonner *et al.* (Woodbridge, 1989), pp. 77-94

LAPIDGE, M., *et al.* ed., *The Blackwell Encyclopaedia of Anglo-Saxon England* (Oxford, 1999)

LAPIDGE, M., and H. Gneuss, ed., *Learning and Literature: Studies Presented to Peter Clemoes on the Occasion of his Sixty-Fifth Birthday* (Cambridge, 1985)

LAW, V., 'Grammar, Latin (Study of)' in *The Blackwell Encyclopaedia of Anglo-Saxon England*, ed. M. Lapidge *et al.*, (Oxford, 1999), pp. 217-8

-----, *The Insular Latin Grammarians* (Woodbridge, 1982)

LECLERCQ, H., 'Anges', *Dictionnaire d'Archéologie Chrétienne et de Liturgie*, ed. F. Cabrol (1904-6), cols. 2080-2161

LECLERCQ, J., 'Tables pour l'inventaire des homiliaires manuscrits', *Scriptorium* 2 (1948), 195-214

-----, 'Le iiie livre des homélies de Bède le Vénérable' *Recherches de Théologie ancienne et médiévale* 14 (1947), 211-8

LEONARDI, C., 'Il venerabile Beda e la cultura del secolo viii', *I problemi dell'Occidente nel secolo VIII*, Settimane di Studio 20 (Spoleto, 1972), 603-58

LEVISON, W., *England and the Continent in the Eighth Century: The Ford Lectures delivered in the University of Oxford in the Hilary Term, 1943* (Oxford, 1946)

-----, 'Modern Editions of Bede' *The Durham University Journal*, NS VI, vol. 37 (1945), 78-85

-----, 'Bede as Historian', in *Bede: His Life, Times and Writings*, ed. A. Hamilton Thompson (Oxford, 1935), pp. 111-51

LEYSER, C., *Authority and Asceticism from Augustine to Gregory* (Oxford, 2000)

LOEWE, R., 'The Medieval History of the Latin Vulgate', in *The Cambridge History of the Bible: The West from the Fathers of the Church to the Reformation*, ed. G. W. H. Lampe (Cambridge, 1969), pp. 129-34

LONGÈRE, J., *La prédication médievale* (Paris, 1983)

LOWE, E. A., *Codices Latini Antiquiores* (Oxford, 1934-72)

-----, *English Uncial* (Oxford, 1960)

-----, 'A Key to Bede's Scriptorium', in *Palaeographical Papers 1907-1965*, ed. L. Bieler (Oxford, 1972), pp. 441-9, 1st published in *Scriptorium* 12 (1958)

LOZITO, V., 'Le tradizione celtiche nella polemica antipelagiana di Beda', *Romanobarbarica* 3 (1978), 71-88

de LUBAC, H., *Exégèse Médiévale: Les quatres sens de l'Écriture* (Paris, 1959-64)

LUNEAU, A., *L'histoire du salut chez les Pères de l'Église: La doctrine des ages du monde* (Paris, 1964)

McCLURE, J., 'Bede's *Notes on Genesis* and the Training of the Anglo-Saxon Clergy', in *The Bible in the Medieval World: Essays in Memory of Beryl Smalley*, ed. K. Walsh and D. Wood (Oxford, 1985), pp. 17-30

-----, 'Bede's Old Testament Kings' in *Ideal and Reality in Frankish and Anglo-Saxon Society: Studies Presented to J. M. Wallace-Hadrill*, ed. P. Wormald *et al*. (Oxford, 1983), pp. 76-98

-----, *Gregory the Great: Exegesis and Audience* (unpublished D.Phil., Oxford, 1978)

McCREADY, W., *Miracles and the Venerable Bede*, Studies and Texts 118 (Toronto, 1994)

McKITTERICK, R., ed., *The New Cambridge Medieval History: Volume II c.700– c.900* (Cambridge, 1995)

-----, 'Chapter 2 (c): England and the Continent' in *The New Cambridge Medieval History*, pp. 64-84

-----, 'Chapter 25: Eighth-Century Foundations' in *The New Cambridge Medieval History*, pp. 681-94

-----, *The Carolingians and the Written Word* (Cambridge, 1989)

-----, *The Frankish Church and the Carolingian Reforms 789-895* (London, 1977)

MACKAY, T. W., 'Augustine and Gregory the Great in Bede's Commentary on the Apocalypse', in *Northumbria's Golden Age*, ed. J. Hawkes and S. Mills (Stroud, 1999), pp. 396-406

de la MARE, A. C., and B. C. Barker-Benfield, ed., *Manuscripts at Oxford: R. W. Hunt Memorial Exhibition* (Oxford, 1980)

MARENBON, J., *From the Circle of Alcuin to the School of Auxerre: Logic, Theology and Philosophy in the Early Middle Ages* (Cambridge, 1981)

MARKUS, R. A., *Gregory the Great and His World* (Cambridge, 1997)

-----, 'From Caesarius to Boniface: Christianity and Paganism in Gaul', in *The Seventh Century: Change and Continuity*, ed. J. Fontaine and J. Hillgarth (London, 1992), pp. 250-76

-----, *Saeculum: History and Society in the Theology of Saint Augustine*, rev. edn (Cambridge, 1988)

-----, 'The Sacred and the Secular: From Augustine to Gregory the Great', *Journal of Theological Studies* 36 (1985) 84-98

-----, *Bede and the Tradition of Ecclesiastical Historiography*, Jarrow Lecture (Jarrow, 1975)

MARROU, H. I., Review of M. T. A. Carroll, *Revue du moyen âge latin* 4 (1948), 394-5

MARSDEN, R., '*Manus Bedae*: Bede's Contribution to Ceolfrith's Bibles', *ASE* 27 (1998), 65-86

-----, *The Text of the Old Testament in Anglo-Saxon England* (Cambridge, 1995)

MARTIN, L. T., trans., *Bede the Venerable: Homilies on the Gospels: Book One Advent to Lent* CSS 110 (Kalamazoo, 1991)

-----, 'Augustine's Influence on Bede's *Homeliae Evangelii*' in *Collectanea Augustinianum: Augustine: 'Second Founder of the Faith'*, ed. J. C. Schnaubelt and F. Van Fleteren (New York, 1990), pp. 357-69

-----, 'The Two Worlds in Bede's Homilies: The Biblical Event and the Listener's Experience', in *De Ore Domini: Preacher and Word in the Middle Ages*, ed. T. L. Amos *et al.*, Studies in Medieval Culture 27 (Kalamazoo, 1989), pp. 27-40

-----, trans., *The Venerable Bede: Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles*, CSS 117 (Kalamazoo, 1989)

-----, 'Bede's Structural Use of Word-Play as a Way to Truth', in *From the Cloister to the Classroom: Monastic and Scholastic Approaches to Truth*, ed. E. Rozanne Elder (Kalamazoo, 1986), pp. 27-46

-----, 'Bede as a Linguistic Scholar', *American Benedictine Review* 35 (1985), 204-17

MAYR-HARTING, H., *Perceptions of Angels in History: An Inaugural Lecture Delivered in the University of Oxford on 14 November 1997* (Oxford, 1998)

-----, 'Bede's Patristic Thinking as an Historian' in *Historiographie im frühen Mittelalter*, ed. A. Scharer and G. Scheibelreiter (Vienna, 1994), pp. 367-74

-----, *Two Conversions to Christianity: The Bulgarians and the Anglo-Saxons* (Reading, 1994)

-----, *The Coming of Christianity to Anglo-Saxon England*, 3rd edn (Pennsylvania, 1991)

-----, *Ottonian Book Illumination: An Historical Study*, 2 vols., 1st edn (London, 1991)

-----, *The Venerable Bede, the Rule of St Benedict, and Social Class*, Jarrow Lecture (Jarrow, 1976)

MEYVAERT, P., 'Bede, Cassiodorus and the Codex Amiatinus', *Speculum* 71 (1996), 827-84

-----, 'Bede's *Capitula Lectionum* for the Old and New Testaments', *RB* 105 (1995), 348-80

-----, 'Bede and the Church Paintings at Wearmouth-Jarrow', *ASE* 8 (1979), 63-78

-----, *Benedict, Gregory, Bede and Others* (London, 1977)

-----, 'Bede the Scholar' in *Famulus Christi*, ed. G. Bonner (London, 1976), pp. 40-69

-----, 'The Registrum of Gregory the Great and Bede' in his *Benedict, Gregory, Bede and Others* (London, 1977), XI, first published in *RB* 80 (1970), 162-6

-----, 'Gregory the Great and the Theme of Authority' in his *Benedict, Gregory, Bede and Others*, (London, 1977), V, first published in *Spode House Review* 3 (December 1966), 3-12

-----, *Bede and Gregory the Great*, Jarrow Lecture (Jarrow, 1964)

-----, 'Diversity within Unity, A Gregorian Theme' in his *Benedict, Gregory, Bede and Others*, (London, 1977), VI, first published in *The Heythrop Journal* 4 (1963), 141-62

-----, 'Bede and the *Libellus Synodicus* of Gregory the Great' in his *Benedict, Gregory, Bede and Others* (London, 1977), XII, first published in *Journal of Theological Studies* n.s. 12 (1961), 298-302

-----, 'The Bede "Signature" in the Leningrad Colophon', *RB* 71 (1961), p. 285

MICHELLI, P., 'What's in the Cupboard? Ezra and Matthew Reconsidered' in *Northumbria's Golden Age*, ed. J. Hawkes and S. Mills (Stroud, 1999), pp. 345-58

MITCHELL, B. M., and F. C. ROBINSON, *A Guide to Old English*, 5th edn (Oxford, 1992)

MOHRMANN, C., *Études sur le Latin des Chrétiens*, 2 vols. (Rome, 1961)

MORIN, G., ed., *Sancti Caesarii Arelatensis: Sermones*, CCSL 103 (Turnholt, 1953)

-----, *Miscellanea Agostiniana* I (Rome, 1930)

-----, 'Liturgie et basilique de Rome au milieu du VIIe siècle', *RB* 28 (1911), 296-330

-----, 'Les notes liturgiques de l'Évangelaire de Burchard', *RB* 10 (1893), 113-26

-----, 'Le recueil primitif des homélies de Bede sur l'Evangile', *RB* 9 (1892), 316-26

-----, 'Le liturgie de Naples au temps de saint Grégoire', *RB* 8 (1891), 481-93 and 529-37

MORRIS, C. D., *Church and Monastery in the Far North: An Archaeological Evaluation*, Jarrow Lecture (Jarrow, 1989)

MULLER, A., 'L'unité de l'Église et de la Sainte Vierge chez les Pères des IVe et Ve siècles', *Études Mariales* 9 (1951) 27-38

MYNORS, R. A. B., 'Technical Description and History the Manuscript' [Stonyhurst Gospel], in *The Relics of St. Cuthbert*, ed. C. F. Battiscombe (Oxford, 1956), pp. 356-61

-----, *Durham Cathedral Manuscripts to the End of the Twelfth Century* (Oxford, 1939)

di NAPOLI, R., *An Index of Theme and Image to the Homilies of the Anglo-Saxon Church: Comprising the Homilies of Ælfric, Wulfstan and the Blickling and Vercelli Codices* (Hockwold-cum-Wilton, 1995)

Ó CRÓINÍN, D., ed., *The Irish* Sex Aetates Mundi (Dublin, 1983)

O'KEEFFE, K. O'Brien, 'The Use of Bede's Writings on Genesis in Alcuin's *Interrogationes*', *Sacris Erudiri* 23 (1978-9)

-----, *Visible Song: Transitional Literacy in Old English Verse* (Cambridge, 1990)

O'MALLEY, J. W., 'Introduction: Medieval Preaching' in *De Ore Domini: Preacher and Word in the Middle Ages*, ed. T. L. Amos *et al.*, (Kalamazoo, 1989), pp.1-12

O'REILLY, J., 'The Library of Scripture: Views from the Vivarium and Wearmouth-Jarrow' in *New Offerings, Ancient Treasures: Essays in Medieval Art for George Henderson*, ed. P. Binski and W. G. Noel (Stroud, 2001), pp. 3-39

------, 'Patristic and Insular Traditions of the Evangelists: Exegesis and Iconography' in *Le isole Britanniche e Roma in età Romanobarbarica*, ed. A. M. Luiselli and E. Ó Carragáin (Rome, 1998), pp. 49-94

OBERHELMAN, S. M., *Rhetoric and Homiletics in Fourth-Century Christian Literature: Prose Rhythm, Oratorical Style and Preaching in the Works of Ambrose, Jerome and Augustine*, American Classical Studies 26 (Atlanta, Georgia, 1991)

OGILVY, J. D. A., *The Place of Wearmouth and Jarrow in Western Cultural History*, Jarrow Lecture (Jarrow, 1968)

OLIVAR, A., *La Predicación Cristiana Antigua* (Barcelona, 1991)

Oxford English Dictionary, 2nd edn (Oxford, 1989)

PAGANO, R. R., *Understanding Statistics in the Behavioral Sciences*, 3rd edn (St Paul, Minnesota, 1990)

PALMER, R. B., 'Bede as a Text Book Writer: A Study of his *De Arte Metrica*', *Speculum* 34 (1959), 573-84

PARKES, M. B., *Pause and Effect: An Introduction to the History of Punctuation in the West* (Aldershot, 1992)

-----, 'The Contribution of Insular Scribes in the Seventh and Eighth Centuries to the "Grammar of Legibility"' in his *Scribes, Scripts and Readers* (London, 1991), pp. 1-18

-----, 'Tachygraphy in the Middle Ages: Writing Techniques Employed for the *Reportationes* of Lectures and Sermons' in his *Scribes, Scripts and Readers: Studies in the Communication, Presentation and Dissemination of Medieval Texts* (London, 1991), pp. 19-34, 1st published in *Medioevo e rinascimento*, Annuario del Dipartimento di Studio sul Medioevo e il Rinascimento dell'Università di Firenze 3 (1989), pp. 159-69

-----, *The Scriptorium of Monkwearmouth-Jarrow*, Jarrow Lecture (Jarrow, 1982)

PELTERET, D. A. E., 'Bede's Women' in *Women, Marriage and Family in Medieval Christendom: Essays in Memory of Michael M. Sheehan C. S. B.*, ed. C.M. Rousseau *et al.*, (Kalamazoo, 1998), pp. 19-46

 PFAFF, R., 'Liturgy' in *The Blackwell Encyclopaedia of Anglo-Saxon England*, ed. M. Lapidge *et al.*, (Oxford, 1999), pp. 292-3

-----, *The Anglo-Saxon Bishop and his Book: The Toller Memorial Lecture* (Manchester, 1999), 1st appeared in *Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester* 81.1 (Spring 1999)

-----, *The Liturgical Books of Anglo-Saxon England* (Kalamazoo, 1995)

-----, 'Bede among the Fathers? The Evidence from Liturgical Commemoration', *Studia Patristica* 28 (1993), 225-9

-----, *Medieval Latin Liturgy: A Select Bibliography* (Toronto, 1982)

PIPER, A. J., *The Durham Monks at Jarrow*, Jarrow Lecture (Jarrow, 1986)

PLUMMER, C., ed., *Venerabilis Baedae Opera Historica*, (Oxford, 1896)

QUENTIN, H., 'Bède le Vénérable', *Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie* 2 (Paris, 1907), cols. 632-48

RABY, F. J. E., 'Bède le Vénérable', *Dictionnaire d'histoire et de géographie ecclésiastique* 7 (1934), 395-402

RAHNER, K., *Meditations on the Sacraments*, trans. J. M. Quigley *et al*. (London, 1977)

RAND, E. K., *Studies in the Script of Tours IA: Survey of the Manuscripts of Tours* , 2 vols. (Cambridge, Mass., 1929)

RAUNER, E., 'Notkers des Stammlers "Notatio de illustribus viris" Teil II: Kritische Edition', *Mittellateinisches Jahrbuch* 21 (1986), 34-69

RAY, R., *Bede, Rhetoric, and the Creation of Christian Latin Culture*, Jarrow Lecture (Jarrow, 1997)

-----, 'Bede and Cicero', *ASE* 16 (1987), 1-16

-----, 'What do we know about Bede's Commentaries?', *Recherches de Théolgie* 49 (1982), 1-20

-----, 'Bede's Vera Lex Historiae', *Speculum* 55 (1980), 1-21. Stable URL: http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0038-7134%281980%2955%3A1%3C1%3AB VLH%3E2.0.CO%3B2-T

-----, 'Bede, the Exegete, as Historian', in *Famulus Christi*, ed. G Bonner (London, 1976), pp. 125-140

RECIO, D. J. F. Rivera, 'El "Homeliarum Gothicum" de la Bibliotheca Capitular de Toledo', *Hispania Sacra* 4 (1951), 147-68

REUTER, T., *Germany in the Early Middle Ages c. 800-1056* (London, 1991)

REYNOLDS, R. E., 'Chapter 22: The Organisation, Law and Liturgy of the Western Church, 700-900', in *The New Cambridge Medieval History*, ed. R. McKitterick (Cambridge, 1995), pp. 587-621

RICHÉ, P., *Education and Culture in the Barbarian West: Sixth Through Eighth Centuries*, trans. J. J. Contreni (Columbia, 1976)

RICHTER, M., 'Das irische Erbe der Karolinger', in *Karl der Grosse und sein Nachwirken*, ed. P. L. Butzer *et al.* (Turnholt, 1998), I, 79-96

ROBINSON, B. P., 'The Venerable Bede as Exegete', *The Downside Review* 112 (1994), 201-26

ROLLASON, D., *Bede and Germany*, Jarrow Lecture (Jarrow, 2001)

-----, *Symeon of Durham: Historian of Durham and the North* (Stamford, 1998)

SALMON, P., *L'office divin: Histoire de la formation du breviare*, Lex Orandi 27 (Paris, 1959)

-----, *Le Lectionnaire de Luxeuil: Paris, MS Lat. 9427; édition et étude comparative. Contribution à l'histoire de la Vulgate et de la liturgie en France aux temps des Mérovingiens* , I (Rome, 1944-53)

SCHALLER, D., 'Der verleumdete David: Zum Schubkapitel von Bedas "Epistola ed Pleguinam"' in *Literatur und Sprache in Europaïschen Mittelalter:*

Festschrift für Karl Langosch zum 70. Geburtstag, ed. A. Önnerfors *et al.*, (Darmstadt, 1973), pp. 39-43

SCHMITZ, P. 'Note sur l'homiliaire ms. Berlin, Bibl. État, Lat. fol. 75b', *RB* 45 (1933), 333

SCHNAUBELT, J. C., and F. Van Fleteren, ed., *Collectanea Augustiniana: Augustine: "Second Founder of the Faith"* (New York, 1990)

SCHREINER, S. E., 'Eve, the Mother of History' in *Genesis 1-3 in the History of Exegesis*, ed. G. Robbins (Lewiston, 1988), pp. 135-86

SCRAGG, D. G., 'The Corpus of Vernacular Homilies and Prose Saints' Lives before Ælfric', *ASE* 8 (1979), 223-78

SHARPE, R., 'The Varieties of Bede's Prose', in *Aspects of the Language of Latin Prose* (forthcoming)

-----, *Titulus: Identifying Medieval Latin Texts* (Turnholt, 2002)

-----, *Medieval Irish Saints' Lives: An Introduction to Vitae Sanctorum Hiberniae* (Oxford, 1991)

SINISCALCO, P., 'Due Opere a Confronto sulla Creazione dell'uomo: Il *De Genesi ad Litteram Libri XII* di Agostino e I *Libri IV In Principium Genesis* di Beda', *Augustinianum* 25 (1985), 435-52

-----, 'Le età del mondo in Beda', *Romanobarbarica* 3 (1978), 297-332

SMETANA, C. L., 'Paul the Deacon's Patristic Anthology' in *The Old English Homily and Its Background*, ed. P. E. Szarmach and B. F. Huppé (Albany, 1978), pp. 75-97

SMITH, H. Dansey, *Preaching in the Spanish Golden Age* (Oxford, 1978)

STANSBURY, M., 'Source-marks in Bede's Biblical Commentaries' in *Northumbria's Golden Age*, ed. J. Hawkes and S. Mills, (Stroud, 1999), pp. 383-9

STEINHAUSER, K. B., 'Forty Gospel Homilies: Review', *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 1 (1993), 102-3

STENTON, F., *Anglo-Saxon England*, 3rd edn (Oxford, 1971)

STINSON, C., '"Northernmost Israel": England, the Old Testament, and the Hebraic "veritas" as Seen by Bede and Roger Bacon' in *Hebrew and the Bible in America: The First Two Centuries*, ed. S. Goldman (Hanover and London, 1993), pp. 14-42

STRAW, C., 'Purity and Death' in *Gregory the Great: A Symposium*, Notre Dame Studies in Theology 2, ed. J. C. Cavadini (Notre Dame, 1995), pp. 16-37

-----, *Gregory the Great: Perfection in Imperfection* (Berkeley, 1988)

SUTCLIFFE, E. F., 'Some Footnotes to the Fathers', *Biblica* 6 (1925), 205-10

SZARMACH, P. E., and B. F. Huppé, ed., *The Old English Homily and its Backgrounds* (New York, 1978)

SZARMACH, P. E., and V. Oggins, ed., *Sources of Anglo-Saxon Culture*, Studies in Medieval Culture 20 (Kalamazoo, 1986)

TALBOT, C. H., ed. and trans., *The Anglo-Saxon Missionaries in Germany: Being the Lives of SS Willibrord, Boniface, Sturm, Leoba and Lebain, together with the Hodoeporicon of St Boniface* (London, 1954)

TAYLOR, J., 'The Text of St John Chrysostom's Homilies on John', *Studia Patristica* 25 (1993), 172-5

THACKER, A., 'Monks, Preaching and Pastoral Care in Early Anglo-Saxon England', in *Pastoral Care Before the Parish*, ed. J. Blair and R. Sharpe (Leicester, 1992), pp. 137-70

-----, 'Lindisfarne and the Origins of the Cult of St Cuthbert', in *St Cuthbert, His Cult and His Community to AD 1200*, ed. G. Bonner *et al.* (Woodbridge, 1989), pp. 103-22

-----, 'Bede's Ideal of Reform', in *Ideal and Reality in Frankish and Anglo-Saxon Society: Studies Presented to J. M. Wallace-Hadrill*, ed. P. Wormald *et al.* (Oxford, 1983), pp. 130-53

THOMPSON, A. Hamilton, *Bede, His Life, Times and Writings: Essays in Commemoration of the Twelfth Centenary of His Death* (Oxford, 1935)

TUNBRIDGE, G., *A Study of Scribal Practices in Early Irish and Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts* (unpublished D.Phil. thesis, Oxford, 1992)

VACANT, A., ed., *Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique* (Paris, 1903-50)

VACCARI, A., 'Le antiche vita di S. Girolamo', in *Miscellanea Geronimiana* (Rome, 1920), pp. 1-18

VERBRACKEN, P.-P., *Études critiques sur les sermons authentiques de S. Augustin* (Steenbrugge, 1976)

VESSEY, J. N., 'After the Maurists: The Oxford Correspondence of Dom Germain Morin OSB' in *Patristique et Antiquité tardive en Allemagne et en France de 1870 à 1930: Influences et échanges. Actes du Colloque franco-allemand de*

Chantilly (25-27 octobre 1991), ed. J. Fontaine *et al*. (Paris, 1993), pp. 166-90

VOGEL, C., *Medieval Liturgy: An Introduction to the Sources*, revised and trans., W. G. Storey and N. K. Rasmussen (Washington DC, 1986)

-----, 'La réforme liturgique sous Charlemagne', in *Karl der Grosse*, ed. W. Braunfels, vol. II (Dusseldorf, 1965), pp. 217-32

WALLIS, F., trans., *Bede: The Reckoning of Time* (Liverpool, 1999)
van der WALT, A. G. P., 'Reflections of the Benedictine Rule in Bede's Homiliary', *JEH* 37 (1986) 367-76

-----, *The Homiliary of the Venerable Bede and Early Medieval Preaching* (unpublished Ph.D. thesis, London, 1980)

WARD, B., *The Venerable Bede* (London, 1998)

-----, '"In medium duorum animalium": Bede and Jerome on the Canticle of Habakkuk', *Studia Patristica* 25 (1993), 189-93

-----, *Bede and the Psalter*, Jarrow Lecture (Jarrow, 1991)

-----, 'The Spirituality of St Cuthbert', in *St Cuthbert, His Cult and His Community*, ed. G. Bonner *et al*. (Woodbridge, 1989), pp. 65-76

-----, 'Miracles and History: A Reconsideration of the Miracle Stories Used by Bede', in *Famulus Christi*, ed. G. Bonner (London, 1976), pp. 70-6

WEBSTER, L., 'The Iconographic Programme of the Franks Casket' in *Northumbria's Golden Age*, ed. J. Hawkes and S. Mills (Stroud, 1999), pp. 227-46

WEIGAND, F., 'Das Homiliarium Karls des Grossen', *Studien zur Geschichte der Theologie und der Kirche* I.ii (Leipzig, 1897)

WEST, P. J., 'Liturgical Style and Structure in Bede's Homily for the Easter Vigil', *American Benedictine Review* 23 (1972), 1-8

-----, 'Liturgical Style and Structure in Bede's Christmas Homilies', *American Benedictine Review* 23 (1972), 424-38

WETHERBEE, W., 'Some Implications of Bede's Latin Style', in *Bede and Anglo-Saxon England: Papers in Honour of the 1300th Anniversary of the Birth of Bede, Given at Cornell University in 1973 and 1974*, ed. R. T. Farrell, British Archaological Reports 46 (Oxford, 1978), pp. 23-31

WIEGAND, F., 'Das Homiliarum Karls des Grossen', *Studien zur Geschichte der Theologie und der Kirche* I.II (Leipzig, 1897)

WILDHABER, R., '*Beda Venerabilis* and the Snakes', in *Folklore Today: A Festschrift for Richard M. Dorson*, ed. L. Dégh, H. Glassie and F. Oinas (Bloomington, 1976), pp. 497-506

WILMART, A., *Auteurs Spirituels et Textes dévots du moyen age latin: Études d'histoire littéraire* (Paris, 1932)

WINTERBOTTOM, M., A review of Janson, *Medium Aevum* 45 (1976), 298-300

WOOD, I., *The Most Holy Abbot Ceolfrid*, Jarrow Lecture (Jarrow, 1995)

-----, *The Merovingian Kingdoms 450-751* (London, 1994)

WORMALD, P., 'The Venerable Bede and the "Church of the English"' in *English Religious Tradition and the Genius of Anglicanism* ed. G. Rowell (Wantage, 1992), pp. 13-32

-----, ed., *Ideal and Reality in Frankish and Anglo-Saxon Society: Studies Presented to J. M. Wallace-Hadrill* (Oxford, 1984)

-----, 'Bede, Beowulf and the Conversion of the Anglo-Saxon Aristocracy' in *Bede and Anglo-Saxon England: Papers in Honour of the 1300th Anniversary of the Birth of Bede, Given at Cornell University in 1973 and 1974*, ed. R. T. Farrell, British Archaological Reports 46 (Oxford, 1978), pp. 32-95

WRIGHT, D., 'The Date of the Leningrad Bede', *RB* 71 (1961), 265-73

WRIGHT, N., 'Bede and Vergil', *Romanobarbarica* 6 (1982), 361-79

URLs

Fontes Anglo-Saxonici Project, ed., *Fontes Anglo-Saxonici: World Wide Web Register*, http://fontes.english.ox.ac.uk/

'Homiletics', http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/07443a.htm

'MS Görres 86, Berlin Staatsbibliothek', http://www.manuscripta-medievalia.de /hs/katalogseiten/HSK0710_b077_jpg.htm

'Cologne, Dombibliothek Codex 172', http://www.ceec.uni-koeln.de/ceec.cgi/kleioc/ 0010/exec/katk/%22kn28%2D0172%22