

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 nationale (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 Cathédrale, 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: Catalogue Codicum manuscriptorum qui in collegiis aliisque 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 saluatore', 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 uigilantes et custodientes uigilias 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 uoce sermonis uerum etiam claritate diuinae 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 ... uerum 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 audiuius 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 *audiuimus*, 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.